

Policy/ Paragra ph/ Figure	Wording	Comments	SDNPA response
Basic Conditions		<p>Neighbourhood plans must meet the Basic Conditions. All of these can be found in paragraph 65 of national guidance: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-- 2#basicconditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum</p> <p>One of these states that the “neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan”. Up to date strategic policies are set out in the local plan.</p> <p>It is recommended, as early as possible, to carefully consider how TNP meets the Basic Conditions and why.</p>	SDNPA to write Basic Conditions Statement
		<p>Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that those producing neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, this is set out in Annex A of the TVBRLP.</p> <p>More specifically paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.</p> <p>When considering whether a policy is in general conformity a qualifying body, independent examiner, or local planning authority, should consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general 	To note and to clarify that TVBC has confirmed that SEA/SA is not required.

		<p>conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy• the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach. <p>Strategic policies will be different in each local planning authority area. When reaching a view on whether a policy is a strategic policy the following are useful considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the policy sets out an overarching direction or objective• whether the policy seeks to shape the broad characteristics of development• the scale at which the policy is intended to operate• whether the policy sets a framework for decisions on how competing priorities should be balanced• whether the policy sets a standard or other requirement that is essential to achieving the wider vision and aspirations in the Local Plan• in the case of site allocations, whether bringing the site forward is central to achieving the vision and aspirations of the Local Plan• whether the Local Plan identifies the policy as being strategic <p>A qualifying body is advised to set out in its basic conditions statement how they have had regard to national policy and considered whether a particular policy is or is not relevant. A qualifying body is encouraged to set out the particular</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>national policies that it has considered, and how the policies in a draft neighbourhood plan or the development proposals in an Order take account of national policy and advice.</p> <p>A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures).</p> <p>In order to demonstrate that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to sustainable development, sufficient and proportionate evidence should be presented on how the draft neighbourhood plan or Order guides development to sustainable solutions. There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainabilityappraisal). However, qualifying bodies may find this a useful approach for demonstrating how their draft plan or order meets the basic condition. Material produced as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan may be relevant to a neighbourhood plan</p>	
Evidence base		<p>A neighbourhood plan should be supported by a proportionate (in the work required) and robust (to withstand scrutiny) planning evidence base.</p> <p>The three core evidence base documents are the Basic Conditions Statement, Consultation Statement and Environmental Report (SEA or SA report).</p> <p>These should be the primary method of demonstrating how</p>	To Note

		<p>TNP meets requirements, to help pass the examination and ensure it can be made part of the development plan.</p> <p>Other evidence base documents may be submitted for examination where they have been prepared and lend support to TNP. The volume of these extra documents should be within reason, so as not to unnecessarily delay examination.</p> <p>The evidence base documents have been filed in categories and are well ordered. It would be helpful however to link the relevant number in the evidence base to the areas of the text to which the document relates for clarity. In particular this would also be helpful within the Evidence Base section at the end of the Plan.</p>	
Health Check		<p>Seeking independent advice from a suitably qualified professional on whether the neighbourhood plan will meet the Basic Conditions is strongly recommended.</p> <p>Two options that could be considered are to seek the views of an examiner or consultant or to carry out a health check on your plan.</p> <p>A health check gives valuable independent insight into whether a neighbourhood plan is expected to meet the Basic Conditions and helps to inform the final submission plan.</p>	To Note
General		<p>The use of community projects and aspirations in a separate section is welcomed and it is clear that these do not form part of the land use policies.</p>	SDNPA to re-structure text to reference relevant evidence, TVLP/NPPF policies after NDP policies.

		<p>The My Community Guidance recommends how to set out and reference each policy. In relation to each policy, it may be beneficial to more clearly identify and present the objectives from the outset to provide a defined and highlighted basis for the policy.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to clearly refer to the relevant parts of the evidence base that supports the policy</p> <p>TVBRLP and National policies should be referred to where these are built upon/ relevant.</p> <p>Whilst much of this is in the supporting text, it is not readily visible and would benefit from re-organisation.</p>	
EN1: Landscape and Character of Thruxton Parish	<p>1. Development proposals must conserve and enhance the rural character and open chalk landscape of the Parish and must demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) proposals are informed and guided by the landscape character; b) design, layout and scale of proposals conserve and enhance existing landscape features that contribute to the distinctive character, pattern and evolution of the landscape in the Parish; c) lighting is avoided and where necessary does not cause light pollution sufficient to reduce the quality of dark night skies or adversely affect habitats or the amenity of other 	<p>TVBC support the objectives of the policy, however it appears less detailed the TVBLP E2, with the exception of lighting. It would benefit from further work from the evidence base to support the 'distinctive character, pattern and evolution of the landscape in the Parish' element, such that it was clear what these elements are. If there is more information within the evidence base, this should be highlighted.</p> <p>Potentially criterion c) could be a separate policy which could go into further detail about reducing light pollution.</p> <p>Need/ Objectives/ National & TVBC Policy – Although it states it supports the objectives LE01 and 02, it would be beneficial to add this to the policy and potentially to add to the text to provide a more defined and highlighted basis for</p>	SDNPA to re-structure policy.

	occupiers.	the policy.	
Policy EN2: Settlement character and separation	<p>1. Development proposals must conserve and enhance the individual identity and separation of settlements, and rural sense of place of the Parish. Development proposals will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) are located within a settlement boundary, except where they comply with Policy HD8; b) do not, individually or cumulative with other existing or proposed development, diminish the physical and visual separation of the four settlement areas of Thruxton Parish; c) respond to the individual identifies of each of the four settlement areas; and d) do not have a detrimental impact of the predominantly undeveloped landscape of the parish. 	<p>The policy is generally consistent with the intentions of policies in the TVBRLP.</p> <p>It would be helpful to refer to the relevant parts of the evidence base that supports the policy in a clearly defined manner – these are set out in paragraph 5.10, but could be clearer. There is also the requirement for a proportionate landscape assessment set out, but this not included in the policy. TVBLP policies should be referred to where these are built upon.</p> <p>Criterion b) could be worded more positively in line with sustainable development. At present any development on the edge of a settlement would ‘physically diminish’ the separation by its very nature. Therefore it would be beneficial to re-word this such that the word ‘physically’ is removed. The four settlement areas could be mentioned by name, particularly if there are specific areas of concern. It may also be beneficial to state how such a policy would be monitored.</p> <p>The reference to Policy E3 of the TVBLP could be confusing as this is not an area within the designated Local Gaps.</p>	<p>SDNPA to re-structure to clarify relevant evidence base. Remove reference to word ‘physically’, name settlements and explain how policy is to be monitored.</p>
Policy EN3: Protecting views	<p>1. Development proposals must protect and, where possible, positively contribute, to the views and vistas within, to and from the Parish and open countryside, especially where these views are from public rights of way and Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>2. Special attention should be made to preserving notable views which are shown on Maps 2(a-c) and include:</p>	<p>The policy is generally consistent with the intentions of policies in the TVBRLP.</p> <p>It is not clear as to where the evidence for the viewpoints has been obtained. If it is within part of the evidence base of surveys/ questionnaires or appraisals, could this be referenced? Some views such as in and around the Conservation Area for example could carry more weight</p>	<p>Consider more work to be done here to evidence viewpoints and to explain why they are important.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. View from footpath over Mullen's Pond towards Thruxton village; 2. Entry to Thruxton village from east; 3. View from footpath looking northwest towards Thruxton village; 4. View from footpath looking south east towards Amesbury Road; 5. View from footpath towards Fyfield Church; 6. View south towards Quarley Hillfort from the old A303; 7. Looking towards Thruxton village from east from Amesbury Road; 8. Looking east from Thruxton Down; 9. Entering Thruxton Down from the east; 10. Entering Thruxton Down from the west; 11. View of Snowdrop Field from Village Street; 12. View of Manor House field from Church Lane; 13. View across Village Green; 14. View down Village Street from west; and 15. View down Village Street from east 	<p>than others, but without further evidence it would be difficult to substantiate that all views 'must' be protected from development proposals.</p> <p>The plans could be clearer and would benefit from larger numbers (in particular viewpoint 2 for example). Do the different size arrows denote anything different, if so this should be reflected in the key.</p> <p>It may also be beneficial to state how such a policy would be monitored.</p>	<p>Improve clarity of mapping.</p> <p>Look at how this can be monitored and explain in supporting text.</p>
Policy EN4: Biodiversity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals must conserve or enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity of the Parish, including creating links between habitats to improve connectivity. 2. Development proposals that would result in an adverse effect on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation which cannot either be avoided or adequately mitigated will be refused. 3. Where development will impact important habitats it should be demonstrated that the development would have a positive impact on those 	<p>The policy which set out opportunities for improving biodiversity is welcomed, but it should be added that:</p> <p>Policy – criterion 1 is too general, not all development proposals in the village may relate to biodiversity. The wording should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The current map shown provides a good overview, but a detailed map would be beneficial. Criterion 2 should link to the map and potentially add the potential SSSI Impact Risk Zones such as Quarley Hill Fort SSSI/ Salisbury Plain SAC &</p>	<p>SDNPA to consider re-wording.</p> <p>Look at the provision of a more detailed map and identification of SSSI impact zones even though this information is on Natural England's interactive Magic website</p>

	<p>habitats. A suitable management plan will be required, which clearly sets out the long term management of the habitat, complete with a fully costed budget proposal for the management plan, and to provide the finance in the form of an upfront payment to cover all works so as to ensure that the burden does not fall on the Parish Council. Important habitats include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chalk grassland - Hedgerows - Ponds - Chalk water courses including Pillhill Brook 	<p>SSSI, which fall within the Parish?</p> <p>Criterion 3 – the wording of the policy with reference to seeking a financial payment should be reworded. It must be clear that this will be sought via appropriate condition or planning obligation to mitigate the effects of the development.</p>	Re-word to refer to conditions/obligations.
Policy EN5: Pillhill Brook	<p>1. Development proposals that would adversely affect the following features of Pillhill Brook will not be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) landscape character, appearance and setting; b) biodiversity; and c) ability for the headwaters and watercourse corridor to function by natural processes throughout seasonal variations. <p>2. SuDS or other appropriate methods of managing rainwater run off from development towards the Brook must ensure that any pollution is dealt with at source and not allowed to enter the water course.</p> <p>3. Informal Recreational proposals that would enhance the accessibility, understanding or enjoyment of the biodiversity assets of Pillhill Brook and Mullens Pond will be supported provided its distinctive character and biodiversity is retained.</p>	<p>TVBC support the objectives of the policy, which builds on TVBRLP Policy E5 , in particular Criterion 2 and 3. It should be noted however that with regard to criterion 1c, it is not clear where the information for this aspect is to be found and measured?</p>	<p>Criterion c) refers to maintaining the natural functioning of the river rather than this being altered through man-made structures. SDNPA can add extra text to clarify.</p>
Policy EN6: Trees and hedgerows	<p>1. Development proposals should, where possible, conserve and enhance trees and hedgerows. The loss of trees or hedgerows of value will not be</p>	<p>TVBC support the objectives of the policy, which builds on that set out in TVBRLP Policy E2. Criterion 1 sets out that the loss of trees or hedgerows of</p>	SDNPA to add wording.

	<p>supported.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that affect existing trees and hedgerows, or involve the new planting of trees and hedgerows, must demonstrate that they have been informed and guided by full site survey, including Ecological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3. Existing trees and hedgerows should be integrated into the proposed landscaping schemes for the development and provide a management plan for their future care and maintenance, which clearly sets out the long term management and yearly maintenance of all trees and hedgerows, complete with a fully costed budget proposal for the management plan term, and to provide the finance in the form of an upfront payment to cover all works so as to ensure that the burden does not fall on the Parish Council</p> <p>4. Where replacement or new trees and hedgerows are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) replacement planting must be with appropriate locally native species unless there are overriding reasons to do otherwise. Species should be particularly suitable to the location, including variety, height, density and soil type; b) tree plantings should be given sufficient space to develop into their natural size and shape; and c) succession planting should be considered where existing plantings are mature or over- mature. 	<p>value will not be supported. It may be beneficial to add of 'amenity or biodiversity value' or similar to clarify. There may also be situations where the proposal will be of benefit to the community and therefore in the interests of sustainable development, it is suggested that such a loss would not be permitted 'unless the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the amenity value'.</p> <p>Criterion 2 uses the word 'site survey' does this refer to an arboricultural survey or a topographic survey? The wording should be considered to clarify.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – the wording of the policy with reference to seeking a financial payment should be reworded. It must be clear that this will be sought via appropriate condition or planning obligation to mitigate the effects of the development.</p>	
Policy EN7: Green Infrastructure	<p>1. Development proposals should seek to maintain, enhance, and take opportunities to provide new</p>	<p>Policy supported, although it provides little additional information over TVBRLP Policy E6.</p>	<p>Can remove this policy?</p>

	<p>green infrastructure assets and links, which are integrated into the design of the development proposals.</p> <p>2. Green infrastructure proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) improve countryside access through enhancements to the public rights of way network, maximising opportunities for walking and cycling, including multi-user route and, where possible facilitate circular routes, and b) strengthen connectivity of habitats. 		
Policy EN8: Local Green Space	<p>Development proposals will not be supported on areas designated as Local Green Space identified below, and as shown on Map 4, other than in very special circumstances. These circumstances are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) where there is an existing building/structure within the Local Green Space and the works are needed to maintain its viability/use into the future (e.g. Church, sports pavilion, etc.); OR b) where the proposed development will be for the benefit of the community and will preserve the particular local significance of the space for which it was designated. <p>The areas designated as Local Green Space are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LGS1 – The Village Green - LGS2 – Manorial Earthworks - LGS3 – Snowdrop Field - LGS4 – Churchyard - LGS5 – Recreation Ground - LGS6 – Allotments - LGS7 – Mullen’s Pond and surrounding fields - LGS8 – Land between Coach Park and the 	<p>TVBC support the protection of local green spaces where it conforms with Local Plan policies and the NPPF. The policy as set out clearly references the criteria in the NPPF for designation as local green space.</p> <p>A detailed Local Green Space Assessment July Report 2017 has been provided in the evidence base, which is important as the NPPF states in paragraph 77 that not all green areas and open spaces will be suitable for this designation. This provides justification as to why each green space has been allocated using the recommended methodology.</p> <p>Although the report is available in the evidence base, it may be beneficial to have a short summary on the allocated green space to provide a direct and accessible reference to the basis on which they have been selected.</p> <p>Whilst map 4 lists the Local Green Spaces, it may also be beneficial to have larger scale individual maps within the document for clarity.</p>	<p>SDNPA to add detail from LGS assessment report. Consider inclusion of detailed maps in NDP document.</p>

	eastern footpath		
Policy EN9: Pollution	<p>1. Development proposals that reduce levels of pollution, particularly light pollution in Thruxton Down, noise and air from the A303 or Thruxton Airfield or water pollution of the Pillhill Brook will be supported.</p> <p>2. Development proposals should ensure surface water run-off fully complies with 'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) regulations and should not exacerbate ground water drainage and foul water drainage through infiltration.</p> <p>3. Development proposals will not be supported if the level of air, noise, light and water pollution has a demonstrably negative and damaging effect on the people and natural environment of the Parish, now or in the foreseeable future, taking into account cumulative impacts.</p> <p>4. Development proposals should follow best practice methods to reduce levels of dust, other pollutants and damage by construction vehicles from demolition through to completion.</p> <p>5. Development which is sensitive to noise or poor air quality near to the A303 or Thruxton Airfield must include appropriate measures to reduce the impact on users or occupiers to acceptable levels.</p>	<p>The policy builds on that under TVBRLP Policy E8 in addition to the NPPF and provides specific local detail, which is welcomed.</p> <p>Criterion 2 however, does not fully relate to pollution and would benefit from either being within a separate policy (EN 10 for example) or the policy could be renamed.</p> <p>There is also some overlap with the light pollution element of Policy EN1 and potential for re-wording/consolidation.</p>	SDNPA to remove criterion 2 and create separate policy.
Policy EN10: Flood Risk	Development proposals in areas prone to flooding should provide appropriate flood management measures to reduce the risk of flooding throughout the Parish, especially near Pillhill Brook, Mullens Pond, Village Street and Amesbury Road. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be used, to manage surface water run off from new developments, unless they are demonstrated to be inappropriate.	<p>The policy builds on that under TVBRLP Policy E7 in addition to the NPPF and provides specific local detail, which is welcomed.</p> <p>There is overlap with Criterion 2 – see comments on EN9 above.</p>	SDNPA to remove part of policy to combine with policy on SuDS.

Policy H1: Conservation Area	<p>Development proposals within the Conservation Area, or within its setting, must preserve or enhance its historic character and appearance by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) protecting important open spaces and built and natural features identified in the Neighbourhood Plan Conservation Area Land Appraisal and Village Design Statement; b) ensuring proposals are designed in context with their surroundings, including existing buildings, street pattern, open spaces, trees and other historic characteristic features; and c) using traditional materials such as chalk (cob), flint, brick or rendered walls with thatch or slate roofs and traditional boundary features such as thatched or tiled topped Hampshire walls. 	<p>The policy re-iterates statutory duty, however It would be beneficial to add the key features taken from the appraisal and VDS for clarity to criterion a). This could be added to the supporting text itself and then referred to thereafter.</p> <p>The wording of the policy should reflect that of paragraphs 132-135 of the NPPF regarding significance, harm and balancing any development with public benefits.</p> <p>Criterion c) is worded too prescriptively. The use of materials should be encouraged, but this does not allow for contemporary design, which may also use additional materials not mentioned. You may want to re-word to allow the use of additional materials, but require justification etc.</p>	<p>Do not agree as this policy adds much more local detail about what need to be preserved and enhanced. Can add phrase about public benefits.</p> <p>Do not agree as this does not prevent a contemporary design just that that the materials should reflect and be contextual those in the conservation area.</p>
Policy H2: Archaeology	<p>1. Acknowledgement, assessment, identification and designation of potentially significant archaeological deposits must be addressed by all potential developers to help prevent damage and loss of areas not yet identified, but could yet still be, of historical importance. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken to be proof of absence. There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation in-situ of all potentially significant archaeological deposits or, where not possible, recorded for deposition within a public archive.</p> <p>2. Where appropriate, the enhancement of the understanding and appreciation by the public of significant archaeological sites through the provision of well-designed interpretation materials or landscape features will be supported.</p>	<p>The Parish contains a number of sites of archaeological interest and therefore support for this is welcomed. However it is not clear from criterion 1 what is required from developers and how this would be applied. This should be reworded.</p>	<p>SDNPA to reword criterion 1.</p>
Policy H3: Parish	<p>Development proposals affecting Parish Heritage</p>	<p>Maps 7a to c hows the Heritage Assets, but would benefit</p>	<p>SDNPA to consider inclusion of detailed</p>

Assets	<p>Assets set out below, and as shown on the Maps 7(a-c) must be supported by an assessment of their significance as a heritage asset and how the proposal impacts on this significance. Any harm to significance will be resisted and will need to be robustly justified by evidence, as well as demonstrating that all efforts have been made to minimise harm by appropriate design and materials and optimal viable uses.</p> <p>The following are designated as Parish Heritage Assets;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Thruxton Milestone - The row of cottages that includes the Former Post Office - May Cottage Barn, Village Street - Veronica Cottage, Village Street - Rose Cottage, Village Street - Site of Thruxton Roman Villa, Land between Coach Park and Dauntsey Lane - Thruxton Airfield Control Tower - World War Two Airfield Hangars - Thruxton Farm Barns, Cholderton Road 	<p>from a larger scale mapping base for clarity and specifics as to what type of heritage asset/ grade of listing etc. These are shown on the Conservation Area map and this could be reproduced or more clearly referred to.</p> <p>The reference to Parish Heritage Assets is unclear as to whether these are designated or non-designated in the policy wording.</p> <p>The wording relating to harm should reflect that of paragraphs 135 of the NPPF regarding significance, harm and balancing any development with benefits.</p>	<p>Can provide a definition of Parish Heritage Assets.</p> <p>While NDP policies should not repeat NPPF SDNPA to add additional wording about public benefits.</p>
Policy HD1: New Residential Development	<p>Residential development of 10 or fewer dwellings will be supported within the settlement boundaries (shown on Map 8) subject to meeting the requirements of other policies in the development plan. Such development must respond to the local need for smaller properties and should consist of 3 bedroom dwellings or less.</p>	<p>The adopted TVBRLP defines Thruxton as a rural village, where windfalls, rural affordable housing sites, community led development and the re-use of buildings and replacement dwellings are supported.</p> <p>It may be advisable to reword to permit minor infill development with development guidelines rather than a specific number of dwellings.</p> <p>The mix of dwellings should allow for variation where a robust justification is provided to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the scheme as a whole would reflect</p>	<p>Many examiner's prefer clarity rather than just saying small scale/ minor etc and have allowed policies that refer to a specific number of dwellings that is proportionate to the scale of the settlement.</p>

		the most up to date housing needs evidence available taking into account viability considerations.	Can add additional wording re: mix.
Policy HD2: Replacement dwellings, extensions and annexes	<p>The replacement, or extension, of existing dwellings must respect the character and appearance of the locality and, in addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) replacement dwellings should be on the same 'footprint' as the building they replace; b) extensions should be subsidiary to the main dwelling in scale and height, matching design and materials, unless a compelling design justifies an exception; c) any extensions to facilitate 'independent living' should accord with policy HD7 of this plan; d) 'Annexes' to be occupied by the children/parents/grandparents/dependent other relatives of the occupiers of the main dwelling will be viewed favourably. Such annexes should demonstrate the functional and physical dependency on the host dwelling. 	<p>Criterion a) should allow for more flexibility. It may be demonstrated that the original siting is less appropriate than an alternative or would offer a benefit.</p> <p>Criterion d) - Planning permission is granted with the land and rarely should be personal. There are exceptions, however it should be recognised that any granting of permission due to personal circumstances, will endure long after any requirement. Therefore whilst some weight should be given to such circumstances, unless the building is temporary, the overall long term impact of the annexe should be assessed as per any other development.</p>	<p>Do not agree. Examiners of other NDP's have supported reference to personal circumstances in policies that reflects specific local needs.</p>
Policy HD3: Sub-division of Residential Gardens	<p>Development proposals for new dwellings on sites that form part of an existing residential garden, or a group of gardens, must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) conserve the character of the surrounding area in terms of form, height, layout and density of development; b) provide sufficient garden space, space around buildings and planting, particularly where these spaces and any trees lend to the character of the area; c) existing features such as trees, hedgerows 	<p>The policy adds to those in the TVBRLP. Consider rewording a) to read 'be in keeping with' rather than 'conserve'.</p> <p>Criterion c) should be altered to unless sufficiently demonstrated otherwise.</p> <p>The wording of TVBRLP Policy E4 may be relevant for information purposes.</p>	<p>SDNPA to reword to read to be 'in keeping.'</p> <p>Consider wording suggested for criterion c is unnecessary and if included would make this policy ineffective.</p>

	<p>of value and walls which are characteristic of the streetscape and local area must be retained;</p> <p>d) provide sufficient amenity space, vehicular access and onsite parking, both for the new development and existing dwelling(s) on the site;</p> <p>e) ensure there is no significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjacent properties as a result of overlooking, loss of privacy or overshadowing.</p>		
Policy HD4: Design	<p>1. Development proposals must demonstrate how the development contributes to the character of Thruxton, incorporating design principles that reflect the local vernacular, particularly the Conservation Area and those features and characteristics included in the Thruxton Village Design Statement. Proposals will be expected to demonstrate the following:</p> <p>a) building form and style valued and promoted locally including smaller houses with characteristically low roofs. Low roof lines and details such as flint inserts, arched window details, dormer windows in a low roof, raised eaves and exposed woodwork are all distinctive local features which will generally be supported;</p> <p>b) use of locally distinctive building materials as appropriate to the location (brick, flint, thatch, clay tiles or slate). The use of flint, mellow red and blue brick, rendering painted white or cream, slate or thatch is encouraged. The use of grey and brown roofing materials</p>	<p>The policy is detailed and references local materials, which avoids duplication with TVBRLP Policy E1. However it would be advisable, to consider adding the principles of the VDS to the supporting text rather than a general reference, the findings of this could be summarised for clarity.</p>	<p>SDNPA to add principles of VDS to supporting text.</p>

	<p>is preferred, or if a red roof is appropriate a mellow mixed red using reused tiles would be acceptable;</p> <p>c) suitable boundary treatments, such as brick, flint, chalk or hedges of beech, hawthorn, ivy, privet or yew. Thatched or tiled topped Hampshire walls should be maintained and are an attractive method of delineating new boundaries. Chalk should be used to repair existing cob walls;</p> <p>d) attention to design detail, with discrete siting and design of service features such as bin stores; cycle stores; meter boxes, flues and ventilation ducts; renewable energy; lighting, satellite dishes and phone lines;</p> <p>e) development should create places that are sustainable, durable, safe and secure, functional, aesthetic, flexible and suitable for their location and use, meeting the relevant policies of the development plan; and</p> <p>f) avoid or minimise the use of external lighting in line with Policy EN01.</p> <p>2. Development proposals where required, should be accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, showing how the proposed design and access arrangements for the proposed development have responded to, and been informed by, the site context.</p>		
Policy HD5: Outdoor Space	<p>1. Development proposals for new and extended housing development should include high quality outdoor amenity space, appropriate to the nature of the development (i.e. either private gardens or a shared amenity area) and must contribute to the</p>	<p>The policy is supported although in criterion 2 it is unclear how it would be assessed whether a garden is commensurate with the proposed dwelling.</p>	<p>Do not agree. The wording could not be any clearer.</p>

	<p>local character using appropriate materials and landscaping, providing native tree cover and improved biodiversity.</p> <p>2. The amount of land used for garden or amenity space must be commensurate with the size and type of dwelling and the character of the area, and should be of appropriate utility (for play and recreation) and quality having regard to topography, shadowing (from buildings and landscape features), and privacy.</p>		
Policy HD6: Off-Street Parking	<p>1. All new residential developments must provide sufficient resident and visitor car parking spaces so as not to impact on parking issues that already exist in some areas. Development proposals that result in the loss of existing residential off-street car parking to levels less than those set out below, will be strongly resisted unless an equal amount of replacement off-street car parking is provided in a suitable location. Wherever feasible, electric vehicle charging facilities should be provided.</p> <p>2. Provision of parking must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) be sufficient to avoid additional on-road parking, arising directly or indirectly from the development, which will lead to safety hazards or hinder the passage/free flow of traffic (including use by agricultural vehicles, horses or pedestrians); b) not detract from the rural character of the area; c) take into account that the rural location, and the lack of public transport, will require facilities for visitor parking and reflect the fact that more than the normal level of car ownership is likely, and, 	<p>The level of proposed parking must accord with that set out in the TVBRLP Annex G and Policy T2 unless otherwise justified in the evidence base. There is no specific reference to a parking or traffic survey identified in the supporting text.</p>	<p>SDNPA to look into further the justification/evidence for different parking standards.</p>

	<p>d) incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>The following parking standards should be used as guidance:</p> <table><tr><td>House size</td><td>Total spaces</td></tr><tr><td>1-bed</td><td>1.5 spaces per unit (rounded to the nearest whole number) 2</td></tr><tr><td>and 3-bed</td><td>2 spaces per unit</td></tr><tr><td>4+bed</td><td>3 spaces per unit</td></tr></table>	House size	Total spaces	1-bed	1.5 spaces per unit (rounded to the nearest whole number) 2	and 3-bed	2 spaces per unit	4+bed	3 spaces per unit		
House size	Total spaces										
1-bed	1.5 spaces per unit (rounded to the nearest whole number) 2										
and 3-bed	2 spaces per unit										
4+bed	3 spaces per unit										
Policy HD7: Supporting independent living and sheltered housing	<p>1. The conversion and extension of existing dwellings, and other buildings, to support independent living for older members of the community will be supported provided that the scale and design of development are in keeping with the character of the location, and that the impact on the amenity of surrounding properties is acceptable.</p> <p>2. Sheltered or purpose built housing for the elderly, on a very limited scale, and with a preference for those with local connections (i.e. currently living in the Parish or with children/closest living relative living in the Parish) will be viewed favourably.</p> <p>3. Dwellings designed to be suitable for older residents (aged 60 and over) must demonstrate, as a minimum, that they meet Building Regulations requirements M4(2) for accessible and adaptable dwellings. These dwellings will also be suitable for younger residents and are not intended to be restricted in use.</p>	<p>This policy is supported and partly overlaps with the annexe element of HD2.</p> <p>The wording of 3) is somewhat confusing as it reference those aged over 60 and then discusses younger residents. It would benefit from more clarity.</p>	<p>SDNPA to clarify policy further, if possible.</p>								
Policy HD8: Rural Exception Housing for Local People	<p>Development proposals for rural exception housing of 100% Affordable Housing will be supported in line with Policy COM8 of the Test Valley Local Plan and where such proposals are generally less than 5 dwellings.</p>	<p>No evidence base reference has been produced to support the limited dwelling numbers. The number in the policy does not tie in with that of the supporting text.</p>	<p>Many examiner’s prefer clarity and have supported policies that refer to a specific number of dwellings that is proportionate to the scale of the settlement.</p>								

POLICY CI1: Protection of existing community facilities	<p>1. Development that results in the loss of key community buildings or facilities that serve the local community, as listed below will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) an assessment has been undertaken which shows the facility is surplus to requirements and there is clear evidence that the community has no need for that type of facility; b) it can be demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided in an equally accessible location; c) the development is for an alternative community facility, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss. <p>Key Community Facilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kimpton Primary School - Thruxton Recreation Ground - Thruxton Memorial Hall - Thruxton Village Green - Church of St Peter and St Paul <p>2. Proposals to enhance the viability and/or community value of these facilities will be supported, providing that they accord with the other policies of the Development Plan.</p>	<p>The protection of community facilities is supported, and the wording takes future needs into considerations.</p> <p>There is some duplication with that of protected green spaces on the list, which is already covered.</p> <p>A plan setting out the location of these facilities would be beneficial.</p>	<p>Include plan to show location of community facilities.</p>
Policy CI2: Provision of new community facilities	<p>1. The provision of new recreational or community facilities will be supported, provided that their design and scale are in keeping with the local character and that the impact on the residential amenity of surrounding residential properties is acceptable.</p>	<p>The policy overlaps with above and potentially could be reworded and added to CI1.</p>	<p>SDNPA to consider combining with CII.</p>
Policy CI3: Developer Contribution to infrastructure improvements	<p>1. Development proposals must be served by appropriate, necessary and reasonable</p>	<p>This policy would benefit from either referencing appropriate legal agreements or CIL specifically otherwise it</p>	<p>Consider removal or re-wording.</p>

	infrastructure either on-site, through off-site works, and/or financial contributions that mitigate their impact.	is a duplication of TVBRLP Policy COM15.	
Policy CI4: Improved Pedestrian and Travel to School Safety	<p>a) Development proposals that result in improvements to pedestrian safety in the Parish and safety to pupils travelling to Kimpton Primary School on foot, by bicycle, bus or car will be supported.</p> <p>b) Residential development must endeavour to provide good pedestrian connections to safe and suitable pedestrian routes to the schools and other amenities.</p>	<p>The policy builds on TVBRLP T1.</p> <p>It may also be beneficial to add cycle safety as well as pedestrian?</p> <p>It is suggested that criterion b) should replace 'must' with 'shall' to reflect that it may not be appropriate for all proposals.</p>	SDNPA to add additional wording.
Policy CI5: Increased Access Points and Traffic	<p>- Development proposals in the following locations, which increase the number of access points, or would involve an increase in traffic generation, will need to demonstrate that they do not further increase the risk to pedestrian safety or exacerbate parking stress in these or adjoining areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Village Street along its full length, including the junction with Lambourne Way, and - In the vicinity of the Memorial Hall, and - Stanbury Road (particularly at the corner of the Recreation Ground). 	This policy does not reference the evidence base or provide detailed justification for its inclusion.	SDNPA to reference evidence base.
Policy CI6: Connected Countryside	<p>1. Development proposals that result in improved countryside access and enjoyment of the countryside through enhancements to the public footpath / cycle network and safe access across the A303 will be supported.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that would reduce or <u>detrimentally impact on public access to the</u></p>	This overlaps with Policy EN7 and could be reworded and consolidated.	SDNPA to consider combining with EN7.
Policy EC1: Thruxton Airfield	Major commercial development proposals on	The site specific policy is welcomed, but could be simplified	SDNPA to consider additional wording.

	<p>Thruxton Airfield will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) are part of a long term plan for the site and its users; and,b) deliver multiple benefits for the airfield, Parish and local environment; and,c) contribute to the importance of the motor industry and aviation to the Parish at a local and a national level; and,d) contribute to its sense of place and identity as former historic airfield;e) re-use or replace existing buildings where feasible.	<p>by replacing criterion a) to c) by a wording requiring sufficient supporting information to accompany any application which would demonstrate it was in accordance with objectives.</p>	
--	--	--	--