

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan - 1st Draft

Comments and Responses

May 2017

The responses herein seek to answer comments raised by respondents to the Neighbourhood Plan -1st Draft following its issue in September 2016 and say whether the draft plan has been modified or not. It should be noted that there was good support (greater than 70%) for all of the policies and greater than 80% for all but 6. However, a number of useful comments were raised and changes made to the Draft Plan as a result. With regard to housing site options, 78% of respondents supported the proposal to concentrate effort on further investigation of development of Site 26 to a greater of lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site 1 if necessary.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Summary

The 1st Draft of the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) was published and made available for viewing, on the TNP website, in September 2016. Residents and local businesses were then invited to comment on it and influence the content before formal consultation took place.

The availability of the Plan for viewing and comment was publicised through the Twyford e-mail system, posters located throughout the village, a banner placed at the cross-roads in the village centre, a notice in the Parish magazine and fly-sheets posted to every household in the Parish. All residents and other interested parties were invited to a drop-in event at the Twyford Social Club on the 14th September where the draft policies and other background data could be viewed and where survey forms were available for comment. The event was organised by an independent organisation, Action Hampshire, and they collected and collated all of the comments. Survey forms were also made available through the TNP website and the village shop following the event. Completed survey forms were either left at the drop-in event or returned to Action Hampshire directly or through the village shop up to 6 October.

115 people attended the drop-in event. 86 written responses/comments were received. These were analysed by Action Hampshire and the results passed to the TNP Technical Committee for consideration. All comments remain anonymous except where permission has been given to identify the respondent.

The majority of those responding were from the 45-59 and the 60-74 age groups although a number of women were in the 30-44 age category. Residents made up the greatest number of respondents and a handful of forms were returned by people who lived outside Twyford but had an interest in its future (e.g. owned a business in the parish).

Most people supported the 1st draft policies as presented on the 14th September and on the website. The majority of the “agree with modification” ticks were against two sections - housing, mobility/access and St Mary’s Primary School. The housing section was also where the most concerns were raised.

56 people indicated that they were generally happy with the content of the 1st draft (although a number did point out that they had raised issues); 13 people indicated that they did not support the 1st draft.

The detailed comments and responses are attached. A few of the comments have been combined to avoid excessive repetition, or summarised to protect respondents anonymity, but are mostly presented as written.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Index to Comments and Responses

Policy	Page No	Policy	Page No
Vision and Objectives		LHE2 – Landscape and Views	24
Our Vision For Twyford	3	LHE3 – Historic Environment, Buildings, Archaeology	25
Objectives of the Plan	3	LHE4 – Local Green Space and Informal Open Space	25
		LHE5 – Dark Night Skies	26
		LHE6 – Local Biodiversity, Trees and Woodlands	26
The Settlement Boundary			
SB1 – The Settlement Boundary Policy	6		
SB2 – Development outside the Settlement Boundary	7	Water Environment	
		WE1 – Flood Risk	27
Housing		WE2 – Water Abstraction Zones	None
HN1 – Local Housing Needs and Housing Mix	7	WE3 – Nitrate Sensitive Areas	None
HN2 – Housing Provision	8		
HN3 – Land for Housing: Site Selection	8	Movement and Accessibility	
HN4 – Affordable Provision	10	MA1 – Walking and Cycling	28
HN5 – Exception Sites	None	MA2 – Parking	29
HN6 - Housing Infilling, Redevelopment, Extensions	11	MA3 – Minor Traffic Management Improvements	30
HN7 – Bourne Fields and Bourne Lane	12	MA4 – Northfields/Hazeley Enterprise Park	31
HN8 – Twyford Conservation Area	13	MA5 – Transport in the Village (Aspirational)	31
HN9 – Housing in the Countryside	14		
		Sustainable Development	
Business and Employment		SD1 – Microgeneration and Renewable Energy	None
BE1 – Employment and Business Provision	18	SD2 – Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings	None
BE2 – Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park	19	The Design of Development	
BE3 – Twyford Preparatory School	19	DE1 – Design	None
Sustainable Tourism		Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	
ST1 – Visitor and Tourism Facilities	20	IDC1 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	None
ST2 – Visiting and enjoying Twyford	21		
		Development Briefs	
Community Provision		DB1 – Land adjacent to the Village Hall	34
CP1 – Community Sports Facilities and Open Spaces	21	DB2 – Land to North Of Hewlett Close at Northfields	40
CP2 – St Mary’s Primary School	22		
		Housing Site Selection	41
Landscape, Heritage and Ecology		Are you generally happy with the 1st Draft Plan	43
LHE1 – Protected Gaps	24	Other Comments	46

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
Our Vision for Twyford (78% of respondents agreed with these, 22% agreed with modifications, 0% disagreed)		
	1) What is community led development? Can't all be community led.	Agreed but great efforts are being made to involve the community in development of the Plan through informal public consultation such as this. NO CHANGE
	2) Too much of the information provided appears to be opinion. I would rather see information supported by facts.	Evidence to support the Plan has been described in the preamble to the policies. Much additional evidence has also been uploaded to the TNP website. NO CHANGE
	3) Too vague and without substance	The vision and objectives are necessarily broad. The detail to reflect the vision is in the policies. NO CHANGE
	4) Strengthen to say not joined with Winchester area?	Twyford is and will continue to be tied to Winchester for council and many planning matters. NO CHANGE
Objectives of the Plan (73% of respondents agreed with these, 27% agreed with modifications, 0% disagreed)		
Objective II “To enhance a vibrant and thriving community life, by providing new housing to meet local needs promoting employment and supporting retail, community and sports provision	1) Essentially agree. Just need to be careful what “vibrant” means in terms of businesses / housing	Noted. It clearly important that any detailed specifications for development in the village centre properly reflect this requirement. Work is ongoing with this. NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE
	2) Needs to be commercially viable or won't happen.	Agreed BUT NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE
	3) Affordable housing only	Not viable. NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE
Objective III “To strengthen a dynamic village centre, integrating other parts of the parish particularly through the location of new developments, community facilities and improved walking and cycling access.”	1) S26 being promoted subtly but it is there.	Although a preference has been made in the Draft Plan for development of Site 26 for many reasons, there is still much work to be done before this can be agreed as the site most suitable for new housing. Any development proposals for this site will need to demonstrate that any perceived advantages are real and outweigh any disadvantages when compared with other options. NO CHANGE
	2) Need to ensure central new developments don't affect character of the village.	Agreed. This will depend on how carefully any requirements for development are specified, work for which is still ongoing. See also (1) above
	3) I am unsure that plan as it stands will strengthen the village centre	Noted. See also (1) and (2) above. NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
	4) Objectives III and IV, unfortunately these two objectives will seemingly often contradict each other. The nature of the village is that it will struggle to cope with more traffic and more traffic heading into the village centre especially if further developments are focused on the “centre”.	Agree to an extent but development in the centre would encourage walking and cycling. See also (1) above. Any development of other potential housing locations would also have comparable traffic impacts
Objective IV “To manage and reduce traffic impact on the village, improving road safety, minimising car usage and meeting parking needs, especially through new developments and by improvements to walking and cycling routes	1) More emphasis on parking needs. Encourage people with garages and house parking to use these facilities. If a communal parking area was available in the village, for rent, it would generate extra income for the village and help relieve the parking problem.	Parking needs are acknowledged to be important and a full background is set out in the draft plan under Policy MA2. Provision is made for public needs in the village centre and for all new development. However no extra provision is made to increase supply for private housing in the areas of the village where there is evident shortage. This is because of the environmental harm from any solution e.g. widening streets or acquiring new land. No one has made any practical suggestions other than the use of Hunter Park. However this is a well used village recreation ground with a limited amount of its own parking and this is often overfull. We also doubt that the extra car parking could be effectively delivered or managed in a cost effective way. NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE
	2) More emphasis on parking needs e.g. residents with garages and hard standing who still leave cars on the street. Parking at Hunter Park.	
Objective VII “to ensure that all parish developments meet local needs, are community led and are environmentally sustainable.”	1) What local needs? Are these houses being proposed as homes for local Twyford connected people?	Local needs are central to the TNP; they and the housing situation generally are summarised in the housing section of the Draft TNP, starting with Policy HN1. Housing needs, in the TNP sense, have arisen either because particular groups of people with long association with Twyford cannot afford to purchase or rent a house in the village or there are not enough houses of a particular type. The Housing policies in the TNP have been drafted with these groups in mind and will limit the occupation of some of the new houses to people with strong local connections; this will help some families but is not expected to solve the underlying problem.
	2) Environmentally sustainable – yes but also has to be commercially viable otherwise nothing gets done.	Agreed. Development specifications need to be carefully written to enable this to be the case. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
Objective VII “to ensure that all parish developments meet local needs, are community led and are environmentally sustainable.”	3) Encourage reduction in car usage by allowing working from home →decent broadband for all. FTTC required. Ensure all BT cabinets are enabled for fibre to provide access to fast internet – increasingly important.	Agreed that this is a need of the village. Improved broadband is being pursued by the Parish Council
	4) Too narrow / restrictive	The TNP is a community led initiative focussing on local needs and Twyford’s very special environment. It is deliberately narrow in its focus. The restrictions in housing and business provision and limits on other development are those appropriate to a National Park where the preservation and enhancement of natural beauty is the foremost objective
	Option A: I feel Option A is far too many houses for the site proposed. Houses would be excessively packed on the site and the increase in cars would cause significant problems in Hazeley Rd	Point raised for consideration in the Strategic Environmental Assessment being undertaken by an independent body. Increased traffic resulting from development in this location unlikely to be any worse than development in any other location. NO CHANGE TO OBJECTIVE

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics

Vortal (Developer of Site S26)

With reference to Objectives II, III and IV, development of the full allocation of dwellings on Site 26 will allow for delivery of the following:

- a mixture of tenures to meet all local need
- single locality for the affordable housing that will be more manageable to a Registered Social Landlord
- non-residential land uses to benefit the community and enhance Village Centre
- reduce overall traffic movements due to proximity to Village Centre and promotion of walking routes and non-car based trips
- potential for increased footfall to support the Village Centre shops and amenities
- focus on a single, high-quality development scheme that integrates with the central locality
- minimise the external visual impact on South Downs National Park

Comments noted. Any development on site S26 will also need to demonstrate that its advantages outway any disadvantages when compared with other sites.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
SB The Settlement Boundary		
SB1 The Settlement Boundary Policy	<p>1) The Settlement Boundary should be amended to include certain properties:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Area :A between Norris Bridge and Queen Street</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Area B: Waterhouse and Hewlett Closes</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Area C: between Hewlett close and Northfields Mill</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Area D: the tennis courts and Bowling green on Roman Road</p> <p>2) Land allocated for housing should be included within the Settlement Boundary.</p>	<p>The settlement policy was independently assessed by Terra Firma on behalf of the TNP using the same criteria as those of SDNPA in reviewing the SDNP Local Plan 1.</p> <p>Area A was excluded on these criteria, even though it includes about 12 dwellings, including two tight up to the road because the dominant character of this area is set by the larger houses. The whole is within the Conservation area. The exclusion makes them subject to Countryside policies, limiting some but not all types of development. NO CHANGE</p> <p>Area B includes two sites which were released for housing as “exception sites”. WCC have pointed out that it is usual practice to exclude “exception sites” from settlement boundaries to ensure that their special status as sites for affordable housing is retained. AMEND BOUNDARY</p> <p>Area C lies between the two “exception sites” (now excluded) and Northfield Mill, both of which are outside the settlement boundary. NO CHANGE</p> <p>Area D: the tennis courts and Bowling green on Roman Road are adjacent to low density housing on either side but adjoin countryside to the east. It is green space and a category of land use excluded by the SDNPA’s Settlement Boundary Assessment Criteria. NO CHANGE</p> <p>The boundary will be amended at a later date to include the land but only after building is complete. NO CHANGE</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
SB2 Development outside the Settlement Boundary	This policy is too restrictive; does not allow discretion in decision making.	SB1 and SB2 are well established planning policies which have, for many years, formed the basis of directing development to settlements and protecting the countryside from inappropriate development. Policies HN9, ST1 and BE1 with SB2 set out the many uses and buildings which are good and necessary for the countryside and so should be permitted. These policies are intended to give clear guidance and to be selective but the planning system gives wide discretion to the decision maker. The Neighbourhood Plan will be the starting point in each decision. NO CHANGE
HN Housing		
HN1 Local Housing needs and housing mix	1) The proposal to restrict development to 1, 2 and 3 bed homes is possibly too restrictive. The village needs affordable larger properties for existing families who wish to live in a larger property and remain in the village. Many 4 + bed properties are outside the price range of residents and they have to move to Colden Common to meet their expanding housing requirements, within their budget. Affordable houses are needed for younger people who have a Twyford connection, not just older home owners who want to downsize.	The greatest demand in the Winchester housing area is for 1, 2 and 3 bed houses and in Twyford for affordable houses. The existing stock is being constantly enlarged so it becomes less affordable. The small number of additional houses likely to be built in Twyford in the next 10 to 15 year (approx 40) cannot meet everyone's needs or aspirations and is not intended to meet demand. Nor can market housing be targeted to local people. 4 bed houses and above are relatively plentiful within the TNP area but will not be "affordable" by normal yardsticks. The evidence base is supplied by the Housing Needs Survey; Winchester Core Strategy and Housing market assessment; 2011 Census. The decision of WCC In respect of the WDLP Part 2 is noted. NO CHANGE
	2) Very small for family homes and downsizers.	The government set out minimum floor space per no. of bedrooms. The space standards set by HN1 are intentionally above the Government figures and could not be set as minima. The more generous size is intended to allow for as wide a range of possible demand (family, elderly, downsizers etc.) The size limit is set so as to keep the dwellings more affordable, to minimize the land take and to increase the numbers of dwellings achievable by infill. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN1 Local Housing needs and housing mix	3) This policy is in conflict with the Nationally Described Space Standards, which do not set a maximum for any housing unit. With regards to the space standards, this approach was recently rejected by the Winchester Local Plan Part 2 Inspector in the context of Policy CP2 and it being out of confirming with the Nationally Described Space Standards. The City Council sought the same approach, which the Inspector concluded did not comply with National Policy.	See response to (2) above
	4) As for not including any 4+ bedroom properties, this would be to the detriment of retaining or encouraging families to the village. Instead a broad mix of all house types should be proposed via Policy HN1, particularly in the absence of any supporting evidence of no demand or need for such properties (representative of Site 26)	See response to (1) above
HN2 Housing provision	1) 20 houses too many. Previous allowance was zero. The change of calculation boundaries should not increase the need for Twyford to take more houses (relates to HN3, too).	The TNP explains the background to the 20 houses in the preamble to the policy. A further 20 houses are likely by infill. To put the number in context, 50 houses have been permitted by allocation and infill since 2001; the number for the next 15 to 20 years is likely to be less. NO CHANGE
	2) If you permit infilling within village settlement boundary, then many more than 20 new houses might be built and the village character could be lost.	See response to (1) above
HN3 Land for housing: site selection	1) Older persons' private housing needed. Small bungalow? Chalet? Cottage? If central may not need to be so "affordable" for those downsizing. Build these in addition to needed affordable.	All of these points are agreed to be valid and to provide opportunities for meeting community needs. It is very difficult to be prescriptive. However, development will be a mix of market and affordable housing and of different sizes. We will discuss the range of housing with the Developer. These special needs may be met by infilling under HN6. NO CHANGE
	2) I am disappointed that no provision has been made for any 4 bedroom houses x 2 responses	See response to HN1 (1)

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN3 Land for housing: site selection	3) Do not agree with Site 26 proposal due to flood risk, look of valley as you drive in to Twyford. Terra Firma report stating constraints of developing the site.	The site selection process is still ongoing. The Technical Committee have favoured Site 26 for the many reasons set out both in the Draft Plan and in consultation but have accepted that the impact of 20 houses on the landscape and the effect on flooding and drainage must be looked at in more detail before a final decision is made. The work is in hand. POLICY TO BE AMENDED
	4) New housing needs parking spaces so as not to make the parking problem worse.	Agreed. This is already addressed in Policy MA2. NO CHANGE
	5) 1 st choice of the Technical Committee is S26 leading the weighting of agreement to this by questions and statements in this document. I believe all 20 houses on S26 with potential access to Twyford Prep school and car park are strongly desired by those seeking our views.	The site selection process is still ongoing. The Technical Committee have favoured site 26 for the many reasons set out both in the Draft Plan and in the consultation but have accepted that the impact of 20 houses on the landscape and the effect on flooding and drainage must be looked at in more detail before a final decision is made. This work is in hand. The Twyford School access proposal is now deleted. AMEND POLICY
	6) I do agree with 20 or 22 houses in the village but access from Hazeley Rd to prep school and car park on Site 26 with all 20 houses I do not think is best for the village	Noted. The access has been removed AMEND POLICY
	7) I feel Site 2 has some merit and should be considered.	See response to (5) above
	8) Favours Option D spreading over three sites. Smaller developments would be more in keeping with the rest of the village and would have less of an impact on already overloaded drainage and antiquated sewerage systems in any one area.	Development of 3 sites is not favoured because no social housing would have to be provided only a sum of money which could be allocated to any area within the SDNP. In addition Twyford does not have the land to build social housing even should this money be allocated to Twyford. The drainage issues are recognised and addressed in other policies. NO CHANGE
	9) Is there going to be a way to stop these new buildings extending? Converting these affordable 2 beds to 3/4 beds?	It is not possible to stop this. We have no wish to do be over prescriptive. NO CHANGE
	10) Site 20. If developed would completely alter and spoil nature and character of Park Lane, an historic sunken lane with trees both sides used by horse riders and walkers. Also no doubt street lighting would be needed. Site would destroy picturesque field and farming.	Development of this site has already been rejected. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN3 Land for housing: site selection	11) Why do you limit the percentage of affordable housing to 40%? Why not higher?	40% is the maximum permitted by Government. NO CHANGE
	12) I am not sure how you can ensure that affordable housing remains affordable in perpetuity as even housing associations are forced to sell to occupants. I think that the only way is for the Twyford Charity to purchase the land and develop the site, but how could it raise the money?	Section 106 agreements are required, and control subsequent occupation and affordability. These can be got rid of, but only with difficulty. It is not possible to predict how Government intends to legislate in favour of purchase of rented affordable housing. NO CHANGE
	13) Why aren't we looking for one – bed properties? If, for example, we looked at a co-housing opportunity where there is a "shared house" then people can live in a smaller individual family footprint, as they can use the spare bedroom in the shared house.	One bed properties are a priority, see Housing Needs Survey. Shared housing is allowed for within the Settlement Boundary, under HN6. NO CHANGE
HN4 Affordable provision on allocated & windfall sites	1) Surely can't be limited to local people? It is outrageous to discriminate against people who were not born in the village when there is a housing crisis in and around Winchester. No one is automatically entitled / not entitled to live somewhere based on the criteria you have set out. It puts Twyford in a very bad light.	The use of the planning system to favour local people who are otherwise priced out of the housing market in their home towns and villages has long been established by government and is strongly supported by the Twyford Community. It is a cornerstone of the TNP. This advantage is accepted. NO CHANGE
	2) Do we need to specify the equivalent of 40% for sites with 5 – 10 dwellings so that we don't get smaller contributions for these sites?	No 5 to 10 dwelling sites are proposed. NO CHANGE
	3) The number of Affordable Units to be generated via the Neighbourhood Plan, while important, will be small in the context of larger towns and villages. Registered Social Landlords (RSL), and indeed the City Council itself, seek minimum clustering of affordable housing, particularly rental units, for management purposes. This minimum is usually around 5 or 6 dwellings, with a maximum of around 10 to 15, depending on the size of the site and to encourage pepper potting. A disadvantage of spreading the housing to two or more sites, would mean the Affordable Housing provision would be diluted down to only a very small number of units per site, which may make them less attractive to an RSL to take on. Rural sites with only 1 or 2 units are not attractive propositions for RSLs, who prefer their stock to be grouped together, and thus, such a strategy may devalue the affordable provision (rep of Site 26)	Agreed. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
<p>HN6 Housing: infilling, redevelopment, extensions & changes of use</p>	<p>1) Should infill be restricted to the HN1 small dwellings criteria?</p>	<p>Agreed, the HN1 should apply to infill. POLICY AMENDED</p>
	<p>2) These provisions seem unduly restrictive. Surely existing planning laws would cover these points.</p>	<p>The infill policy is a set of well-established planning rules which have been the basis for deciding planning applications for many years. The TNP will replace existing local plans and so needs to restate the key policies in the Winchester Core Strategy and the Winchester District Local Plan. The TNP however adds the size restriction on new infill houses for reasons that are given in HN1(1) and (2) above. NO CHANGE</p>
	<p>3) Why have a blanket restriction on removal of trees and hedges. Overgrown and neglected vegetation replaced by an attractive wall can be an improvement.</p>	<p>Several detailed matters have been raised by Councillors and the TNP team so detailed amendments are required. These include: clarifying that the HN1 applies to Infill; clarifying redevelopment policy; clarifying that any restriction on size will be based on design and other constraints not on policy. POLICY REDRAFTED</p>
	<p>4) Why insist on professionally prepared plans? A small project can be adequately described and submitted to planning by a resident.</p>	<p>The requirement for plans to be professionally prepared supports both the status of Twyford as a village of great character within the South Downs National Park and the Government regulations requiring submission of detailed plans showing the proposal in its context with extensive supporting information. Few householders have this skill. However the wording could be “to a professional standard” WORDING AMENDED</p>
	<p>5) Leads to poor quality environment and unbalanced stock</p>	<p>The Policies have been designed to improve the balance of housing stock to match village needs. See response to HN1(1) and (2) above</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN6 Housing: infilling, redevelopment, extensions & changes of use	6) Would like to see sensitive infill, as there is a need for more houses, particularly as it can increase the sense of community if carried out well – families of 3 generations or similar groups of people could live together and it could reduce social isolation – for example, could a group of older people choose to downsize and live in a shared home for mutual support? Also this could be a way to get people who can't afford to live in the village back home – parents could split houses up for example. It is a shame to miss this opportunity by ensuring that there must be a “lack of demand” for the larger houses. 7) No new infill please	Comments noted. The policies have formulated to help achieve this. NO CHANGE See response to (2) above
HN7 Bourne Fields and Bourne Lane	1) This section has clearly been devised by Bourne Lane residents! Smacks of self-interest. 2) Why is Bourne Lane/Fields exempt? 3) I do not see the reason for protection here. There are many large plots. 4) Do not agree to limit of single plot infill 5) Overly restrictive 6) Are members of the NP committee all residents of Bournefields? Why is it appropriate to single out one area of the village for infill? 7) The blanket exclusion of new access on to Bourne Lane is unnecessarily restrictive. Already established planning protection policies should be sufficient to provide the level of planning control necessary. 8) Wider	Infill is permitted throughout the village within the Settlement Boundary not just Bourne Lane. This is not an enabling policy it is a restricting policy preventing excessive infill for financial gain which would damage the character of the area. The policy is to be amended to apply more generally to all areas of predominantly detached housing in the village POLICY REDRAFTED See response to (1) above See response to (1) above See response to (1) above See response to (1) above Infill is permitted throughout the village within the Settlement Boundary. See also response to (1) above. See response to (1) above Policy modified and applied more widely

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN8 Twyford Conservation Area	1) People should be allowed to extend their houses to 4 or 5 bedrooms etc. if it is in keeping and sensitive to the area.	The policy allows for extensions without restriction on the size but subject of course to the extra controls and sensitivity of scale and materials etc. Within the Conservation Area designation, policies HN1 and HN6 would also apply. NO CHANGE
	2) Tying this policy to HN1 could severely impact family development within the village. For example, as I have mentioned, I would like to continue to live and work in the village and expand my family. To do this I was considering a loft conversion – however my interpretation of HN1 would be that my house, a three bedroom house within the conservation area, could not grow beyond 120sqm. This would effectively stop me from performing a loft conversion, as it would take my house over that footprint. Please ensure that exceptions are made here so that existing householders can extend, improve and maintain their homes without falling foul of this rule. If my interpretation is correct I see no future for my family and our current house in the village.	This is accepted. One example is Stacey’s garage, where a residential use would be more appropriate in all respects. POLICY REDRAFTED AS PART OF HN6
	4) I agree with HN8 if “.....and subject to HN1 and HN6” is deleted.	The objective of making new houses small and affordable, applies to all areas of the village. NO CHANGE
	5) Large houses should be able to have flexible accommodation i.e. annexes to allow families to grow and reduce in size over generations. Should stay in a single ownership. The same policy of HN9 iii could apply. (Part in DE1)	See response to (1) above
	6) My query with this policy is how does this relate to HN1? We may eventually wish to do a loft conversion on our property which would take our home over the space limits. I feel a change in wording to specifically allow existing home owners to extend and improve their homes is needed.	See response to (1) above
	7) Unnecessarily restrictive and not necessarily in best interests of the local community	See response to (1) above
	8) I am not sure why the houses between Queen Street and Norris’ Bridge are not in the conservation zone. The deeds of Water Farm House state that it is in a conservation zone	The Conservation Area boundary has not been amended or altered by the TNP; the Draft Plan Map 5 only showed that part of the conservation area which was within the Settlement Boundary; hence the misunderstanding. Map 5 has now been amended to show the whole Conservation Area.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
HN8 Twyford Conservation Area	9) You should not say no change of use, conversion or new-build by sub division of plots. There have to be exceptions, each looked at on individual merits.	Agreed. POLICY AMENDED.
HN9 Housing in the countryside	Allow multiple occupation of large houses	This is intended to restate the existing well established policies of the Winchester Local Plans with additional flexibility for accommodating elderly relatives who would normally be counted as part of the one household. NO CHANGE

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics:

Mr Jonathan Humphrey (owner of Site S1):

The company is in agreement with the overall housing provision Policy HN2 and the proposed policy for the Twyford Conservation Area.

Policy HN1 on local housing needs and housing mix is also accepted although the company questions the application of floor area limits in the context of the need to provide for downsizing. Older people wishing to move from larger properties to properties with a smaller number of bedrooms are likely to require more facilities and floor space that would normally be the case with other age groups moving into properties with the same number of bedrooms.

The needs of the downsizing elderly are accepted and have been recognised in the Draft Plan. The floor space limits on new housing are substantially larger than the minimum and are internal not external dimensions. With such a small number of new houses at its disposal, the TNP cannot be expected to cater for the precise needs of every group or individual. Where the elderly are in housing need it is hoped the affordable housing policies will come to their aid; where they are the owners of substantial properties in the village, they should be able to afford one of the existing stock of smaller properties.

Policy HN3 – Land for Housing ; Site Selection is a draft policy that has been drawn up following a lengthy site selection, short listing and analysis process. This process appears to be only part way through and needs to be concluded before the policy wording can be finalised. Hence, we would like to reserve the right to comment again in due course and when the policy position and allocation intentions are finalised.

Agreed the Site Selection Process is ongoing

It is understood that Site 26 is to be preferred for locational and accessibility reasons. In this regard insufficient emphasis has been placed on the merits of Site S1 which include proximity to a large number of employment opportunities within easy walking and cycle distance as well as close proximity to the church and other village facilities that are also generally within walking or cycling distance. Safe pedestrian access to the village centre has recently been enhanced with the installation of the Puffin crossing.

The merits of Site 1 are fully appreciated which is why it remains under active consideration. It will be assessed against site 26 and a comparison made of these and a wide range of other considerations in coming to the final decision.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Reference is made to settlement morphology and in particular the amount of development that has taken place in certain parts of the village within recent years. The Technical Committee appear to have preferred Site 26 in part because less development has taken place in this area over recent years than in the Northfields area. This analysis is questionable. The figures that have been quoted are misleading and in some cases incorrect. Where growth has occurred in recent years depends on the time period covered and type of development considered (eg re-use and conversion as well as new build). The figures quoted do not appear to have taken full account of new development through conversions and re-use particularly in the southern part of the village and in the wider countryside.

This is in part a factual statement of the numbers of houses built in the north and south of the village over the past 15 years or so, of which by far the greater number is in the north. This has been discussed with the owner and his advisors and the numbers of dwelling corrected.

Even so, the relevance of this criteria is to be questioned. If the new development were of a volume to cause significant physical, visual or social harm there may be a cause for looking elsewhere. However, in the context of Twyford, its overall size and population, its school rolls and level of service provision, this is not the case. Recent development has been generally small-scale, incremental, discrete and well absorbed. It would be difficult to conclude that it has not been successful or has caused any community harm.

The point here is not that past development has caused harm but that the location of new housing closer to most village facilities is a clear benefit to the occupants .

Further in relation to site selection, insufficient weight appears to have been attached to the potential for harm that could arise in connection with Site 26. Significant development in this location is questionable in part because of the effect it may have on drainage and flooding as well as on the landscape and general character of this area. It would also give rise to significant additional vehicle trips within the most hazardous and congested part of the local road network. Beyond activity in the local area most new residents will wish to travel north towards Winchester and the main road network on a significant number of occasions. Development at Site 26 will give rise to many more daily trip movements through the crossroads where they will need to make the right turn from Hazeley Rd to the B335/High Street.

The potential of part of this site for flooding and the consequences of additional run off are key matters of site selection which are still under active consideration.

Site 1 is considered preferable to a range of reasons development at Northfields would be well contained, a logical next stage to recent incremental and successful development and it would have no adverse impact on the conservation area, character areas, the road network, drainage or landscape.

The competing demands for road space in the village centre are acknowledged; Site 26 would also be expected to provide additional car parking as part of the housing proposed; this would be of direct benefit to the wider village and to the many facilities grouped around the Hazeley Road. By contrast 20 houses on S1 are likely to generate additional traffic because the site is so much further from the day to day facilities which are within much easier walking distance of site 26.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

It is possible a scheme for the full 20 house requirement could be located at Site 1. This could include the full 40% affordable housing provision and associated amenity space. Early stage consultation responses suggest that this option would be supported by local residents who generally consider that Northfields is a good place to live for a range of reasons. Further it should be noted that initial development viability assessments suggest that the development could make a significant contribution towards the cost of acquisition of land and the setting out of parking spaces for the desired extension to the car park at the Parish Hall and Surgery site.

Since these comments were made, they have discussed them with Jonathan Humphrey and his team; layouts and supporting technical information has been prepared and the financial offer confirmed. These discussions and the site selection process are ongoing.

Policy HN4 on affordable provision on allocated and windfall sites is accepted although the second paragraph needs to be changed to refer to sites of 6 – 10 dwellings (instead of 5 to 10 dwellings) in order to be in accord with current legislation and national guidance.

Agreed. The affordable housing policies of the Government have been clarified by the courts while the Draft Plan was in preparation. The SDNPA are also likely to propose a different threshold. HN4 is being amended to take account of the latest situation with the aim of securing the maximum amount of affordable housing on site.

The third paragraph of the policy which requires local people to have “strong local connections to Twyford” to be eligible for affordable housing may also be difficult or impossible to enforce in the context of current legislation and guidance. This concern also applies to the last part of **Policy HN5** on exception sites.

Disagree; this proposes the same local connection criteria applied to the recent social housing built in Hewlett Close.

Policy HN6 for housing infilling, redevelopment, extensions and changes of use is an appropriate policy that should be amended so that it does not exclude Bourne Lane and Bourne Fields.

Policies HN,7 and 8 have now been combined. See comment to HN7 below

Policy HN7 which takes Bourne Fields and Bourne Lane out of Policy HN6 and seeks to establish a new restrictive character area is not justified. These areas are well described and analysed within the Landscape Character Assessment but as outlined above there is a disconnect between the survey work and the analysis and the conclusions in relation to changes to the Settlement Policy Boundary and this new policy area proposal.

It is accepted that there has been new development within this area. However, it should be noted that the most prominent and visually harmful development has been in the form of replacement dwellings and not in the form of plot infill. An inappropriate and loaded reference is made to “suburbanisation”. There has been additional development in the area but this has generally been of a high quality and respectful of local character and the wider landscape. It has resulted in some increase in density but this on its own is not a negative factor. To suggest that this area should be subject of a policy which limits development to “single plot infill of similar size to the existing frontages” is unsubstantiated and extreme. It is a constraint that does not apply even to the conservation area. Overall, this policy is considered unnecessary and should be deleted as sufficient protection is afforded by other policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and the Development Plan.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

This policy has been re-examined and redrafted to apply more generally to all areas of predominantly detached housing in the village. See the fuller comments under this policy above.

Policy HN9 for housing in the countryside is appropriate but needs to be amended to take account of relevant national and Development Plan provisions such as NPPF para 55 provision for new isolated houses of “exceptional and innovative quality” as well as building conversions.

This policy does not include the full range of countryside exceptions; it is expected that either the Winchester Core Strategy or when approved the South Downs Local Plan will include this provision.

Southern Planning Practice Ltd:

Policy HN8, which prevents new housing within the Conservation Area and by association Policy HN6, which excludes infilling and redevelopment within the Conservation Area, are objectionable. A Neighbourhood Plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that those producing neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development. Qualifying bodies should plan positively to support local development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan. More specifically paragraph 184 states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan.

In relation to Conservation Areas the basic conditions that must be met if it is to proceed to referendum are, inter alia, that the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development and that it is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.

The NPPF provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development: the embargo on housing within the Conservation Area cuts straight across this presumption.

Furthermore, the NPPF does not exclude development within a Conservation Areas. On the contrary, it recognises that new development can add value. Paragraph 137 states that Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. It also recognises under paragraph 138 that not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Again the embargo on development closes any potential to improve the Conservation Area through new housing development.

In addition, both the Winchester Joint Core Strategy and the South Downs Local Plan places no such restrictions within Conservation Areas.

The Neighbourhood Plan states under Chapter 3 that the policies conform to the NPPF, but as advised above this is not correct. It is noted also that the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan are, amongst other things, to:-

II) To enhance a vibrant and thriving community life, by providing new housing...

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

- III) To strengthen a dynamic village centre...
 V) To improve the quality of the built environment...

New housing development within the Conservation Area can meet all of these objectives, whereas restricting housing within such an area would be prejudicial to schemes which could add value to the village cherished built environment and would rail against the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For these reasons policy HN8 should be dropped and Policy HN6 amended to including housing within the Conservation Area

Agreed. HN8 amended and text included in HN6.

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
BE Business and Employment		
BE1. Employment and business provision	1) Policies will inhibit home working, cottage industries and self-employment.	These are allowed for within the Settlement Boundary. Outside the Settlement Boundary, policy SB2 also allows for change of use for employment. BE1 favours firms with a local focus. NO CHANGE
	2) Policies will prevent any increase in employment.	Extra space does not always bring extra employment. However policies allow for expansion of locally focussed firms and employers both i the SB and outside and in BE2. A consent for 240 new jobs at Northfields has been granted and is expected to be implemented early in the plan period. NO CHANGE
	3) Existing businesses should be allowed to expand and replace buildings, especially if they guarantee local employment.	Twyford has an exceptional range and quantity of employment for a small village. The arguments against unfettered expansion of all firms and employers in the TNP are set out in the Draft Plan. NO CHANGE
	4) Part of site 26 should be allocated for business.	The South Downs National Park Local Plan does not allocate any additional employment space to Twyford. Also site is subject to landscape and other constraints. The limited area of land for development is of most value as a housing site with community facilities. NO CHANGE
	5) Challenge statistics on local working.	Further information has been requested on the basis of this comment. NO CHANGE
	6) Twyford should act as an employment centre for the arc of countryside to the East.	Twyford already acts as a significant service centre for neighbouring communities. The meeting of employment development needs is however primarily for areas outside the National Park. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
BE2 Northfields and Hazeley Enterprise park	1) Policy will prevent gradual regeneration in a sustainable location.	The policy will permit additional development, provided preconditions are met. These will be a more limited sort and with less environmental impact than has occurred previously. NO CHANGE
	2) Using “the primary benefit of the Twyford Community” is not legitimate under current legislation, planning guidance or development plan policy.	Further information has been requested for the basis of this comment. NO CHANGE
	3) The requirement for a masterplan and an overall landscaping plan are unreasonable.	The master plan is justified by the scale and complexity of this site and its importance for the TNP and the SDNP and to look at the environmental issues comprehensively. The landscape plan for the whole site is an essential element in the protection of the SDNP. NO CHANGE
BE3 Twyford preparatory School	1) Agree access problems need to be sorted out. There should be no reference to a new access to the school from Hazeley Road.	The continuing impact of traffic from twice daily traffic into and out of the school has wider impacts on the village. These are largely caused by the private car and appear to be the direct consequence of pupil numbers and the distance from school. Reference to access from Hazeley Rd is removed. POLICY AMENDED
	2) Text should confirm that the school does bring benefits to the village Any additional school facilities should be available for the wider community.	The economic and other benefits of the school are acknowledged. TEXT AMENDED
	3) Planning policy cannot limit pupil numbers.	Planning can require limits on increases in pupil numbers as a condition or precondition of planning consent for any further development. It would need to justify this restriction by traffic or other land use impacts. The school could mitigate these impacts by reducing the use of the private car for instance by cycling or bus use. NO CHANGE
	4) Detailed points on clarity and accuracy of text. Remove “minimizes the use of the car”	Agreed. TEXT AMENDED

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
ST Sustainable Tourism		
ST1 Visitor and tourism facilities	1) What is visitor accommodation if it is not a holiday home? Restriction on duration of stay would be hard to apply.	Clarification in ST1 policy wording needed to clarify difference between visitor holiday accommodation and second homes. Policy and introduction have been redrafted, with definitions, and now includes conditions which require new visitor accommodation to demonstrate that the purpose is for holiday use, not as a second home. NB, visitor accommodation could also include hotels and B&B's in addition to short term lettings of self-catering accommodation for holiday purposes. POLICY AMENDED
	2) Need to define 'holiday homes' – does this mean second homes?	See above for policy redraft in order to clarify distinction between 'holiday' and 'second' homes and to include new conditions to prevent growth in the second homes sector within the parish. POLICY AMENDED
	3) Don't think these are real priorities	No alternative priorities suggested in consultation. NO CHANGE
	4) Request for a SDNP "Gateway" interpretative link - waterworks to water meadows to water mills.	Enhanced interpretation of historic features, with SDNPA support is aspirational for the parish but not enforceable in policy. TPC could highlight to SDNPA and Twyford Waterworks Trust the opportunity for SDNPA to use Twyford Waterworks Trust as National Park Gateway site, as it is at the western end of the National Park and has an existing heritage attraction in the Waterworks. No policy redrafting proposed, but possible aspirational policy or action by TPC to progress. NO CHANGE
	5) New "attractions" in the village should be allowed if they are in keeping with the special qualities of the SDNP.	ST1 policy wording to be changed to replace 'preservation' with 'protection and enhancement' of SDNPA special qualities in order to clarify the point that ST1 and ST2 policies don't prevent the creation of new attractions, but ST1 does require new visitor facilities to meet an identified need, benefit an existing Parish attraction, and to demonstrate that a new attraction will contribute to the protection and enhancement of SDNP special qualities. POLICY REDRAFTED

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
ST2 Visiting and enjoying Twyford	1) Too much signage should be avoided.	ST2 policy wording to be changed to support the need for appropriate and sensitively sited signage which does not clutter the countryside. Signage would be in line with SDNPA policy and recommendations, and may include adoption of SDNPA's 'shared identity'. POLICY AMENDED
	2) Do not advertise lock and water meadow. Why encourage visitors in cars.	No advertising is planned. NO CHANGE
Community Provision		
CP1 Community sports facilities & open spaces	1) Change of use of land, in particular Ballard Close, to include support for further provision of youth facilities (applies to CP2, also).	The TNP's desire to create Community and Sports Facilities for sectors of the village has now been included within the purpose of the policy. Further to a meeting between TNP Committee and Ballard Close Committee – reference to Ballard Close has been removed from CP2. POLICY AMENDED
	2) Add some provision for the youth of the village	See response to 3 below
	3) Under CP1 we note that one of the purposes of the policy is that "there is a need for further provision to provide facilities for young people. This is a purpose we very much endorse and support. We also note that a further CP1 purpose is that "Any new development should make open space provision on site". Any new provision for youth facilities should ideally have sufficient attached open space for young people to participate in relevant outdoor activities. However if an opportunity arose for additional indoor facilities for young people, which did not have on-site open space provision, we would not wish the Neighbourhood Plan to preclude this. We have a concern that although TCP's aims are included in CP1's <u>purposes</u> they are not reflected in CP1 <u>policy</u> (within the green box). Does this mean that in the fullness of time, the purposes can be forgotten or diluted? In other words, are the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan equally as important as the policies?	The TNP's desire to create community and sports facilities for all sectors of the village has now been added to the policy. POLICY AMENDED
	4) Any further development in Hunter Park would spoil the beautiful tree-lined surroundings and nature of the Park, and would no doubt lead to additional car-parking space and lighting.	Hunter Park is a designated Local Green Space and protected under LHE4. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
CP2 St Mary's Primary School	<p>1) The Ballard Close Committee has consulted the custodial Trustees, Fields in Trust, regarding the statement “<i>change of use of land, in particular Ballard Close, for the expansion of the school will be supported</i>” and would politely request that this be removed from Policy CP2. The original deed for Ballard Close states that “the administrative trustees shall lay out & maintain the land as a Playing Field and Recreation Ground in perpetuity for the Parish of Twyford. The field is held charitably for the purpose of a Playing Field and Recreation Ground of which Fields in Trust is the trustee. The land is privately owned and should not be included in the Neighbourhood Plan for purposes other than the charitable objectives. X 2</p>	<p>Further to meeting between TNP Committee representatives and Ballard Close Committee the reference to Ballard Close has been removed from CP2. POLICY AMENDED</p>
	<p>2) Ballard Close (not Ballards). Ballard Close land is held in trust for the use of all the children in the village, not just those attending the school, so cannot be built on. I feel the Plan should honour and respect Ballard Close as protected land – and that this should be in the policy. Contradicts LHE4 which protects Ballard Close.</p>	<p>See (1) above.</p>
	<p>3) It is important that children play and exercise and the playing field is vital to that development and wellbeing. Any proposed development should not result in a loss of recreational land.</p>	<p>See (1) above.</p>
	<p>4) Parking needs addressing at peak times</p>	<p>Noted but this is outside the control of the TNP.</p>
	<p>5) Any mention of Ballard Close should be taken out. Ballard Close was purchased by Twyford villagers back in 1930 or so to prevent any building on it. It is a very valuable open space and sports facility used every day of the year by the children of the village and school. It is also used for village functions. The protection of Ballard Close is invested in the charity “Fields in Trust” whose sole purpose is to prevent the loss of such spaces. I am staggered that the Technical Committee should even have thought of desecrating Ballard Close let alone actually putting it in the local plan.</p>	<p>See (1) above.</p>
	<p>6) Change of use of Ballard Close is not acceptable for school expansion. Better to put a second storey on a new wing + / or temporary classroom x 2</p>	<p>See (1) above.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
CP2 St Mary's Primary School	7) The school has 7 year groups from Year R to Year 6 over 5 permanent and 1 temporary classroom. Ballard Close is for under 14s, not under 4s. I would be keen that Ballard Close is used to improve outdoor play at school, but we need to ensure that community access is maintained. We should be thinking about what the school facilities could also offer to the community – there are no community events at the school, but there used to be evening classes etc.	This issue is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Twyford St Mary's is responsible for the way its buildings are used.
	8) We note that CP2 includes the following statement within its policy “change of use of land, in particular Ballard Close, for the expansion of the (St Mary's) school will be supported”. One option for further facilities for young people could be the development in Ballard Close, with its “built in” open space. In fact, it may be possible that there could be shared use – during the day for school activities (including pre-school and after-school) and during the evening and weekends for youth and community activities. Could the purposes / policies of CP1/CP2 reflect this possibility?	See (1) above.
	9) Six separate comments expressing opposition to the idea of development on Ballard Close – valued open space for school; teachers shouldn't park on playground (could Social Club help during the day?).	See (1) above.

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics

Mr Jonathan Humphrey:

Policy CP1 for community and sports facilities and open spaces is considered to be acceptable but needs to be amended in relation to new residential development. Consideration should be given to the need to provide in accordance with current standards of public open space together with consideration of existing provision and spare capacity. This change is necessary to take account of current guidance and Development Plan policy. There are detailed open space audits for the area that can be relied on in undertaking the type of assessment that will be necessary. *Details of Open Space availability and requirements are in line with WCC 2013-14. Open Space Policy has been included but Twyford will be subject to the emerging SDNP Open Space Policy.*

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
LHE Landscape, Heritage and Ecology		
LHE1 Protected gaps	1) Protected gaps should include Ballard Close.	The Close is owned by a charitable trust which has dedicated it as public green space, therefore it is already a protected green space within the village. NO CHANGE
	2) Allowing development in the protected gaps could improve the existing views.	The quality of Twyford's landscape depends on the existing village setting and rural character. Protecting the green buffer zones ensures that the countryside around the village is not developed. Policy LHE1 specifies the importance of retaining 'open and undeveloped countryside between Twyford and adjoining settlements'. NO CHANGE
LHE2 Landscape & Views	1) The Village Character Assessment is inaccurate, its principles are not clear, and therefore its principles should not be reflected in the policy.	There has been confusion between the volunteer-produced village Character Assessment, and the commissioned 'Twyford Parish Landscape Assessment Part1: Landscape Character Assessment' (December 2015), a professional landscape assessment produced by consultants Terra Firma. The latter document provides a 'transparent, consistent and robust approach' to landscape considerations in identifying potential sites for development. This has been clarified in the wording of policies LHE1 and LH E2. Policy LHE2 will no longer refer to the 'principles within the Character Assessment', but will focus instead on developments being able to demonstrate that they contribute to 'the protection and enhancement of the special village character and landscape of the parish'. POLICY REDRAFTED
	2) The view from Shawford Road and Berry Meadow towards St Mary's Church will be obscured by the hedge put in by the Bishopstoke Fishing Club.	The St Mary's Church view issue relates to a hedge maintenance issue, and can be monitored by the Parish Council. It is not appropriate for mention in TNP policy. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
LHE2 Landscape & Views	4) The policy should be re-written to distinguish between development which may negatively impact on natural beauty or character from development which may to a degree be prominent but not otherwise harmful.	The policy does not permit an increase in the prominence of the settlement within the landscape and needs to focus on the retention and enhancement of Twyford's special village character, and the relationship of the settlement to the surrounding countryside. New LHE2 policy wording does not preclude new development, but specifies that it must protect and enhance special village character and landscape. POLICY REDRAFTED
	5) In relation to the Northfields Site it is accepted that the feed mill is visually prominent from a wide area and in this instance the prominence is negative. However, this is not the case with the Enterprise Park buildings or other built form at Northfields, which have had significant changes over recent years and these changes have reduced negative prominence.	Developments relating to Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park are covered within policy BE2 and therefore no change is proposed to policy LHE2. NO CHANGE
LHE3 Historic environment, buildings & archaeology	Policy supported and no concerns reported	NO CHANGE to policy but references to Parish Landscape Assessment clarified in policy introduction.
LHE4 Local green space & informal open space	1) Support for creating Local Nature Reserves but concern that this should balance (current) dog walking and recreational use with protecting wildlife.	Issue has been raised in discussion with Twyford Parish Council. Future management plans for proposed Twyford LNRs must address potentially conflicting demands of exiting recreational use and dog walking with need to protect vulnerable habitats. Wording changed in forward to Policy LHE4. NO CHANGE TO POLICY
	2) All protected spaces on Map 8 (and Protected Gaps on Map 9) are to west and south. The open spaces to NE, E and SE are also important to the village and should have similar designation as Local Green Space.	No change is proposed to existing Local Green Space designations, as specific suggested locations for further designated green spaces in the NE, E and SE have not been received in consultation. The NE and E areas are already covered by Hockley Golf Club, with an agreed management plan which takes account of local Biodiversity Action Plan priorities. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
LHE4 Local green space & informal open space	3) Volunteering also improves the sense of community	Although there is already significant volunteering in the village, the desirability of establishing a TPC Wildlife / Heritage group to engage volunteers, raise awareness and assist in management and interpretation of parish natural and cultural heritage assets is supported. Progressing this proposal is outside the TNP policy, and should therefore be taken forward by TPC. NO CHANGE.
LHE5 Dark night skies	1) This should include the impact of development adjacent to the village. The visually intrusive Park & Ride at Compton has had a big impact on Twyford.	Issue of Compton Park & Ride light pollution was raised in discussion with TNP and SDNPA at TNP meeting on 14 November. Developments outside the parish boundary have a big impact, but are outside the scope of the TNP policy and are difficult for TPC to influence. The issue should be pursued by TPC. NO CHANGE
	2) The policy in respect of street lighting should not be as rigid as wording states and should be considered with a balance in respect of public safety.	Need for policy amendment to address the local concern about public safety in the complete absence of street lighting is accepted. The policy has been changed with the additional phrase 'or considered essential for public safety' in relation to street lighting associated with new developments. POLICY AMENDED
	3) Views that there should be minimal lighting rather than none. In winter it is dark early and difficult for the elderly if no lights. No lighting would also encourage people to drive rather than walk or cycle as they don't feel safe.	See (2) above.
LHE6 Local biodiversity, trees & woodlands	1) Wording doesn't go far enough in protecting trees and woodland.	Policy introduction has been tightened to include reference to parish trees being "recorded and protected". This could be progressed through undertaking a (volunteer-managed) parish tree survey. Policy wording has also been changed to ensure net gains for biodiversity through development are achieved, rather than simply no net loss. This further protection within the policy also follows advice from Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. POLICY AMENDED

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
LHE6 Local biodiversity, trees & woodlands	2) Policy is too restrictive, and needs to accommodate need to remove overgrown trees. Don't be too dogmatic about preserving everything.	Policy already specifies that a tree survey should inform management of significant trees in the parish affected by development proposals, which addresses the point about identifying significant trees and managing overgrowth. NO CHANGE
	3) Aim for positive gain if we end up with mitigation, rather than no net loss.	Policy wording has been amended to ensure that this positive gain will be enforced. POLICY AMENDED
	4) Please ensure local resident specialists are engaged with this policy area.	Local resident experts should certainly be engaged by TPC in any future parish tree survey. However, this is outside the scope of the policy and TNP. NO CHANGE
WE Water Environment		
WE1 Flood risk	1) This could go further. All new development should contribute to improving the foul sewer in the lowest lying area of St Mary's Terrace. It would also be good if property owners are encouraged to separate surface water from the combined foul system to further reduce the load on the foul drain. This will effectively increase capacity of the foul drain (part included SD2).	New policy WE2 added. Policy sets requirement for development to have a neutral effect on existing systems. Developer contributions as outlined in Policy IDC1 is the appropriate mechanism for providing mitigation to any existing foul water related problems. POLICY WE1 AMENDED, NEW POLICY WE2 ADDED
	2) The village is extremely fortunate to have natural flood water storage in the low lying fields either side of Hazeley Rd along the course of the Winter Bourne. The lakes that form in these fields prevent the water from flowing into the village all at once. This natural water-storage system MUST be protected at all costs in order to safeguard the village.	Agreed. However, this is an issue for the Parish Council rather than the TNP. PC is discussing with HCC. NO CHANGE
	3) Extremely important as flooding of homes appears to be on the increase.	Agreed. POLICY STRENGTHENED
	4) Feel you should replace "above" by "East of" to further clarify the area and perhaps to add approximate measurements. No mention of the problem of the outlet of Hazeley Bourne into R Itchen which is a 12 inch pipe and woefully inadequate if we should ever experience a flood similar to that in 2000/01.	Policy amended to clarify extent of Zone 3 area. Flood mitigation measures or agreed contribution will be required as part of any development of Site 26 and is reflected in Policy. POLICY AMENDED
	5) The text suggests we get flooding in exceptional rainfall – this isn't true. It's when the groundwater levels are exceptional. It could be an average year after a very high year that tips the balance into flooding. "Groundwater" is one word, not two. There are typos in the wording of the flooding policy.	Policy amended to refer to groundwater levels rather than rainfall. POLICY AMENDED

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
WE1 Flood risk	6) Can we require innovative thinking regarding surface water and sewage? Encourage a reduction in surface water in sewers and an increase in grey water use to lower water bills to decrease the impact on the water environment and flooding.	Policy SD2 amended to encourage use of grey water in future developments. POLICY SD2 AMENDED
	7) It is pre-empting a thorough Flood Risk Assessment to conclude in Policy that the land area north of the Parish Hall will be treated as Flood Zone 3. The EA Mapping, combined with any remediation / mitigation measures, are the correct method for judging the flood risk of any piece of land within the Parish (rep of Site 26)	Policy modified to better define the Zone 3 area to include the observed area of springs rising during 2014 floods. The EA mapping is not sufficiently precise in its definition to be the only means of defining flood risk area. POLICY AMENDED
MA Movement and Accessibility		
<i>NOTE: most of these comments relate to matters outside the scope of the TNP. Nevertheless, many of these matters are included in the 'Aspirational' Policies in MA5 to keep the pressure up on HCC</i>		
MA1 Walking & cycling	1) Should include maintaining pressure for a cycle route to Hockley and where feasible, completing gaps in footways (or is this covered by MA5?).	Agreed. Already included in Policy MA5. NO CHANGE
	2) Can we add a cycle path through the village to connect us to Winchester and Colden Common (is included in MA5)	Central section relies on use of Church Path. – which is included in Policy MA1. Other sections already included in Policy MA5. NO CHANGE
	3) As there is no safe connection at present for cyclists the footpaths (used by few pedestrians) between Hockley Golf Club and Twyford could be used as a cycle path, involving just cutting back one side to widen the path slightly.	Outside our control and we understand using the footway as a cycle route is not acceptable to the highway authority. NO CHANGE
	4) So glad you have included cycling in the local plan but feel you have not gone far enough to signal to the Highways Authority of what is needed (explanation of current cycle route through village) .At the south of the village the route reverts to using a footpath along the road to Colden Common, but does Colden Common make provisions for cyclists in its local plan? If so, do they want cyclists to approach the village along the main road or via Upper Moors Road? I think you should contact them so that Highways are in no doubt where to put cycle paths or lanes – should they ever do so! The final routes chosen should be well signed and be specific on what cyclists and pedestrians should do when they meet!	See all above comments. We agree but it is outside our control

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
MA1 Walking & cycling	5) Para 3 : replace “footpath or cycle” by “footpath <i>and</i> cycle”	Agreed. POLICY AMENDED
	6) Rephrase Para 3 to say “attractive and safe footpath <i>and</i> cycle links”	Agreed. POLICY AMENDED
	7) What are we “maintaining and improving”? It???	The Rights of Way network.
	8) We need to consider shared pedestrian / cycle routes on the church path, Hazeley Rd. etc. to promote cycling. Can this be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan?	Not under our control, therefore aspirational. Church Path is now included in MA5. POLICY AMENDED
MA2 Parking	1) If parking is increased will it not be filled rapidly & within a year, if that, we will be back to where we are. How can a new car park be managed???. This will encourage more use of roads to access parking.	The survey demonstrated that parking is used for short periods only by those needing to use the facilities within the village centre and there is insufficient capacity to meet this need. There was no evidence that parking is being used for long term parking. If, in the future, the car park starts to be used for this purpose then appropriate management measures will need to be put in place to prevent it, but this is not a good reason for not making suitable provision for those who need to visit the village centre. NO CHANGE
	2) Extending the restricted parking on Hazeley Rd would mean residents of those houses / flats would be unable to park where they live. Applies to MA3 too.	This comment has been made by a number of residents in this area. The proposal to extend parking restrictions as far as car park deleted from text. However parking restrictions near shop/post office still supported under aspirational policy MA5.
	3) I agree that something needs to be done on Hazeley Rd so I propose that the restricted parking bays are extended. HOWEVER provision should be made for local residents via an on-street residential parking permit scheme. This would also ensure provisions for visitors and tradespeople are maintained	To be effective a Residents Parking Scheme needs regular monitoring. Unlikely to be acceptable to WCC and is not something that can be done within the TNP. See also (2) above. NO CHANGE
	4) Parking survey was not comprehensive. Needs to be done over a number of days / weeks / times of day. Do not believe that 40 spaces are necessary.	Whilst more survey data would be nice, we feel the information we have is sufficient to provide a robust assessment of the situation. See also (6) below.
	5) Need to avoid people parking all day for the station	Agreed, but there aren't any.
	6) 40 spaces too many – reduce to 20 - 30	It is important that land for up to 40 spaces is secured as this may be the only opportunity to do so. A small number of spaces (around 20) would be constructed initially with remaining space being held in reserve for future need. POLICY AMENDED TO REFLECT THIS

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
MA2 Parking	7) Extending the surgery / parish hall car park by 40 spaces is a drastic solution considering you have not consulted the surgery in any way about the possibility of spreading walk-in sessions or other possible solutions. The car park is only at capacity during the week in the mornings. Otherwise there is capacity. A one-day traffic study is not sufficient to come to the conclusions that you have drawn. A week-long study is strongly advised before any further discussions on this I would suggest.	The surgery has been consulted. See also (4) and (6) above. NO CHANGE
	8) NEW PARKING NEXT TO DOCTORS' SURGERY. I am not sure exactly which ref no this relates to but my point is as follows – I think this is the best place for developing for parking. To make it more “attractive” to the Hazeley Rd residents opposite perhaps a wide wooded area to shield it. This would make it into an attractive feature.	Appropriate landscaping will be required as part any development adjacent to the car park but a wooded area is likely to be impractical. NO CHANGE
	9) Parking needs to keep Hazeley Rd clear	Some people disagree on this point. NO CHANGE
	10) More parking required in all areas of the village (even more than proposed 40 extra).	Providing additional parking elsewhere in the village has been considered but dismissed as impractical. NO CHANGE
	11) Need to consider the environmental impact of 40 car parking spaces – drainage, landscaping etc. Don't make it too easy to park as while there are people who need to drive, we really should be encouraging people to walk or cycle more.	Agreed. Specification for any development on Site 26 will address this. The management of the new car park to deter unnecessary use of the private car will be for TPC to decide in due course.
	12) Whilst the principle of the additional parking spaces adjoining the existing Surgery Car Park is acceptable, the amount of spaces and land availability will be subject to the developable land and allocation of housing on Site 26 (rep of Site 26)	It will be a requirement of any development of Site 26 that land is allocated for additional parking. NO CHANGE
MA3 Minor traffic management improvements	1) I would like to see improvement in traffic management on Finches Lane between the traffic lights and the “cut through” to School Lane, in order to reduce the parking along this stretch and prevent the need for children to cross between parked cars to access the school.	Outside our control This could be added to the aspirational policy MA5. There is the risk that removing or reducing parking will increase speeds on this section of road. NO CHANGE
	2) Para 2. No (?). Remove this paragraph. This will just push parking issues elsewhere. Should not be done until other parking available.	Something needs to be done. NO CHANGE
	3) Make Bourne Lane “access and residents only” to avoid rat-run vehicles	Impractical and outside control of the TNP. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
MA3 Minor Traffic management improvements	4) Residents occupying the following houses with entrances on Hazeley Rd, have no on-site parking: i) 1 High Street; ii) 2 High Street; iii) Lady's Waste; iv) The Cosy End; v) The Old Bakehouse. On-street unrestricted parking for residents of these properties is paramount. To extend the time restricted on-street spaces as far as the car park would appear to be self-defeating. The present situation regulates itself with only the residents of the above properties parking outside their own properties for a longer time. Visitors coming to the shop or to visit the surgery or pharmacy park where there is a space and move off after a short time.	The proposal to extend the time-restricted spaces has now been dropped. POLICY AMENDED
	5) It's the short stay visitors that cause the main problem into overspill and bottlenecking the road	If additional parking is provided this problem will be reduced. NO CHANGE
	6) This will move to another nearby road as people from far away as the High St park here.	This comment is unclear and thought to refer to on-street parking in Hazeley Road. Additional off-street parking will reduce any problem. NO CHANGE
	7) This suggestion will only move the problem to Churchfield Rd for most days long term parking.	Maybe, but at least it is safer for people to park there than on Finches Lane. NO CHANGE
	8) What would these "mitigations" look like? This seems very vague, and I can't picture them.	The sort of measure is set out in the last sentence of the first paragraph. NO CHANGE
MA4 Access to Northfields Farm/Hazeley Enterprises	1) Road would cut people off from the village community. Their access would be to Winchester. It would also slow down traffic at Hockley Cottages which is positive, as the speed limit often isn't complied with, and this would naturally slow vehicles.	Disagree Not sure who is being cut off NO CHANGE
MA5 Transport in the village (aspirational)	1) Add a crossing of the B3335 by Manor Rd /Manor Farm Green to enable children in the south of the village to safely cross to go to Hunter Park.	Not sure this is the correct location, but there is a need for improved pedestrian crossing south of the traffic lights. NO CHANGE
	2) Can we drop the "aspirational"? It is good for all development to contribute to these good aims.	No. Implementing the measures set out here is beyond our control, but retaining them keeps pressure up on HCC. NO CHANGE
	3) More buses needed during the day as well as night x 2 responses	Agreed and included in aspirational policies. NO CHANGE
	4) Improve cycling provisions from M3 through to Hedge End. The road is too narrow for cyclists and cars. Permission for cyclists to use pavements (and give way to pedestrians using those pavements!).	Agreed and this is included in both MA1 and MA5. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
MA5 Transport in the village (aspirational)	5) Renew footpath surface Twyford →Hockley and widen footpath for cyclists. Do not widen Bourne Lane, it will lose rural character.	Agreed but outside our control. NO CHANGE
	6) No new access for school onto Hazeley Rd	Agreed. This has been deleted. POLICY AMENDED
	7) Roman Road is a private street. Enhancing pedestrian facilities would not enhance the street scene. There is a made footpath behind – Nurse’s Path – for those wishing to access Hunter Park. Keep it as an aspiration. X 2 responses	Roman Road is a private street and therefore owned by the frontagers . Details of improvements (if any) to be agreed with residents when highway authority acts. NO CHANGE
	8) The footpath between Twyford and Colden Common needs work and has not be referred to – it is used on a very regular basis.	Outside our control. NO CHANGE
	9) How will diverting traffic from school into Hazeley Rd help ease traffic on Hazeley Rd? Will only compound problems at peak hours.	This proposal has been deleted. POLICY AMENDED
	10) In my opinion great care should be taken to maintain the fact that Twyford is a village, the nature of which should not be lost by the obsession with providing footpaths as a matter of principle. Clearly there are situations where footways would be beneficial but clearly in others footways could have a detrimental impact on the existing nature, detail and amenity of the village. The risk of urbanising the village should be avoided, it is only too easy through over complication to lose the many benefits of a village such as Twyford.	This comment relates, I think, to footways NOT footpaths. The comment is accepted although the only ‘new’ footways are likely to painted areas alongside the carriageway. NO CHANGE
	11) Could it extend along Hazeley Rd to Waterworks Cottages – people here are scared to walk in to the village?	A footpath all the way to Waterworks Cottages is impractical and likely to be unacceptable to SDNP. NO CHANGE
	12) Cycle movements – the description seems to preclude a cycle route through the village. Can we put a shared cycle path / pedestrian route down Church Lane and the Church Path, ensuring bikes give way to pedestrians? It is already 40 mph at Hockley – are we asking for an extension north to the motorway here?	All these matters are the responsibility of the highway authority, however creating a continuous cycle route through the village is included in Policy MA1. The removal of the existing TRO on Church Path is included in Policy MA5. NO CHANGE

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics

Mr Jonathan Humphrey:

The inclusion of **Policy MA4** – Access to Northfields Farm / Hazeley Enterprise Park and the principle of a new highway access from the B3335 White Hill into Northfields Park / Hazeley Enterprise Park is supported by the landowners. *Noted*

The subtext preceding this policy is misleading in its statement that the change in occupiers at Northfields from a few large users to many smaller users that will exacerbate local traffic issues and in particular large vehicles making turning movements in front of the village stores / post office. The Farm and Enterprise Park are carefully managed. A vehicle routing regime is in place and CCTV cameras record vehicle registrations so that any offending vehicles can be identified and warned. It is intended that this management regime should continue and hence there should be no worsening of village traffic problems as a result of development at Northfields Farm and the Enterprise Park. *Further details on the effectiveness of the monitoring of traffic have been requested from Mr Humphrey.*

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
Development Briefs		
	I would like to see the Development Briefs pushing towards more community led development – should/can we offer plots for community led development before offering them to developers?	The whole plan has been community led by the TNP team of local volunteers and by the many opportunities for the village to engage with the process in setting the objectives, selecting the sites for development and commenting on the draft policies. The community will benefit directly from a range of policies, including affordable housing and the limits on property size. This will be delivered by the owners of the land in accordance with the local plan. The land is privately owned and the Parish Council is in no position to offer it for sale. NO CHANGE
DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)	<p>1) Support DB1 and DB2. But for DB1 have mixed use development to include provision for youth and also for surgery to expand if required for the village. A surgery should be supported and retained in the village centre.</p> <p>2) Support DB1 and DB2. But for DB1 emphasise that minimum 40 parking spaces are additional to full provision of parking space for new dwellings</p> <p>3) DB1. No mention of a Youth Club.</p>	<p>The draft plan indicates its support for improved youth facilities. The proposers of this are the Twyford Community Project who have a number of ideas for youth provision but have not settled on one single one. A local plan must be able to show that it can implement its proposals but in this case it would appear that the project is not sufficiently advanced to justify the reservation of part of site 26 housing land for this purpose. There are in addition a number of other possibilities, for instance, the Cecil Hut has been empty and unused for several years It is identified as a community asset in the Draft plan; this gives the community the right to buy the property for community use if the Doctors decide to dispose of it; this would give space for new building if the Cecil hut itself cannot be adapted.</p> <p>The expansion of the surgery would be supported if it was proposed but no mention of this or the possible land needs has been suggested. A firmer proposal would be required to justify the reservation of land for this purpose. NO CHANGE</p> <p>Agreed. This is already covered in Policy MA2 NO CHANGE</p> <p>See Comment (1) above</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
<p>DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)</p>	<p>4) DB1 – No – will cause more traffic problems in village.</p>	<p>The competing demands for road space in the village centre are acknowledged. Site 26 is also expected to provide additional car parking as part of the proposed housing (see policy MA2). This will, be of direct benefit to the wider village and to the many facilities grouped around Hazeley Road. By contrast 20 houses on Site S1 are likely to generate additional traffic because the site is so much further from the day to day facilities which are within much easier walking distance of Site 26. NO CHANGE</p>
	<p>5) DB1 – would be very dense and crowded</p>	<p>Twyford Parish Council has commissioned a layout of Site 26 with precisely this objective; namely to test whether there is adequate space for 20 houses and additional car parking with landscaping and open space. The layout produced by an independent planning company Spindrift demonstrates that this is achievable. NO CHANGE</p>
	<p>6) Support DB1 with housing and car park, 40 spaces. If there is insufficient room for 20 houses and 40 car park spaces, reduce the number of houses.</p>	
	<p>7) Yes to DB1 but with reservations – Land adjacent to parish hall – any development must satisfy strict criteria to safeguard properties situated on the course of the Winter Bourne. These criteria must not be overridden by developers. Any further development on Site 26 should be confined to upper part of the field, with the lower field left as a flood-plain and a safe area for floodwater to pool naturally in times of flooding.</p>	<p>Flood risk policy WE1 and DB1 strengthened to ensure this is the case. POLICIES AMENDED</p>
	<p>8) No to DB1 – too many houses for the one site. I support a joint development between the two sites.</p>	<p>Noted. STILL BEING CONSIDERED.</p>
	<p>9) No to DB1 – not all housing on one site but favour 11 : 11 and smaller car park and <u>if</u> Twyford Prep vehicle access then one way only to be enforced. Hazeley Rd is / was a country road</p>	<p>STILL BEING CONSIDERED. Parking for 20 cars only now proposed with space for more if required later. Prep School access deleted. POLICY CHANGED</p>
	<p>10) Too much developed on the site by surgery – visual impact and traffic problem.</p>	<p>Visual and traffic impact will need to be carefully assessed. STILL BEING CONSIDERED</p>
	<p>11) Although said “No” to DB1, would support it if could add “a new youth / community building to replace the Cecil Hut”.</p>	<p>See comment (1) above. NO CHANGE</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)	12) Said No to DB1 – developing the south of the village would lead to yet more congestion. Centralising facilities and concentrating village activity in one area already causes the congestion. Spreading facilities between the centre of the village and Northfields would benefit all. And more houses at Northfields would warrant more community facilities to be developed at Northfields.	<p>For car parking and congestion in the village centre, see comment (6) above.</p> <p>The area of Site 26 affected by flooding is confined to a narrow strip adjacent to the Hazeley Road. However, the ability of Site 26 to solve issues of flooding is critical to its development. If it can do so, this will be to the benefit of the village. These wider benefits will be weighed against any harm arising from the landscape impact of Site 26. Similarly the provision of the car park extension will be of wider community benefit, again something which Site S1 cannot offer other than indirectly by financial contribution. The splitting of the 20 houses into two sites of 11 is less likely to result in the solution of these two key problems for the village. STILL BEING CONSIDERED</p> <p>The provision of additional community facilities in Northfields would be a further demand on the limited finance which 20 additional houses can reasonably be expected to supply. NO CHANGE</p>
	13) Said “No” to DB1 – I don’t see how 20 houses and 40 parking spaces can be put in the site without contradicting points re flooding (and many other of the points made previously in the plan) , visuals from Hazeley Rd and Monarch Way (?) + also managing traffic.	<p>See Comment (12) above.</p> <p>The evaluation of the landscape impact has been helped by the production of a more detailed layout produced by independent planning company Spindrift and further work by the Technical team showing the context of site 26 as part of the village with existing development on three sides and with a strong landscape framework. The viewpoints of the potential housing are limited and a series of photomontages has been produced which shows the limited extent of landscape impact of housing on Site 26.</p>
	14) Whether Site 26 is developed or not Hewlett Close is likely to be developed.	<p>The Draft plan could allow for this as an exception site under Policy HN5 if need was demonstrated. NO CHANGE</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
<p>DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)</p>	<p>15) DB1 gives specific development proposals / aspirations for Site 26 (land adjacent to TPH car park). These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car park for around 40 cars • Retention of clump of trees on top of site, possibly as open space • Eight social houses in the village centre • Up to 12 small market houses in the village centre • Possible measures to assist prevention of further flooding of village car park • A comprehensive plan for whole site • Integration with village hall / surgery <p>Believe the following should be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new youth / community building to replace the Cecil Hut <p>The draft plan does present the option of some of the 20 new houses being built on Site 1 (Northfields). This would then free space for a youth / community building on Site 26.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Cecil Hut is not part of DB1; see also above comment (1) above. The freeing of space for a youth club would be at the expense of housing land and would have a negative impact on the ability of the site to finance other community benefits. The meeting of Youth needs has a range of other options. NO CHANGE</p>
	<p>16) Don't support DB1. Coming to the conclusion that Site 26 is the preferred site seems to be fundamentally flawed based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First the local housing survey suggests Northfields is the preferred choice of the villagers 	<p>The two front runners in terms of public response for the housing allocation are Sites S1 and 26. In the series of consultations both are supported, neither to the exclusion of the other. The site selection is not in any case a matter of popular vote, but a judgement made on the basis of a wide range of factors and on which the public will have the opportunity to comment further and to vote on whether they consider it acceptable. STILL BEING CONSIDERED</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
<p>DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)</p>	<p>16) cont.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing 20 properties on this site contradicts the Terra Firma report stating that the site has “limited capacity for a small number of houses” and could affect some sensitive views) • Also is questionable in terms of meeting Objectives 2.2 1 and IV, and policy LHE2 (see previous points about LHE2 which read “Agree with policy. Please note the choice of site 26 seems to contradict this as its elevated sloping position and area that would need to be developed to avoid flooding, would increase the prominence of the settlement within the landscape, and would be visually prominent from the east approach”). • Appears mainly to be based on the need of 40 carpark spaces based on a one day survey (methodology and results of I can't seem to locate). <p>Before deciding this is the preferred site, both the additional need for car parking and the feasibility of all contending sites should be assessed independently by experts in these areas.</p>	<p>The preference for Site 26 does not contradict the Terra Firma report; the numbers of houses are small; the houses themselves are small; not the entire site is used; and further work has been carried out to evaluate the landscape impact. Landscape is one of the factors in this decision but other considerations are also important and need to feature in the balancing judgment.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is to be read as a whole; both LHE2 and HN3/DB1 are part of it. LHE2 is not to be applied to the site selection process or to the allocation of land. It applies once the Plan is approved, to other development permitted by the plan but not site specific.</p> <p>The need for 40 extra car parking is independent of the allocation of housing but is tied to this location. Both are justified separately. The mixed use of Site 26 which results appears to the benefit of all and is an approach encouraged by Government.</p> <p>The site selection exercise has been exhaustive and thorough and has sought public involvement at all stages. The only two landowners actively promoting their sites are those of Sites S1 and 26. The Technical team is both expert and independent of any personal interest; they have taken advice where it is needed.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
<p>DB1 Land adjacent to the Parish Hall (74% of respondents agreed with these, 26% disagreed)</p>	<p>17) DB1 - there are serious flaws in this policy, whilst it clearly states further work required I am not sure they can be overcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is by no means clear that only part of this field will be made available – so in a sense S26 is not necessarily a viable option. If owners insist on whole field being used, then very likely to fail key TNP landscape objective and conflicts with Terra Firma work which only identified part of the field as being suitable. • Policy MA5 – Twyford Prep School – Development of the <u>entire</u> field below the Prep School and beside the hall car park is contrary to the objectives of the TNP in terms of landscaping and conflicts with LHE2, Table 2, bullet point 12 (this is comment made by respondent to Policy MA5 and referred to in response to DB1) • Developer will make flood mitigation measures but no one will remember that it is a <u>RIVER</u> that some pipework will not handle – potentially flooding houses opposite, houses up valley and closing road more often • Giving up the rest of this field is too high a price to pay, just to get more parking. 	<p>Some of the comments here are similar to (16) above and the response is largely similar.</p> <p>The owners cannot insist on the whole field being used; the Neighbourhood Plan sets the framework for development. However the landowner has the right to test the Councils decisions through the various application and appeal procedures set by Statute. This is in the normal course of planning control and should be expected.</p> <p>As a means of establishing their attitude to development, Councils are encouraged to engage with landowners when preparing local plans and this is what the TNP has done with the owners both of Site S1 and Site 26. Both discussions have been constructive and cooperative. Vortal's first submission for 30 houses on the whole of Site 26 has now been superseded by their acceptance of the terms and benefits of the development brief and of the principles of layout produced by independent planning specialist Spindrift.(see the comments by the developer under comment 18 below).</p> <p>With regard to flooding, see response to comment (12) above.</p>
	<p>18) DB1 policy is supported in principle, however the development brief objectives can only be supported based on the developable land and allocation of houses on Site 26. The stated tenure mix and house size caps would not comply with Local or National Policy, whilst the development should focus on delivery of a high quality scheme that brings benefit to the community. The amount of additional car parking spaces, and open play space, are completely dependent on any housing allocation on Site 26 and the amount of developable land (the representative of Site 26).</p>	<p>The support is noted and welcomed. The limit on the house sizes has been retained as a key part of the TNP's response to local conditions. However the areas specified are internal measurements rather than external. We understand that the developer may now accept the size limitations; the tenure mix will be discussed further with the Housing Authority and providers.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Draft policy to which comments apply	Comments or concerns	Response
DB2 Land to North of Hewlett Close at Northfields (82% of respondents agreed with this, 18% disagreed)	1) Provision of housing close to employment space will cause traffic problems.	The additional housing numbers whether of 11 or of 20 are modest but we agree that the road access is not of conventional design and that the impact of the additional traffic should be considered further. The landowner has consent for additional commercial development using this same access and could choose to substitute this consent, or part of it, if the traffic impact is shown to be unacceptable.
	2) Support for DB2 but not for DB1 – support what has been proposed for DB1 but would like to add: a new youth / community building to replace the Cecil Hut	See response to DB1 (1) above on page 34.
	3) Said No to DB2 – but perhaps if needed later, just not now.	Noted.
	4) Good site – modifications to detail needed	Noted.
	5) No – village will become two if further development at Northfields	Noted.
	6) the delivery of 11 houses on this site is not suitable due to the sustainability in comparison to other sites within the parish and the 40% delivery of affordable housing many not be sizeable enough to secure a high quality Registered Social Landlord. The locality does not present the opportunity to strengthen the village centre and would not offer any benefit to the community.	The separation of North Twyford, especially Northfields, from South Twyford is made the greater by the long road access down the busy B3335 and the concentration of so many of the key facilities in the centre and South Twyford. Recent development has however been largely in North Twyford which is one reason for the preference for a south Twyford site.

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics

Mr Jonathan Humphrey:

The development briefs for Site 26 and Site 1 should be reviewed in light of the comments set out in the Housing Site Selection section. Proposals for Site 26 should either be deleted and replaced with a policy for new village parking area only or amended to include a significantly lower level of development that would have less landscape, heritage and character area impact and would generate less traffic needing to route through the traffic light junction.

Conversely the development brief for Site 1 should be amended to cater for a greater level of development taking into account its advantages including defensible landscaping boundaries, good drainage and access, proximity to employment opportunities and potential to help fund and create footpath / cycle links and the new village centre car park.

The site selection process is ongoing The ability of site 26 to solve issues of flooding is critical to its development; if it can do so this will be to the benefit of the village and this wider benefit will be weighed against the lesser landscape impact of site 26. Similarly the provision of the car park extension will be of

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

wider community benefit; again something which site 1 cannot offer other than indirectly by financial contribution. Site 1 is not able to offer such direct community benefits as site 26, quite apart from the other benefits listed in the DB1 and the consultation exercise.

Housing Site Selection Do you support the Technical Committee’s proposal to concentrate effort on further investigation of Options A, B and C which would involve development of Site 26 to a greater or lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site 1 if necessary? (78% of respondents agreed with this, 22% disagreed)	
Comments or concerns	Response
1) Option A: I feel Option A is far too many houses for the site proposed. Houses would be excessively packed on the site and the increase in cars would cause significant problems in Hazeley Rd (<i>recorded against Objectives</i>)	See comments (4), (5) and (6) on p35.
2) Prefer B – favour 11 houses on each site. x2	Noted.
3) But just Site 26 and Site 1	Noted.
4) I prefer Option C. DB1 would be very dense and crowded. Option C would be less dense yet still achieve some affordable housing	Option C ruled out because the 6 houses are below the threshold for onsite provision of affordable housing. On density: see comments (5) and (6) on p35.
5) Have said “NO” – because this implies you will pack as many houses as possible on Site 26 and a few (if needed) on Site S1.	See comments (4), (5) and (6) on p35.
6) The wording of the question above is already weighted. A, B and C are not being given equal chance as you say Site 1 used “if necessary”. In other words going for YES above basically says I would agree to 20 houses on S26. I would not but Option B I would agree with but your question is not fair hence my “No” box.	TNP has been clear that its preference is for site 26 for the reasons it has spelt out. This is of course subject to the solution of flooding issues and the provision of community benefits. This is a community consultation to give local people an opportunity to express their views, not a neutral or academic study. The aim is to choose a good site for development.
7) Agree in principle but reduce number of houses to ten and introduce mixed development with community use not just houses.	The TNP has to allocate land for 20 houses. Twyford is already well provided with a wide range of community facilities with further locations if additional need arises in the plan period.
8) Don’t support because the bottom half of the site has potential springs when the water table reaches 12 metres from the surface. Springs burst up through the car park when the last heavy rain and high water table took place in 2014.	Noted and agreed. HCC is studying the flood issues at the moment but has yet to report. See also comment (12) on page 36.
9) Currently don’t agree with any of the options proposed except for development of Site S1 x2	Noted. Development of Site S1 for 20 houses now one of options being considered.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Housing Site Selection (cont) Do you support the Technical Committee’s proposal to concentrate effort on further investigation of Options A, B and C which would involve development of Site 26 to a greater or lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site 1 if necessary? (78% of respondents agreed with this, 22% disagreed)		
	Comments or concerns	Response
	<p>10) I agree with the idea of the technical committee concentrating their efforts on conducting feasibility studies as I’ve suggested however I think the choices are flawed and should be:</p> <p>A. Site 26 only B. Site 1 only C. Site 26 and Site 1 (11 houses max each site).</p> <p>Option D would certainly be best for the village in terms of maintaining character / social integration and minimising impact. It would also allow for different housing mixes to be built meeting the different needs identified in the housing survey; however I do appreciate the need for affordable housing and the difficulty this would create.</p>	<p>Agreed. The delivery of affordable housing rules out sites of less than 11 dwellings.</p>
If you favour Option D which would involve spreading over three sites, suitable for 6 to 10 dwellings, please give reasons.		
	1) No resale of affordable housing at a later date. Not for sale.	Agreed; however the government may change the rules.
	2) Smaller developments would be more in keeping with rest of the village and would have less of an impact on already overloaded drainage and antiquated sewerage systems in one area.	Any new development must be able to show that the site can be drained and provided with sewerage without overloading the system. Smaller developments are less able to help provide community improvements and affordable housing. No owners of smaller sites have been put forward their land for evaluation, so the impact cannot be assessed.
	3) Option D better for the character of the village. Less visual impact. High density in the centre of village harms landscape and character and creates more traffic at vulnerable bottleneck.	Noted but see comments above and comments (4), (5) and (6) on page 35 and comment (12) on page 36.
	4) Site 26 is yet to be determined if possible to build 11 let alone 20 it would make sense to have all alternatives possible. Site 26 has plenty of unknowns that need to be answered	Site 26 is a more complex site than S1. It has the major uncertainty of the flooding. However this is now being studied by HCC and progress is being made to solve other issues to help make an informed decision.
	5) Development of S26 would exacerbate an already heavy traffic problem. Northfields more preferable due to recent development. Developing at S26 would also be uncharacteristic of the village	See comments above on same points. The character of the village is immensely varied as is shown by the study of it by residents. The land form is similar to that south of Hazeley Road, which is developed by a wide variety of form and size and age (Roman Road/Dolphin Hill/Hazeley Road). The houses proposed will be smaller and more consistent in their design.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are you generally happy with the 1st draft plan? (81% of respondents said yes and 19% said no)		
Those who said yes	Comments or concerns	Response
	1) I am very impressed by the thoughtfulness, long-term orientation and balanced nature of the Plan.	Noted.
	2) Very impressed with the amount of time and thought that has gone into this document, well done and thank you.	Noted.
	3) Firstly I would like to thank the people who have obviously worked hard on this plan, they clearly care about our village (as I do) and have proposed some excellent policies. I do feel that some of the policies require modifications as the committee may not have had a broad range of residents on the panel i.e. age range and locality.	Noted. The Draft plan is published for comment and will be so again; as can be seen from the many changes made as result of this consultation; the Committee welcomes comment and uses it constructively. This has been the Committee's approach from the start.
	4) Yes but I would like to see Site 26 split into two. I approve of housing on the suggested area but I strongly oppose housing on the whole of Site 26. To make it clear to the owner that there is support for only part development – this should be made clear.	See comments (5) and (6) on p35, comment (13) on p36 and comment (17) on p39.
Those who said no		
	1) A housing estate of that proposed for Site 26 will be too prominent and urbanises the centre of the village – see LHE2	See comments (5) and (6) on p35, comment (13) on p36 and comment (17) on p39.
	2) Would be supportive if someone had taken the time to get facts correct – also poor grammar throughout does not make it a plan that I have faith in! e.g. Hunters Park. Ballard's Close.	The plan has been prepared by local people and is still in draft. We have constantly asked for comments to get the plan right so keep the comments coming including misspellings or issues of fact.
	3) think it needs more consideration and several amendments to provide a practical plan for village development	Noted but Please spell out what these are.
	4) Contradictions regarding development of the area. What is deemed OK for one area is simply not allowed in another. Is there really a big difference between Bourne Lane and the rest of the village? There seems to be too many “what if and subject to” regarding Site 26.	Bourne Lane: Policy HN6 has been changed following a number of comments suggesting (wrongly) personal interest of the TNP team members and to a lesser extent, the character of Bourne Lane and Bournefields and the consequences for unrestricted infill. The new policy applies the same restriction to all areas of predominantly detached housing.
	5) The development part of the plan is biased towards S26 – in fact the comments made by the Technical Group on Sept 14th were completely biased towards S26. They did not present a balanced view and neither does the Plan. It feels like the consultation was a box-ticking exercise.	Please see comment (6) on p 41.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are you generally happy with the 1st draft plan? (81% of respondents said yes and 19% said no).		
Those who said no (cont)	Comments or concerns	Response
	6) Protects the village but doubt it will result in any / much new housing if that is the intention.	The TNP is required to allocate land for 20 new dwellings; TPC must ensure that the landowner will implement the housing if allocated
	7) Housing policy fundamentally flawed	Noted but this needs to be spelt out to help us understand the points at issue
	8) Housing policy seems to be ignoring reports from Terra Firma and public opinion whilst influencing public opinion to site	See comments (5) and (6) on p35 and comment (16) on p38
	9) The draft appears to be the work of self -interested persons who have not focused on the whole Parish.	This is a disappointing comment. The committee is made up entirely of local residents who have between them lived over 200 years locally. If the draft plan is skewed and some part of the village or some aspect is neglected, we need to know which parts and what we can do about it. As for self-interest, the committee has worked on this plan for nearly three years with no remuneration. If there is any evidence of self-interest, it needs to be made clear to the Parish Council; it is unsatisfactory to make such suggestions and not back them up.
	The plan refers to Ballard's Close – why cannot the name of this public space be spelled correctly? What else is inaccurate?	The plan is published for comment, including the correction of any errors, whether of fact or grammar. Please let us know if you spot anything.
	There is reference to some existing and proposed footpaths without any reference to the condition of the footpath from Hockley to Colden Common.	There is a footpath between the two villages which is well used and maintained by the highway authority. The footpath improvements itemised in Policy MA5 are roads with no footpaths. Twyford Colden Common route is also mentioned as a possible cycle route in Policy MA5

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are you generally happy with the 1st draft plan? (81% of respondents said yes and 19% said no).		
Those who said no (cont)	Comments or concerns	Response
	<p>9) cont</p> <p>Reference to countryside takes no adequate account of existing hamlets and dwellings outside Twyford village!</p> <p>Why expressly permit infill in Bourne Fields but prohibit it in other locations?</p>	<p>The Settlement Boundary is drawn deliberately tightly around the village; thus the hamlets and outlying dwellings (and some of the houses much nearer in) are subject to the countryside policies of the plan. These are set out in some detail. They restrict additional building unless there is some special justification. The exceptions are set out in policies SB2, HN5, HN7, BE1, ST1. No individual group of houses outside the settlement boundary is mentioned. However. If there is some reason why any group might justify any further policy, that could be considered. The Technical Group would need to have the basis of this objection explained more.</p> <p>Infilling is permitted within the settlement boundary (not just Bournefields and Bourne Lane) and this has always been an essential feature of the TNP, continuing past policies. What the TNP did was to restrict the density of infill on Bourne Lane and Bourne fields for the reasons set out in the draft plan. This policy remains in place but has been applied more widely to all houses where the predominant character is of detached houses. The infill policy for the remainder of the village is retained. Outside the Settlement Boundary infill is not permitted.</p>
	<p>10) LHE1 protects gaps including Ballard Close, but CP2 advocates extending the school onto Ballard Close, in contradiction of LHE1. Ballard Close is protected land and as such the section advocating extending the school on to it should be removed.</p>	<p>Agreed. The policy has been changed to exclude any building on Ballard Close.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are you generally happy with the 1st draft plan? (81% of respondents said yes and 19% said no).		
Those who said no (cont)	Comments or concerns	Response
	<p>11) I can appreciate a large amount of work has gone into this and the presentation at the social club, however with the plan in its current format I would vote against it. Additional points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at the open day social club presentation there was unequal representation of the sites under consideration (only Site 26 was highlighted with the plan) • site selection seems to have a large focus on car parking although very little data / results of the survey seem to be provided to see how this conclusion was reached. 	<p>The site selection process has moved forward, with a decision still to make between sites S1 and 26. See also comment (6) on p41.</p> <p>The provision of extra car parking is supported by many people and organizations and the shop; the survey work confirms that which all can see.</p>
	<p>12) Modern developments go for very intensive housing and this would spoil the character of the village and so I favour a joint development (Plan B) with eleven houses on each site (S26 and S1).</p>	<p>Gov. policy encourages best use of land for development and encourages higher density. Higher density is not uncharacteristic of Twyford e.g. Hill Rise, School Road and Hewlett and Waterhouse Closes.</p>
Are there any policies which you feel have been left out or do you have any further comments		
	<p>1) Are the proposals for cycle lanes adequate? What about through the village? Be aware of encouraging further sports in Hunter Park that bring teams of over 20 cars up Park Lane and Roman Road. It's a village open space NOT a replacement for the leisure centres. Keep it small and local.</p>	<p>Re cycle routes: see policy MA5 Re teams visiting Hunter park: this is for TPC to manage as owners of the park.</p>
	<p>2) Page 36. Why is the lawn tennis and bowls club not in the other column with Social Club (both owned by members)?</p>	<p>This will be looked at again.</p>
	<p>3) Government Guidance for a Neighbourhood Plan 048 41 – 048 – 20140306. Ballard Close has not been consulted, yet the Plan supports some of its land being taken by the school.</p>	<p>Policy changed.</p>
	<p>4) Many families have three or more children so new build and extensions should not be limited to 3 bedrooms. There should be a balance.</p>	<p>Policy seeks to increase the supply of smaller 2 and 3 bed houses; the existing houses of this size and number of beds are being enlarged by extensions and rebuilds, making them too expensive and so changing the existing balance.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are there any policies which you feel have been left out or do you have any further comments (cont)		
	Comments or concerns	Response
	<p>5) On the whole I support the local plan – it is clear that a lot of time and effort has already been invested to produce a high quality first draft and for that I congratulate all involved. My main concerns have already been highlighted in individual sections – as an overall comment I hope the team considers the wording they are using carefully and the longer term implications on village life – simple sentences can have a very big impact and potentially impose some very draconian restrictions on the future of our village.</p>	<p>Agreed: The wording of local plans is important and has consequences for anyone wishing to develop. There is independent scrutiny of the draft wording at several stages, still to come. The wording must be clear both for owners and developers and for those who apply the rules, namely the planning officers.</p>
	<p>6) I am disappointed that the provision for self-build has not been progressed. In my view it was clear from the multiple comments received that this is an important issue for the village. In the comments from the April 2016 feedback I note that the <i>“Self- build group were invited to discuss needs with the Technical committee preparing the draft Neighbourhood Plan”</i>. At no point was I consulted or invited to this session.</p>	<p>There was a group in the village interested in self-build when the TNP was first set up. We have heard nothing from any self-build group (numbers, type, location etc.) and so have focussed on affordable housing.</p>
	<p>7) There are obviously some failures occurring in the committee communications strategy and this was also highlighted by the comment regarding the use of the banner being the only way someone else found out about the consultation.</p>	<p>There will be further publicity of the next version of the plan. Help in securing the widest possible coverage is welcome. This is a two way process.</p>
	<p>8) Implementation and monitoring are crucial. I would propose that the team that created the Twyford NP continue to meet and report to the Parish Council at regular intervals on implementation progress.</p>	<p>Agree that this is crucial. However it will be for TPC to decide how it is to be done.</p>
	<p>9) This is a hugely impressive project, well done to all who have worked hard to pull together the information and gather the views of Twyford residents.</p>	<p>Noted thanks.</p>
	<p>10) Well done. Much hard work here which is appreciated.</p>	<p>Noted thanks.</p>
	<p>11) I know from talking to experts at the consultation meeting that these areas aren't supposed to be part of a village plan as it focuses solely on development. But I think we need to be campaigning for good 3G/4G/mobile/broadband coverage as a village. And cycle routes around the area and to Winchester need to be a focus.</p>	<p>Improved broadband coverage is being actively pursued by the Parish Council.</p> <p>For encouragement of cycling see Policy MA5.</p>

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are there any policies which you feel have been left out or do you have any further comments (cont)		
	Comments or concerns	Response
	12) Should be more of a plan around roads / traffic / pollution / speed limits, as well as public transport. Understand that much of this is controlled by County / City Councils but can be influenced by Parish Council. We should be fundraising for more prominent signage especially speed limits.	All of these are ongoing issues which need constant effort. See Policy MA5, which is as far as the TNP can go.
	13) There should be a policy to work together / campaign to get good internet access for all in the neighbourhood. To get fibre to all cabinets, to ensure people can work from home, reduce car usage, and support flexible working for modern families.	Noted. This being pursued by TPC.
	14) A policy regarding internet access would be of use. It's crucial for all aspects of living nowadays.	Noted This being pursued by TPC.
	15) Feel strongly that measures should be taken to reduce traffic numbers and speed through village, including rat-runners in Bourne Lane.	See under comment (12) above.
	16) Keep pressure on large vehicles using village roads?	See under comment (12) above.
	17) Bourne Lane needs hedge cut back more and the timber bollard removed to make passing easier.	Noted.
	18) It would seem that this proposal / draft has been drafted with a decision already made and allowances made in script to shift possible decisions forward 1 or 2 places. There would seem to be allowances for Hazeley Rd development that contradicts Bourne Lane exceptions? Basically some areas get different rules.	This is a neighbourhood plan which gives the community the opportunity to make different policies for different parts of the village; that is its purpose. The test is whether there are good reasons for making these different rules. That is one reason for publishing the plan in draft, to allow people to challenge the plan and ask for further explanation of suggestions or to make additional ones of their own.
	19) Need more parking or protect what is there.	Agreed see Policy MA2
	20) My main concern is provision of social housing due to right-to-buy only five houses are available at Churchfields and 23 at Northfields. Winchester CC has a policy of building.	Agreed; the aim of TNP is to increase the supply of affordable social housing.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

Are there any policies which you feel have been left out or do you have any further comments (cont)		
	Comments or concerns	Response
	21) Some of the Plans contradict themselves – one plan shows areas outside the built up area that are supposedly protected from development and a contradictory plan shows land put up for development. One example is the land behind the houses which are near Manor Farm Green and currently has someone living in a yurt / barn that are under enforcement proceedings. In order to give confidence to the village that correct areas of land will be protected from development the plans should be more accurate and not include Ballard Close or land supposedly protected!	Land at Manor Farm Green is shown as S5 on Plan 3. It was put for SHLAA and evaluated by Terra Firma who rejected it. It is not proposed for development in the TNP. The Enforcement action is pursued by WCC under separate procedures. Agreed that the plans should be accurate which we hope they now are. Ballard Close policy now changed.
	22) Really think more can be done to improve public transport links and access to Shawford Station	See Policy MA5.
	23) Recommend that the conservation area be extended to include Roman Rd to the east including the site of the roman villa. suggest to the parish council that conservation area be extended as part of the neighbourhood plan.	A review of The Conservation Area would be done separately from the TNP; we have asked for this to be done.

Further comments from businesses were made as follows with responses shown in italics

Mr Jonathan Humphrey:

A new policy option with 20 units at Site 1 is preferred. If for whatever reasons this is not the selected option the preferred option would be Option B with 11 houses on Site 26 and 11 on Site 1. However, not all available land would need to be given over for a scheme of this size. Alongside this, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to accept that the need for further development will not go away within the Plan period. It is already acknowledged that affordable housing need will not be met through allocations within the open market housing schemes and there is a need for an additional Exception Site development. Consideration also needs to be given to the inevitable requirement for further housing land when the Plan is subject of review both before and after the end of the Plan period.

This comment suggests that the TNP should give consideration to the need for further housing when the plan comes up for review. The TNP accepts that further affordable housing is likely to be needed in the plan period and makes provision for it. Any additional housing would be outside the current process and dependant on the strategic guidance of SDNPA.

Twyford Neighbourhood Plan – 1st Draft: Comments and Responses

A resident's comments about the section on St Mary's Primary School:

"Can I draw your attention to some inaccuracies in the section on St Mary's Primary School. The TNP has this para on P38: *There are six year groups ranging from Reception (4+) to Year 3 (11+) located in four permanent classrooms and a temporary classroom. Outside space is severely limited although this is partly offset by Ballard's Close which is an open space for the use of children under 4 years old. The school feels lack of space narrows the range of educational opportunities it would like to provide the children. The school's principle access is via School Rd, an un-adopted and unmade up road with on-street parking, that serves many dwellings. Limited parking in the vicinity of the school leads to daily occurrences of traffic congestion and concerns about safety have been expressed*". There are **seven** year groups (R,1,2,3,4,5,6) ranging from Reception (4 year olds) to Year 6 (11 year olds) located in **six** classrooms (**five** permanent classrooms and one temporary classroom).

I am not sure I would say that space is "severely limited". I'd say that *all-weather* outside space is *somewhat* limited, but typical for a Victorian village school. This is more than offset by the large open space of Ballard's Close which is maintained by a Trust for the use of children of the village (not just those under 4 years old).

And have we (the school) actually said this: *"the school feels lack of space narrows the range of educational opportunities it would like to provide the children"*? I don't recall this coming up at a Governors' meeting, but I confess I have not checked back in the minutes. It is a reasonable thing to say, I suppose, but if the plan says that the "school feels..." it ought to be the case that the school (Governors or Head Teacher) has actually formally submitted that as a comment, really. All schools would like more space, but personally I'm not sure that lack of space really, in practice, narrows the range of educational opportunities that we can provide. School Road might be unadopted (I'm surprised to hear that but perhaps that's correct, I haven't checked), but I don't think it is correct to say it is unmade up. It is tarmacked. And is there really daily congestion? I've never seen that, although I'm always coming from the direction of Shawford, perhaps there is congestion on the other side of the village. It is easy to casually say there is limited parking.....which is true....but nevertheless there is *enough* parking! Everyone who drives parks somewhere (Finches Lane, Churchfields or the Phoenix car park).

Comments noted. Policy rewritten