



Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation Statement

CONTENTS:

Initial consultation	p.1
The ways we consulted the residents	p.1
Aims of the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process	p.2
How the Neighbourhood Plan developed	p.2
Background to our consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan	p.4
Who was consulted	p.6
Consultation on the Neighbourhood Area	p.7
Developing of vision objectives	p.7
Consulting on issues and options	p.7
Pre-submission of consultation publicity	p.7
Any issues and concerns raised during consultation	p.7
Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan Poster	p.9
Neighbourhood Plan consultation weeks	p.10
The revised Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan	p.11

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Plan, regulation 20.

- It contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the plan
- It explains how they were consulted
- It summarises the main issues and concerns raised by persons consulted
- It describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed.

Initial consultation

The web was searched to find examples of other people's plans and consultation, especially those whose areas were similar to Titchfield. A guide from the Town Planning Institute was downloaded. The Locality Road Map and worksheets for planning were used and a member attended a Locality training session.

The ways the residents were consulted

- TV programme
- 3 newspaper articles
- Monthly parish magazine
- Bi-monthly newsletter to over 700 people via e mail
- Door step flyers to over 1000 residents every open meeting x 4
- Very active website where debates continue on footpaths, roads, parking etc
- Posters in empty shop window
- Open meetings
- Questionnaires
- Talking to various local groups
- Table at church fete x 3 and at Christmas events
- Opinion canvassing of business

(see appendices to Neighbourhood Plan for evidence)



Aims of THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN consultation process

- To involve as many of the community as possible throughout the development of the plan so that the plan is informed by the views of local people and stakeholders
- To ensure that consultation events take place at critical points in the process
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques
- To ensure that the results of the consultation were fed back to local people as soon as possible after the consultation events
- To consult with residents following the publication of the draft Neighbourhood Plan to obtain their views on the Plan and to provide additional information or answer residents' queries

How the Neighbourhood Plan Developed

- The Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum started out as a sub-committee of the Titchfield Village Trust (TVT). In October 2015 comments, complaints, and suggestions were made by residents to TVT regarding the village and the surrounding related areas. The Trust asked a TVT member to set up a working party to look at the issues. Eight people joined the group at the first informal meeting on Thursday October 20th, 2015. They met monthly after that until January 2016 when a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was suggested as the best way to influence current and future developments in the area so that Titchfield would become the village that its inhabitants want it to be. A Forum was formed, consisting of 25 members from a cross-section of residents. These were recruited via word-of-mouth, article in the Parish Magazine, the first Open meeting and general conversations around the village including in the local pub.
- The starting point was to define the area that would be covered by the Plan. This took some time but was finally agreed after discussions with FBC. Then the views of residents were canvassed. Over 500 questionnaires were sent to residents, businesses and local groups. 152 questionnaires were returned. These were analysed and the results published and presented at a meeting of the Forum in February 2016.
- The results of the survey have been key factors in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Since January 2016 there has been much activity.
- The original survey highlighted areas of concern for the residents and these were placed under the following headings:
 - Housing
 - Getting around
 - Commercial and economic
 - Built and natural environment
 - Historic Titchfield

Members of the Forum joined a sub-group of their choice and comments of residents gathered from the Open Meetings and Questionnaires were debated. The decision then was taken on which of these suggestions should be policy and which should be community aspiration.

- This was then fed back to the residents via 5 public meetings and further comments gathered to enable adjustments to be made. Bi-monthly newsletters were sent out to over 700 residents, articles were in the Parish Magazine, shop windows and

presentations to local groups to inform and up-date on how the Plan was progressing. More details of these communications are to be found on the Forum's website: <http://www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk/>

Timetable of consultation events relating to Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan

date	Activity and suggestions	Action
1. Dec 2015/Feb 2016	Questionnaire was created to ascertain what were residents' main opinions and concerns. It was circulated to 500 residents inc. youth club, school, local societies and general public - the results of this questionnaire were published on the website and formed the basis for the working party groups.	See appendix 6 for results. Sub-groups of Forum formed to sort suggestions into various headings to decide on action. Immediate action taken on some community aspirations such as provision of litter bins outside school and by canal
2. 07.05.16.	Public Open Meeting	Sub-groups and Forum officers available with displays and to answer questions to inform the public about a Neighbourhood Plan. Leaflet provided.
3. 14.05.16.	Church fete - Some residents were unclear of the purpose of, and legal status, of a Neighbourhood Plan	Information and question and answer session set up at village fete. Leaflet produced and distributed at the fete
4. 15.08.16	Meeting with councillors at their executive	Explanation given to fully explain Neighbourhood Plan to Councillors
5. 19.09.16	During the consultation a number of residents highlighted the difficulties with access around the village	An accessibility audit - appendix 9 - was carried out by an occupational therapist and a wheelchair user - see appendix Talks on this were given at key places, eg. doctors' surgery and church. A dropped kerb was provided in the Square.
6. 30.10.16.	Open meeting for all residents (between 70/90 attended), Consultation on all sub-groups of the forum was available. Information was provided by each group	Residents were asked for their comments on each area using post-it notes and public questioning of forum members Action - see Comments folder 1. and Appendix 7 and 8.: Residents identified a small amount of affordable housing on brownfield sites; any development to not exacerbate parking and traffic flow and these are incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan under Housing Policy H1, H2 and H3. Under Presentation and Promotion/Getting Around, residents wished to have improved safety for cyclists, better signage, better parking and

		canal for walkers only policy GA2, cycle links and Community Aspirations, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T23. Roads and Parking - residents raised several issues and these are covered under community aspirations.
8. 26.11.16.	Talk to women's group at church	A brief presentation on the progress of the Plan followed by a discussion which enabled the group to have a greater understanding
9. 03.01.17	Television and newspaper interviews to explain why a Neighbourhood Plan would be beneficial to Titchfield	To reach a wider audience
10. 14.01.17	Talk to patient participation group at surgery on the Neighbourhood Plan	This talk showed how Plan involves the surgery and those working within it including the accessibility audit
11. 02.02.17	Meeting with PCC representative following the Accessibility Audit regarding accessibility in important church areas	This gave the members greater understanding of what was required
12. 30.03.17.	Consultation with chairman of the Titchfield Village Trust to inform him of the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan	Trust fully informed of specific issues that involved the legality of the Plan.
13. 10.04.17.	Meeting with councillors. Questionnaire circulated to young people regarding play equipment and public open spaces	Councillors up-dated on the progress of the NP and to receive any guidance from them Children and young people from local school, youth club and scouts/cubs completed questionnaire to inform members of improvements required to play area. FBC will shortly be providing new play equipment in Barry's Meadow. This was a community aspiration
14. 8.04.17	Consultation with garden centre manager	Development of Abbey entrance for the future was discussed and incorporated in Plan under community aspiration HT2
16. 23.06.17	Newspaper interview with Southampton Echo	Up-date provided on progress
17. 02.07.17	Open Meeting	Residents informed of progress. Forum members available to answer questions. Traffic questionnaire available for completion Appendix 8
18. Sept 2017 - May 2018	Shop window displays in High Street and Health Day	These showed the vision for Titchfield had been formed from residents' comments and the work of sub-groups. The NP map was clearly shown with the designated area marked. The window generated much

		discussion and interest. Appendix 5. A <u>fun</u> health day organised with demonstrations for healthy lifestyle as well as providing information on both health and the Neighbourhood Plan
19. From autumn 2016	Bi-monthly newsletters to over 700 via e mails	Residents kept up to date on current progress Appendix 10
20. 07.01.18	Open meeting on housing development (over 90 attended).	Questionnaire on development of the area plus individual discussion - Appendix 7. The outcome was used to inform the work of the housing sub-group as well as AECOM when producing their Housing Needs Assessment - Item 6 for policies as well as policy H4. Discussion also took place on proposed 'Posbrook' development and flyer provided for residents by member of the public containing advice on how to object to planning application..
21. 15.02.18	AGM	Public invited to hear of progress
22. 13.02.18	Meeting FBC	To inform and question
23. 18.02.18	Meeting residents of Warsash	Advice given of details of having a NP and to promote the work of the Forum
24. 03.04.18	Discussion with Locality regarding the way forward	Questions by Forum on housing needs addressed
25. 23.04.18	Promotion Event in the Barn	Public invited to see display of proposed village emblem following public consultation and generally to promote NP, Community Aspiration HT51
26. 12.05.18	Church Fete	Gazebo at the fete highlighting the work of the Forum and progress made. Promotion inside the church on the proposed emblem community aspiration HT51
27. 30.05.18	FBC meeting	Forum to update and to take questions
28. 05.05.18	Community Centre Event	To promote organisations and groups within the village and provide information from the different sub-groups
29. 11.05.18	CAT (Community Action Team).	Forum represented to highlight the progress of the NP, to be available to answer questions and to be sure we were working alongside the draft local plan
30. 07.07.18	Powerpoint presentation to over 40 members of Titchfield Village Trust	Information provided on the latest progress on the plan which was followed by question and answer session
31. 17.07.18	Fareham Council Meeting	Available at to answer questions and provide additional information if required

32. 30.07, 01.08, 10.08, 25.08.18	Public Open Meetings in the Parish Rooms and in a gazebo on the village green to provide information and answer any queries of the NP	See Comments Folder 2 for responses
33. 20.09.18	FBC meeting to discuss comments on NP following public consultation plus to agree approximate dates for submission of the Plan	Identified FBCs responses and discussed these fully with them. Action all comments accepted. Community Aspirations edited and highlighted separately.

The results of questionnaires, post-it notes, written and verbal comments were published on the website, in the newsletters and in the Parish Magazine. The comments are also showed in Comments 1 - 4 at the end of this document with any action or no action by the Forum Executive highlighted. Comments can be summarised as the majority dealt with traffic problems and resulting pedestrian safety. These have been included, as noted above, in community aspirations. Any relating to planning and housing development have been considered and put as policy where appropriate. General or personal comments not relating to the Neighbourhood Plan have received no action as shown above and in the folders.

Who was consulted

- List as above
- Forum members
- Residents of Neighbourhood Plan
- Children from local primary school
- Local community and village groups
- Local charities
- Local churches
- Local business
- Local professions - doctors, chemist
- Local schools, youth club and groups using community centre
- Titchfield Village Trust
- Local councillors, both borough and county council
- FBC Planning Department
- HCC Footpath Advisor
- Schools Advisor (Walking to School)
- AECOM
- Locality
- Planning Consultant
- Locality Health Check Advisors
- Strategic Environment Agency
- Historic England
- FBC Conservation Officer
- Critical Readers



In order to try to reach as many residents as possible from all age and socio-economic groups, in addition to the above the following took place:

- A leaflet drop to all houses in the village five times using an easy to read and understand flyer
- Part of a 20 minute local tv programme of Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum and Plan
- Two newspaper interviews
- Flyers and posters displayed in local shops
- Open Days with large banner to publicise events
- A fun health day

Consultation on the neighbourhood area

As part of the application for the neighbourhood boundary area to be designated by Fareham Borough Council the residents were first consulted for their comments.

Developing of vision objectives:

‘to make Titchfield a place to go to rather than go through’

‘to make Titchfield a better place to live, work and play’

Consulting on issues and options

There have been 4 surveys - general, housing, public open spaces, traffic. A voting form was used for the residents to vote on the housing policy. Post-it notes were used to gather comments. Again, the website has been valuable in providing comment on a variety of issues. Results published on website, newsletter and Parish Magazine.

Any issues and concerns raised during general consultation

Traffic and parking was a major concern including accessibility, road crossing and speed of traffic. Traffic - see Neighbourhood Plan section ‘Getting Around’. As a result of the consultation, a working party of the forum met regularly to identify problems and propose a number of solutions to traffic problems.

Pedestrian accessibility - Verbal comments and observation on lack of accessibility around the village resulted in an accessibility audit taking place and relevant groups were consulted - GP surgery, the church, the school and parents on improvements that could be made especially for those with a disability, those with impaired mobility and parents with young children. Later it was pointed out by a resident that there appeared to be no access for the disabled at the new country park. Communication with FBC resulted in this being addressed.

Housing - From the housing survey it was noted that the residents wanted more low-cost housing with access to village amenities. As a result of this, the housing working group were set up; available sites in the village assessed, reports written and consultation with Fareham Borough Council draft local plan initiated. Residents also wanted the Forum to object to proposed new housing development that went against the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Environment - At the Open meetings there was a strong interest of residents for an improved environment and play facilities for the future. Two groups were set up to investigate replacing out-date play equipment; improving canal path; access to the beach; auditing of footpaths and possibility of a creating cycle route. In addition, controls on parking

for new homes and environmentally friendly buildings were suggested. From meetings with parents and the HCC representative it was apparent that there should be more opportunities for children to walk to school.

Presentation - To enhance the presentation of the village and to preserve the historic nature of the village, a working party was set up. One of the outcprmes of this group was that the village took part in Britain in Bloom competition. Other future plans are to look at street signage in the village; to develop further the emblem to signify the village history; to investigate the possibility of improving the Titchfield Abbey entrance and to record the history of some of the historic houses.

Pre-submission Consultation

Timetable

Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum has complied with the following publicity requirements as required by Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General Regulations 2012, Regulation 14 (a)(4). The Forum has publicised the Plan proposal to the general public who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area.

The dates for the pre-submission consultation are as follows:

20th July 2018 to 10th September 2018 (8 weeks)

Pre-submission of consultation of publicity

On page 11 is page one of the flyer for the pre-submission consultation period which was delivered to every house and business in the Boundary Plan area. This flyer was colourful and had pictures for illustration. Posters were produced and displayed in shop and house windows; the information put on the website; in the newsletter and in the Parish Magazine. The results were similarly promoted.

1500 flyers were delivered to every house and business in the Neighbourhood Plan area, flyers were also left at strategic points in the village such as local pubs, the GP surgery and shops, posters were placed in shop and house windows. The Plan was available as noted on the flyer on the next page. E mails were sent to all village groups and individuals on current e mail list as well as information on our website www.Titchfieldmatters.org.uk

Different members of the Forum attended the different venues and consultation days and were given the details below as guidelines:

Neighbourhood Plan Consultation weeks

Notes for Guidance of volunteers

The Neighbourhood Plan consultation periods are as shown in our leaflet. Each two-hour period had at least one volunteer in attendance from the Forum. The purpose of the consultation was to answer questions if possible, but also to record any contributions from visitors. The important points are:

1. The draft plan is only a draft and may be modified after listening to residents' views

2. Only people who live within the Plan area are entitled to vote in the referendum
3. Record the comments and the name of the person making the comments. Ask permission to record the name. If the person wishes to remain anonymous, mark it anon
4. Please don't leave the comments at the venue. Take them away with you and deliver them to the Chair of the Forum.

Public Consultation - Public consultation of the NP has been completed. The following groups, in addition to the Planning Department of FBC, were contacted via e mail.

_planningconsultations@hants.gov.uk; enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk

office@stpetertitchfield.org.uk; bobrule4@gmail.com (chapel)

earlstrust@yahoo.co.uk; Martin.Small@HistoricEngland.org.uk

laura.lax@environment-agency.gov.uk; planningpolicy@fareham.gov.uk

enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk

Relevant comments from these groups have been added to the NP.

TITCHFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



This is your chance to look at the Plan and tell us what you think?

You can see the Plan:

- on our website www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk
- at the following Open Meetings:

Parish Rooms	Fri. 27.07.2018.	9.30 am- 11.30 am
On village green	Wed. 01.08. 2018.	10 am - 12 noon
On village green	Fri. 10.08.2018.	2.00 pm - 4 00 pm
On village green	Sat. 25.08.2018.	9.30 am- 11.30 am
Titchfield Festival Theatre <i>(by kind permission of the Theatre)</i>	Tues. 04.09.2018.	7 pm - 9 pm

You can comment:

- ✓ on our website www.titchfieldmatters.org.uk
- ✓ or leave a note in the box in Daisey B's
- ✓ or talk to someone at an open meeting

WE MUST HAVE YOUR COMMENTS BY

10th September 2018

Summary of the main issues and concerns raised through the consultation process:

Comment	Action
1. Typographical errors and quality of photographs	rectified
2. Traffic & parking	a number of issues were raised by residents regarding traffic such as 20 mph speed limit, safe crossing points etc. explanation was given to residents how these could not be part of the statutory part of the NP but would be included as community aspirations in consultation with HCC
3. Housing Needs Assessment	Lack of clarity in the Plan caused confusion over the number of houses that would need to be built over the Plan period. This was fully explained on the web page and at the open meeting. The Plan has been clarified
4. Fareham Borough Council comments	Specific comments received and amendments to the Plan made relating to links with NPPF and clear policy writing
5. Historic England	Changes and additions to the wording to the Historic Titchfield policies - now made
6. Variety of non-specific topics	Changes made

The Revised Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan

In addition to comments from residents, comments were received from Fareham Borough Council and Historic England. Guidelines were also received from The Environment Agency and Natural England. All the relevant information has now been incorporated into the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan for submission to Fareham Borough Council who will pass it to the relevant examiner.

Ann Wheal
Chair
Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum
5.11.18.

Open Meeting Report 30.10.2016

Questions: Where could new housing be placed in the NP area?

What type of housing do we need?"

The written comments are recorded exactly as they were written. The Forum is grateful for the 2 hours discussion on this area of the Plan.

"for the village to thrive and business to continue, it needs a small amount of growth but too much would change the very nature of this beautiful and historic place. Any development behind Bellfield needs to be near the lane. The lower end should be free of housing to avoid impact on the ecology of the canal and nature reserve" **Action - appeal against Foreman Homes planning application forwarded by the Forum**

"if there is to be affordable housing please make it a sensible amount and in keeping with the rest of the village please" **Action policy H2, H3, H4**

"Try brownfield sites first" **Action in accordance with Fareham Local Plan**

"Affordable housing for young families and singles" **Action policy H2**

"Consider demolition of tired/outdated former LTA centre (community centre and using land value to purchase built village hall facilities, first time buyer dwellings provided on land released. Village centre housing reduces the need for vehicle access to shops, pubs etc" **no action**

"Development in centre of village and immediate roads off centre would exacerbate existing access and parking problems. Development notes do not ensure provision of adequate parking. Need more social housing, not more landlord investment opportunities" **Action Policy H2**

"Can we ensure allotments remain supported in the village" **Action Policy OS1**

"Put the market hall back in the middle of the Square" **No action**

"impressive plans, hope some are successful. The needs of families and the young so these plans go a long way to help them" **No action**

"Housing is important, but unless consideration is given to improvement in traffic flow on M27 the whole area will grind to a halt" **No action**

"Brownfield sites to be used" **Action in accordance with Fareham Local Plan**

"More housing needs more facilities, ie doctors, shops, parking etc. **No Action**

"the following were individual identification for areas of development "top of St Margaret's Lane including gypsy site, tanneries" **Action considered by site assessment group**

Although this meeting was primarily for comments on housing people did bring a number of issues regarding presentation of the village and roads and parking. The comments that required action are as follows:

“We need an entry sign ‘Welcome to Historic Titchfield, Home of Kings, Queen’s and Historic Shakespeare” **Action Community Aspiration HT51**

“No cyclists or dogs on footpath by canal, walkers only - signs” **Action, p.40 of NP consultation with the National Cycling Network.**

“Coach Hill, pedestrian crossing needed” **Action Community Aspiration T1**

“Flow controls Bridge Street, good idea. Coach Hill pedestrian crossing to enhance the safe movement of traffic on Southampton Hill. **Action Community Aspiration T3**

“Coach Hill needs traffic calming of some description. Traffic study should be done from 8am. Difficult for children to cross the road. 20mph should start at the top of Coach Hill.” **Action Community Aspiration T4**

“20 mph inside whole village” **Action Community Aspiration T4**

“pedestrian crossing in the Square” **Community Aspiration T2**



**Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan - Public Consultation 20.07.18 to 10.09.18 -
Comments**

plus other comments and website posts

This document contains comments from the 6 public meetings held as part of the public consultation process. It also contains copies of e mails and letters put through the letterbox or sent via e mail. A wide example of the posts put on the website are also included though there are still more for anyone to see.

Following the public consultation, we received comments from Fareham Borough Council and Historic England relating to the Plan and these have been incorporated therein. The Environment Agency and Natural England sent their standard guidelines but the 2 churches, Hampshire County Council, The Earl of Southampton Trust and Homes England did not respond.

Parish Rooms 27.07.18

38 people attended this session and asked questions and/or read the Plan. The following are the only written comments:

1. Serious concerns regarding **cycle routes**. All routes suggested are extremely dangerous - not the fault of the NP but the plan of the village. Both Posbrook Lane and Mill Lane, although legally cycles can ride on these roads I would not recommend it especially for children going to school. **Action Policy GA2 cycle links, Community Aspiration T5**

Public footpaths - legally do not permit cyclists but should be allowed for young children I seem to remember the cycle wheel size used to control who was permitted but now what is the law to ride on public footpaths? **No Action**

2. I approve of everything the village Plan is trying to achieve **No Action**
3. Re Barry's Meadow car park - after surgery hours the car park is under-utilized: from 6.30 in the evening it is empty especially over night. Also at weekends. If the parking

times were altered it would have a beneficial effect on the Square parking. **Action Community Aspiration PO4**

4. Traffic lights required in South Street **No Action**
5. We are very interested in the Neighbourhood Plan and would like to receive the **newsletter No Action**
6. P34 the needs of pedestrians; p34 Coach Hill - crossing point from N to S not a good idea as they will need a crossback, better to a) remove pavement on S side, widen pavement on N side, b) crossing still needed at roundabout; p 35 how about removing the pavements on both sides of Church Street making the road a pedestrianised area and also clearly marking where residents should be parked; p36 larger buses create problems; p 36 trains from Swanwick go to Soton, Portsmouth, Brighton, London and Gatwick. Add Brighton to line from Fareham; Need RADAR key access to the canal path; p38 refer to Public Rights of Way, not footpaths. Are there any bridleways? P40 (i) map needs a key (ii) what connecting cycle routes are necessary? State clearly. P46 open space - corner of Frog Lane and South Street **Action Community Aspiration PO1, Community Aspiration P6**
7. Index needs updating **Action Index updated**

Village Green 1.08.18

Twenty people attended this session and asked questions. The following written comments were as follows

1. I was surprised no specific sites were designated. Other places without Neighbourhood and other plans are vulnerable for 'free for all' development. We do not want this for Titchfield. **No action**
2. I am concerned about housing as in Porchester we had no plan and now have 250 houses planned **No Action**
3. Very comprehensive document encompasses values and strategic plans which are important to a happy life within the village. **No Action**

Village Green 10/08/18.

It was raining very hard. 5 members of the public came under the gazebo

I like the idea of a Neighbourhood Plan because it gives the Titchfield residents the opportunity of having their say. **No Action**

I am against the formal proposals of Foreman Homes. **Action Objective Policy H1 and H2 Policy H3**

I certainly support all key areas of the Plan. **No Action**

Wonderful idea, has our full support. **No Action**

Village Green Saturday 25th August

17 people made no written comment but wanted information regarding the Forum and Plan

The following comments were written. 32 people attended

Make West Street one way. **No Action**

Square limited for short stay shopping parking. **Action Community Aspiration T7**

Permit to residents one car one space. **No Action**

Neighbourhood Plan might work. **No Action**

My concern over Posbrook development is traffic going through. Especially Bellfield and Coach Hill also we have bats flying around. **No Action**

Have you considered the two fields either side of St Margaret's Lane at the A27 junction for Housing ? It seems to me that development of these sites would not impact on traffic through the village. Also it would be possible to make a footpath from the area of the Arts theatre to the village via Barry's Meadow (one already exists but is overgrown) **Action - see sites assessment**

I welcome the publication of the Neighbourhood Plan and support its adoption **No action**

I support the content of the plan and in particular wish to see the issues of traffic, speeding and parking addressed, particularly in South Street **No action**

I fully support the Plan and strongly object to any development on Posbrook Lane **No Action**

I support the Neighbourhood Plan **No Action**

I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan **No Action**

I object to this Plan. **No Action**

This Plan is comprehensive and measured. We live in the 21st Century and should be planning for the next generations who need housing and green spaces. The older generation need to compromise not fossilise **Action Policy H2, Policy H4, Policy BE3, OS1**

We accept the Neighbourhood Plan **No Action**

Approve of new housing if it meets needs 1,2 bedroom for social housing **Action Policy H3**

Parallel parking on sides of square, so we have visibility **No action**

I feel having the Forum and the Trust working separately is counter-productive. Please could both committees meet and coordinate—— each has valuable views and surely could work together **Action Trust continually informed of development of the Plan**

Consultation meeting on the Neighbourhood Draft Plan 4.9.2018

The Chair opened the meeting with a brief introduction on the purpose of the meeting.

She informed residents that the comments made by them have to be published and considered for changes to the Plan.

Colin Wilton Smith, Vice Chair, read out a statement regarding Housing Need as this had been one of the main questions raised at consultations.

One resident made the following comment

He wished to commend those who had worked on the Neighbourhood Plan. He praised the readability of the plan and that the group had not just used planning vocabulary.

He also recognised the effort this had involved as the group had no administration help from a Village group, or a PCC which has helped numerous other areas. **No action**

There being no other comments the Chair closed the meeting . Two new residents who arrived late were informed of what a Neighbourhood Plan consisted of by Colin Wilton Smith after the meeting.

Comments through letterbox

Hi firstly I must congratulate you on putting this together, I know how time consuming this sort of project is.

Comments (helpful, not meant to be critical)

Under Medieval Plan - just checking as I am not sure where your info has come from, but

Page 11 – no mention of the Community Cinema www.titchfieldmoviola.com **Action - information inserted in Plan**

Page 45 – use of solar panels – I have had an informal talk with FBC about putting solar panels onto the rear of Titchfield properties and I think he would look favourably on an application to do this. I think you could add a sentence that says something along those lines. **No action**

- Chapter 12 13.1 there is a typo in the Bold section **Action changed**

Traffic Calming – I think we are missing an opportunity to develop the square to avoid it being a rat run for speeding motorists. I sent suggestions in at the beginning with images of historic squares across the country where they have changed the road surface to visually delineate the space and it has had an impact on road users. Perhaps my suggestions got lost in the mass of suggestions. **Action Community Aspiration T7**

Lastly I wonder if the images you have included have been reduced in pixel size to accommodate the website, but they look quite poor. I am surprised that they are not more professional. **Action revised photographs included**

I will certainly be supporting the plan and will encourage others to do so

I notice today that the Posbrooke Appeal is happening the week beginning November 5th – will the plan referendum happen before then? **Action advice given on date**

Response: Your letter was exactly the sort of comments we had hoped to receive. I will reply as follows:

Medieval Plan – The chair of the Historic Titchfield group initially produced the section. However, due to ill health the group was unable to continue. I took on the with support from History Society. I then sent it to Historic England and they needed a more comprehensive section which again I produced.

P11 – I will add – it didn't come up on any list

P45 – great news, will do

Chapter 12 – will change

Traffic Calming – Hampshire would not consider changing the road surface – costs! So unless you have any money 'sloshing around' that won't happen. However, we are discussing another idea and that is to put the parked cars in the middle of the Square so cars have to slow down to go through. It will also free up the whole visual appearance of the area and slow traffic as well. A space can be left within the parked cars for the disabled or buggy users to stop half-way across the Square.

Photos – I too was concerned about the quality of some of the photographs. We don't have a very good camera. The trouble is I got someone to take a couple of pics for me but they didn't take them to way we wanted them – eg large blank space at front. This means it is more work for Peter to do to edit each pic – I will think on that.

Posbrook Appeal – As a Neighbourhood Forum, we have been granted leave to be an integral part of the appeal process and to make representation. We must submit our documentation by this Friday. Apparently the farther down the line to completion the Plan is the more influence it will have. By November we expect to be having the referendum but as local authorities take between 4 – 6 weeks to organise after the inspector has seen the Plan we are not exactly sure of timings.

Thank you for your support. So glad you will encourage others to vote for the Plan too.

I wonder whether you would be willing for your letter to be posted on the website? Hope so. It is just the sort of document we need instead of some of the silly ones we have had so far. From today, we are not accepting any comments that do not relate directly to the Plan.

Letter August 2018

I do not support the proposal to increase the 20 mph restriction to other roads in our village for the following reasons: Action **Community Aspiration T4**

- 20 mph is too slow for roads such as Coach Hill, which is wide and quite suitable for the existing 30mph limit - potentially leading to frustration, impatience and dangerous overtaking
- It takes away the whole point of the 20mph zone we have through the narrowest and oldest conservation parts of the village
- As it is unlikely to be policed it serves as an additional encouragement not to observe the speed limit, leading to disobedience of speed restrictions in other locations
- It is expensive to implement, and in this time of huge cuts to our services this should not be considered a priority

- The existing 20mph zone is largely ignored - not only by private motorists but by drivers of eg buses, taxis, delivery vehicles and council vehicles (dustcarts routinely speed through the Square) - so it seems totally pointless to extend it. Far better to police what we have and 'condition' motorists to drive at a safe speed and according to the environment

Action Colin Wilton-Smith the Chair of the Housing Group has responded to the letter below on the following page.



Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan Comments

- Existing urban area boundary
- - - Proposed urban area boundary
- Additional area to be considered for inclusion in the urban area boundary

Having seen the proposal to include more of Southampton Hill within the Urban Area Boundary, I would ask that the remainder of the road, up to its junction with A27, is also included. Like the rest of the road, it is *“also in keeping with the village character, and the view along the street leading to and from the village centre”*. (Titchfield neighbourhood plan page 16)

It also seems odd that the Old Lodge itself is part of the area, but its garden is excluded.

I would like the entire road to be included in the urban area, but if this is not possible please consider including the houses and land up to the footpath (marked - - - on the above map) that goes from the Community Centre car park passing alongside the Primary School - .

Thank you

Karen Rizzi, 25 Southampton Hill

Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum



A statutory body guiding the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan

Colin Wilton-Smith, 2 Place House Cottages, Mill Lane, Titchfield, Hants, PO15 5RA

**Karen Rizzi
25 Southampton Hill
Titchfield
Hants**

Dear Karen

RE: TITCHFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMENTS

I refer to your comments regarding the Urban Area Boundary delivered by hand to Ann Wheal.

I have some sympathy with your views as the Urban Area Boundary was debated at some length and our initial views coincided to a large extent with yours, as our original proposal was to extend the Urban Area Boundary up to approximately the junction of Southampton Hill and the A27.

We submitted our initial suggestions to Fareham Borough Council for their views and we received an unfavourable response, mainly because they were concerned that by including the properties with larger garden areas at the top end of Southampton Hill, there was a possibility of back-land development taking place in the future.

We therefore sought the views of the Planning Consultant who was advising the Forum at the time and following our Consultation with him, and also taking into account the views of the Housing Group of the Forum, the boundary was revised to the current proposal.

We have not received at the present time, an indication of support for the current proposals from Fareham Council, although they have raised no objection to-date.

Your comments regarding the boundary cutting through the garden of 'Old Lodge' does seem rather illogical, this goes back to when the Urban Boundary was first created, and I believe again, it is an attempt by the Council to limit the possibility of back-land development.

E mail from resident

Here are my comments on the Neighbourhood Plan document and in particular section **13.8 The Historic Houses Project**

I would like to make a technical point about section '13.8 The Historic Houses Project' of the draft document.

From the text, I believe, it implies that the Historic Houses Project is part of the Forum's work in the village.

The Historic Houses Project started as an adhoc group that recognised the obvious common interests it had with The Titchfield History Society. The project was subsequently adopted by THS as their own.

To correct any misunderstanding I think the sentence in 13.8, '*Once research is complete, the aim is to identify a small number of locally important sites and, in discussion with FBC conservation staff, consider a commemoration plaque.*' should be changed to '*Once research is complete, **the Titchfield History Society's** aim is to identify a small number of locally important sites and, in discussion with FBC conservation staff, consider a commemoration plaque.*'

I appreciate that this section of the Draft Plan is extolling the virtues of the village by listing its great community spirit and diversity, but would not want readers to gain the impression that the 'Historic Houses' was a Forum project.

This would also require the removal of Objective HT.3 which states... "*To produce a written record for each historic property in the conservation areas*'

This wrongly claims the Historic Houses Project as being run by the Titchfield Forum.

Action : RESPONSE to above e mail:

Thank you for your comments regarding the above.

The situation regarding the Historic Titchfield section of the Plan is concerned is that the chair of this section of the Forum unfortunately resigned due to ill health so was unable to complete the work so I completed the section with help from others.

As you will see, I am copying others into this e mail. C, because he was involved in writing the piece of the Historic Houses Project and A because she read the NP and did not make any comments.

I am happy to make the changes you suggest as long as the other two people are happy for this to happen. You may like to contact them direct on this.

NB - others were happy so changes made



Historic England

Comments Folder 3

Ms Ann Wheal

Chair, Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum

Our ref: HD/P5230/

Your ref:

Telephone: 01483 252040

Fax:

5th September 2018

Dear Ms Wheal,

Draft Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2034

Thank you for your e-mail of 20th July advising Historic England of the consultation on your Neighbourhood Plan. We are pleased to make the following general and detailed comments in line with our remit for the historic environment.

The nature of the locally-led neighbourhood plan process is that the community itself should determine its own agenda based on the issues about which it is concerned. At the same time, as a national organisation able increasingly to draw upon our experiences of neighbourhood planning exercises across the country, our input can help communities reflect upon the special (heritage) qualities which define their area to best achieve aims and objectives for the historic environment. To this end information on our website might be of assistance – the appendix to this letter contains links to this website and to a range of potentially useful other websites.

We welcome the statement in paragraph 1.6 that “*The objective of the Plan is to respect and preserve the history of the area for future generations whilst allowing it*

to continue to develop and grow". However, we prefer "conserve" rather than "preserve" as terminology more consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and as recognising that change can take place that maintains or even enhances the significance and special interest of heritage assets. **Action changed**

We welcome Chapter 2, the first three paragraphs of Chapter 3 and Appendix 18 on the history of the parish. However, as Chapter 3 is entitled "Titchfield Today", it would seem to us more appropriate to have the second paragraph and perhaps the first sentence of the third paragraph of Chapter 3, which describe the historical development of Titchfield, in Chapter 2. **Action changed**

We welcome the reference to sustaining a sense of heritage as one of the "themes" of the "clear vision" for Titchfield. However, we are not clear what the vision actually is. We suggest that the vision should set out how the local community would like Titchfield to be in 2034 – paragraph 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "*Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area*". We would hope that that vision would include something like "*a conserved, enhanced, appreciated and valued historic environment*". **Action changed**

- 2 -

The process of determining whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Plan is needed is called "screening". The final paragraph on page 19 should therefore refer to the screening opinion having been received from Fareham Borough Council rather than the SEA. **Action: changed**

Sub-section 7.2 will need to be revised to accord with the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018). **Action Plan written in accordance with NPPF 2012**

We welcome the identification of "*its important historic environment, which includes three of Fareham's six Scheduled Ancient Monuments*" as one of the "*key factors shaping future development in Titchfield*" in sub-section 7.4.

We are aware that the Key Policies of the adopted Fareham Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy unfortunately do not include a policy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. However, all the policies in the Core Strategy should or could be considered as strategic policies with which the Neighbourhood Plan be in general conformity. We therefore consider that sub-section 7.4 should include a reference to Policy CS17 of the Local Plan Part 1. **Action Policy HT1**

We welcome the first and second paragraphs of sub-section 9.1 and Map 6. However, these paragraphs seem a little out of place to us in Chapter 9 and we think that they would be better in Chapter 2 or Chapter **Action - various changes to mapping**

Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Plans to “*contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals*”. **Action Policies re-written more clearly**

However, Policy UAB.1 is a statement of fact rather than a planning policy in that it does not provide any guidance to a decision maker on how they should react to a development proposal. Policy H.2 requires housing sites to provide affordable housing “where appropriate”. However, neither the policy nor the supporting text make it clear when it would be appropriate for new housing sites to provide affordable housing, so we consider that it too is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. **Agreed and changed**

We are not entirely clear whether the Plan is seeking to provide for a particular number of houses. We understand that the identified residual housing need in the parish is 153 dwellings, and sub-section 9.6 indicates that windfall development within the Urban Area Boundary will meet 10% of the identified need, which suggests that it is anticipated that some 15 or so dwellings will be provided through windfall development during the Plan period. **Action to avoid confusion the wording to the housing needs section has been amended**

In fact, Policy H.1 does not specify a minimum or maximum figure, so perhaps this is a moot point, and any development proposals within the UAB should conform with other relevant policies of the development plan, such as HT.1 and HT.2 of this Plan, CS17 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DSP5 of the Local Plan Part 2. However, we suggest that Policy H.1 should be reworded to provide clearer guidance in accordance with the requirement of paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework e.g.

“Planning permission will be granted for small-scale infill development (up to ten residential units per development) within the revised Titchfield Urban Area Boundary shown on Map 3. Page 5, provided that they comply with other policies of the development plan, including those of this Plan”.

Action changed and amended

We welcome Policy H.4, which we consider to be consistent with paragraph 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework:

Plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics. Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.

However, we are not clear if there is an “*understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics*” – there is no mention of any Village Design Statement or character assessment of the parish or Titchfield village in sub-section 9.8 or in the Appendices. **Action No decision has been reached on this but it is under consideration for the future**

We are aware of the Titchfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy and the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area Character Assessment, and suggest that both Policy H.4 and sub-section 9.8 should include references to these. However, even between them, they do not cover the whole of the Plan area. **Action Done**

We consider that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. We believe that characterisation studies can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change.

The preparation of a Village Design Statement or Character Assessment would be a very useful addition to the evidence base for the Plan and a potential community project. The appendix to this letter contains links to characterisation toolkits and we would be pleased to advise further. **Action See above**

We welcome the chapter on Historic Titchfield, although presumably it should be Chapter 13. The description of heritage assets in the parish is very detailed and there is a degree of overlap with references to the historic environment elsewhere in the Plan. Whilst we welcome the emphasis given to the historic environment of the parish and its recognition throughout the Plan, we do feel that the Plan would benefit from a rationalisation of those references. We suggest that the context for the Plan in Chapter 2 concentrates on the historical development of Titchfield and Chapter 12 (13) focuses on the current position as this is most relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan. **Action typo changed**

The National Heritage List for England could also be cited as part of the supporting evidence for Historic Titchfield. **Action agreed**

We welcome and support Policies HT.1 and HT.2 in principle, but consider that both would benefit from rewording as follows:

Policy HT.1

Development proposals that fail to conserve or enhance the historic environment of the parish and the heritage assets therein, particularly the special interest, character and appearance of the Titchfield Conservation Area and the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area, and the significance of the scheduled monument of Titchfield Abbey and of the listed buildings within the parish, will not be permitted except where that harm cannot be avoided and there is clear and convincing justification for that harm in the form of overriding public benefits from the development proposals that could not be delivered in any other way.

Policy HT.2

Due to the historical importance of the area, any development proposals on sites within the conservation areas will not be permitted unless an archaeological assessment has been undertaken, and, if merited, further investigation.

Action both changes made

Is there a list of locally-important buildings and features ? Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to

creating a sense of place and local identity. If not, then the preparation of such a list would be another excellent community project to further add to the evidence base for the Plan. The appendix to this letter contains a link to our advice on local listing and we would again be pleased to advise further.

National Planning Practice Guidance states “... *where it is relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. ... In addition, and where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to*

include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions”.

Have the Hampshire Historic Environment Record and Hampshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment been consulted, the former for non-scheduled archaeological sites, some of which may be of national importance ? National Planning Practice Guidance notes that “*The local Historic environment record and any local list will be important sources of information on non-designated heritage assets*”.

Action - comments included

Titchfield Abbey and fishponds - "stables" are on the 2017 Historic England Heritage at Risk Register. However, the Register does not include Grade II listed secular buildings outside London. Has a survey of the condition of Grade II buildings in the Plan area been undertaken ? If not, this could be another project to add to the evidence base for the Plan. **No action**

Has there been any or is there any ongoing other loss of character, particularly in the Conservation Areas, e.g. through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive streetworks etc that affect local character ?

Finally, the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan offers the opportunity to harness a community's interest in the historic environment by getting the community to help add to the evidence base perhaps by, as noted in our comments above, a character assessment or Village Design Statement, the preparation of a local list of locally important buildings and features or a survey of Grade II listed buildings to see if any are at risk from neglect, decay or other threats. **Action comments included in Plan**

We hope you find these comments helpful. Should you wish to discuss any points within this letter, or if there are particular issues with the historic environment in Titchfield, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you again for consulting Historic England.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Martin Small". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly informal style.

Martin Small

Principal Adviser, Historic Environment Planning

(Bucks, Oxon, Berks, Hampshire, IoW, South Downs National Park and Chichester)

E-mail: martin.small@historicengland.org.uk

Comments Folder 4

Fareham Borough Council provided comments (Part A shown below) and a detailed assessment of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. **Action** - all points were considered and adjustments/changes made with the exception of suggestion of putting Community Aspirations at back of Plan. These have been inserted after policies but in different colour boxes which makes it easy for identification as non-planning issues.

Part A – Local Planning Authority comments in relation to the ‘basic conditions’

1.1 An independent examiner will assess the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan against the ‘basic conditions’, which are:

1. Whether the neighbourhood plan has regard to national planning policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
2. Whether the neighbourhood plan contributes to achieving sustainable development.
3. Whether the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the Council’s development plan.
4. Whether the neighbourhood plan complies with EU and human rights obligations.

Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State

The Local Planning Authority is concerned that there appear to be some areas of potential conflict between the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
Policy Wording

1.2 The PPG sets out the requirements in relation to the wording of neighbourhood plan policies. In particular, the PPG states that policies:

“...should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence” (Paragraph 41, Ref ID: Ref ID 41-041-20140306).

1.3 There are a large number of policies that would benefit from further clarity to allow the decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence. This is discussed further in Part B of this response.

1.4 There are several policies in the plan that require supporting text to explain their intent. Where introductory text has been supplied in the chapters that contain policies in the plan, the link between the policies and the supporting text should be made more explicit. There are several instances where more relevant information should be provided in the introductory text to each chapter, which should be related more directly to policies. In addition, throughout the TNP there is frequently a lack of justification to underpin the approach taken by the policies in the plan. It is suggested that each policy is reviewed to ensure it has the necessary context and evidence to underpin its inclusion and approach.

1.5 The Local Planning Authority is concerned that there appear to be areas of potential conflict between the TNP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and PPG in relation to the wording of policies. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should: - 2 -

“develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development”.

1.6 In addition, the PPG sets out the requirements in relation to the wording of neighbourhood plan policies as set out in paragraph 1.2 of this response. The Local Planning Authority is concerned that currently the specific wording of some of the policies is inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF and PPG. In particular, the policies in the plan require added flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development and some of the policies require greater precision and detail to ensure they can be applied consistently and with confidence in the determination of planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area. The policy wording will be considered in detail through the independent examination process. Inflexible, imprecisely worded and unclear policies could potentially be subject to a recommendation for significant changes, or deletion, by the independent examiner. Part B of this report contains more specific comments in relation to this issue.

Evidence Base

1.7 Generally, policies contained within the TNP appear to be largely supported by the results of consultation events held by the Neighbourhood Forum. However, the PPG requires that the neighbourhood plan is supported by appropriate evidence. The Local Planning Authority is concerned that such evidence has not been presented at this stage. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority considers that it would be advisable for the Neighbourhood Forum to ensure that the Regulation 15 submission TNP is supported by additional information setting out the background and justification for the policies which have been included in the document.

Viability and Deliverability

1.8 The PPG states that a neighbourhood plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF also sets out the need to boost significantly the supply of housing, whilst Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires plans to be deliverable and viable. In addition, the PPG states that, *“what impact the infrastructure requirements may have on the viability of a proposal in a draft neighbourhood plan and therefore its delivery”.* (Paragraph 45, Ref ID: 41-045-20140306).

1.9 The Pre-submission TNP has the potential to place additional financial burdens on development, for example through Policies H.3 (Local Need), H.4 (Quality Design and Local Character), G.A.2 (Cycle Links) and E.1 (New Development) Such obligations should not constrain the supply of new housing by undermining the deliverability and viability of relevant proposals and therefore it is suggested that additional justification is provided by the Neighbourhood Forum to demonstrate that these obligations will not undermine the deliverability of new development.

Contributing to achievement of sustainable development

1.10 Paragraph 72 of the PPG (Ref ID 41-072-20140306) states that:

“A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that - 3 -

consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures). In order to demonstrate that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to sustainable development, sufficient and proportionate evidence should be presented on how the draft neighbourhood plan or Order guides development to sustainable solutions”.

1.11 There are some policies in the TNP which endeavour to support sustainable development such as seeking to provide a smaller mix of housing for specific groups. However, in trying to achieve sustainable development some of these policies may affect the viability and deliverability of new housing development. This is discussed in more detail in Part B of this report.

1.12 There is some information on how the TNP achieves sustainable development in the section on compliance with national policies. However, the basic conditions statement provided with the submission neighbourhood plan should demonstrate how each of the policies achieve sustainable development.

General conformity with the Council’s Development Plan

1.13 One of the ‘basic conditions’ is for the neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the Development Plan. The strategic policies are contained within the Adopted Local Plan (ALP) which includes the Local Plan Part 1 (LP1): Core Strategy and the Local Plan Part 2 (LP2): Development Sites and Allocations.

1.14 It is welcomed that a draft Basic Conditions Statement has been provided as a supporting document for the Pre-submission TNP consultation. It is noted that the statement does not provide information on whether the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the ALP. This information should be provided to support the Regulation 15 submission version of the neighbourhood plan.

1.15 There are some areas where there are potential conflicts with the strategic policies of the LP1 and LP2, which could be addressed through amended wording in the plan or further emphasis in the policies or supporting text. These concerns are set out in Part B of this report.

European obligations and human rights requirements

Strategic Environmental Assessment

1.16 One of the key elements of this basic condition relates to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), which is required where a Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have ‘significant environmental effects’. The Local Planning Authority has previously screened the Draft TNP and determined that an SEA in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 is not required. However, at the time the screening assessment was undertaken there was not a clear proposal to extend the settlement boundary for Titchfield. If this were to facilitate development that would trigger an assessment within the - 4 -

Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan area then the Council would need to re-visit the original screening opinion.

Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

1.17 The screening decision and report for the TNP confirms it is necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. The Appropriate Assessment for the TNP concludes that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European sites if the proposed approach to dealing with likely significant effects is followed. The proposed approach is set out in more detail in the Appropriate Assessment.

Human Rights Requirements

1.18 No detailed assessment appears to have been made in relation to human rights legislation (Human Rights Act 1998). It may be appropriate for the TNF to consider if an equalities impact assessment of the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan is appropriate to assess the positive and negative impacts on groups with protected characteristics. The Local Planning Authority can provide further advice in this regard.

Conclusion

1.19 The Council supports the neighbourhood planning process and in assisting the TNF in producing their neighbourhood plan. To that end, the LPA has a number of key concerns at this stage and has offered suggested amendments where possible when the Neighbourhood Plan falls short of the 'basic conditions'. The areas where the LPA considers the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan falls short are:

i i. Having regard to national policies and advice (particularly the requirements of the PPG).

ii ii. Ensuring the Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the Adopted Local Plan (ALP), i.e. the Development Plan which includes Development Plan (Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies) and does not undermine the strategic policies in the Development Plan. 1.20 Please note, in addition to the above (under category i), it is important to highlight that the Pre-submission Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan does not provide:

iii

iv ✦ Sufficient clarity to allow a decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications in the neighbourhood plan area.

v ✦ Sufficient flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development.

✦✦ ✦ ♣♣ □◆◆ ◆♣♣ er◆◆✦✦✦✦✦✦◆✦□■ □■□ ♣✦✦♣■♣♣ ◆□ ♣♣♣□●□◆ ◆◆□□□□◆ □□●✦♣□□ □♣□◆✦□♣○♣◆◆◆◆

vii ✦ The potential of some policy requirements to have a negative impact on viability and therefore the deliverability of housing.