

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
General comments	N/A	S Rossi	NATS (Safeguarding Team)	N/A	334717	7	Not Specified	Not Specified	No comments to make on the Pre-submission Local Plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Alan Douglas	N/A	N/A	199667	9	Not Specified	No	The Local Plan does not make allowance for individual and community allotment provision.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Site policies SS3.6, SS3.7, SS3.9, SS3.10 and SS3.11 allow for the inclusion of open space within the development, which includes the provision of allotments, as suitable depending on local needs.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Planning Team Marine Management Organisation	Planning Team Marine Management Organisation	N/A	654468	5	Not Specified	Not Specified	No comment on the document as the geographical area it covers does not include any area of the sea or tidal river.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Design Council CABE	Design Council CABE	N/A	86234	8	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Nigel Smith	N/A	N/A	784451	125	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr and Mrs J and T Till	N/A	N/A	121364	130	Yes	No	The Local Plan is unsound in that it has not adopted the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative, and is insufficiently flexible. The proposal to allocate new housing in a small number of large allocations limits housing choice. It does not achieve the National Planning Policy Framework objective of "Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes". The Local Plan should offer the opportunity for a mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups in the community. A larger number of smaller sites should be provided.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal and site assessment processes. The strategy is based on a large number of sites included Brownfield sites within settlements of ranging size, to both small (100 units) and large scale Greenfield allocations (over 3,000) in order to provide a variety of housing over the plan period. The Plan's draft housing mix policy ensures that a variety of homes are provided on such sites to meet local needs.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Ginny Hall	Mobile Operators Association	N/A	669103	196	Yes	No	Telecommunications policy should be included in the Local Plan. This will ensure that the Local Plan is consistent with paragraph 43 of the NPPF.	Suggested alternative policy and supporting text. See representation for wording.	A specific policy in not considered necessary. The Local Plan should be read as whole and policies CN5 (Infrastructure) and EM10 (Delivering high quality development) are relevant	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Peter Dugmore	N/A	N/A	784646	207	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Joan Neve	N/A	N/A	85894	688	No	Not Specified	We have battled ever since I have come to live in Oakley to maintain the Gap between Oakley and Basingstoke. We have attended meetings for Village Plans and Strategies. All to have been disregarded. Your plan would totally decimate Worting as an area, it would no longer exist. The only plan that could work in my view would be to have the proposed park on Manydown, giving all residents easy access to it and reinforcing the boundary between Oakley and Basingstoke, and retaining some of Worting Areas identity. I am totally opposed to mor housing along the Pack Lane area do not think that any infrastructure could cope with the increase of traffic etc.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Manydown has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. The spatial strategy proposed in the Local Plan seeks to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision over the whole of the plan period. See responses to SS3.9 for further details.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Alistair Craig	N/A	N/A	173028	388	No	No	TA / IDP The TA contains inconsistencies with regards to Manydown and site references. Suggested junction improvements have not been worked up / costed in the IDP. The costs associated with upgrading the A339/Roman Road, the A340/Roman Way, Manydown Link Road/ A340 and A339 junctions are significantly understated. The link road and A339 improvements should be classified as 'essential'. The IDP Schedule incorrectly links sites with junctions and needs to be corrected.	Trip rates associated with Manydown needs to be corrected, and the TA should only deal with development in the emerging Local Plan, not development outside of the plan period. The IDP should be updated to include realistic estimates of junction improvements, such as the A339/Roman Rd, A340/Roman Way, Manydown link road with the A339 and A340. The IDP schedule should be corrected to refer to the link road and A339 improvements as essential.	There was a typographical error in Version 4 of the Transport Assessment which resulted in the incorrect trip rates being presented for the Manydown development. The trip rates were subsequently amended in Version 5 of the Transport Assessment that was published on our website during the consultation period. Detailed junction tests and designs for each of the Local Plan development proposals (including Manydown) will be undertaken at a later stage as part of the detailed masterplanning and/or planning application process for the development sites once their respective allocations have been confirmed in the Local Plan. It is for this reason that the IDP does not include indicative costs for the proposed new junctions with the B3400 / A339 as the approach taken to masterplanning will influence the type of road and access arrangements provided to serve the site. The IDP will be updated in due course.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Nick O'Brien	N/A	N/A	439220	230	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Why has HCC have severely cut the capital and day to day budgets of both schools over the last few years if the number of school places required to growth. The figure of 350 houses has been under discussion for a number of years - it sounds like no discussions have taken place with HCC and the plans to expand the population of Whitchurch. What specific actions are going to be taken to support and grow employment within Whitchurch? Traffic is a problem in Whitchurch especially at peak times - there is no mention in the documents about what will be done to address this? The Local Plan says there will monitoring and review of each of the proposals in the Plan. However there is nothing specific about what happens if those proposals are not met. There is a lack of detailed information about what is intended for the communities outside Basingstoke, such as Whitchurch. There does appear to be a clear vision of what the Council intends for Whitchurch	The local planning authority has no involvement in the HCC's capital budget albeit, the Borough Council does work closely with HCC to ensure the provision of infrastructure. In this respect, HCC have informed the Borough Council of the required school places to support new development and this is reflected in the IDP. The Local Plan Transport Assessment has been produced to test the 'worst case scenario' for the traffic impacts on the strategic highway network. This high level model seeks to identify whether the forecast impacts on the highway network in 2029 could be mitigated. Hampshire County Council and the Highways Agency have been engaged throughout the development process of the Transport Assessment. The Highways Authority agree that the scale and nature of highway works delivered may be different to those detailed in the study. As highways authority Hampshire County Council will have the final say on what mitigation measures are implemented on their highway network. The Council continues to work with HCC on proposals to deliver infrastructure improvements on the wider Basingstoke network to support development in the town.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr John Cady	N/A	N/A	473527	395	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Alan Johnson	N/A	N/A	636687	391	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Charles Wright	N/A	N/A	637197	329	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mrs M Cady	N/A	N/A	670567	396	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Traffic problems should be addressed before any more housing is developed. A doctors surgery should also be considered.	The Local Plan Transport Assessment has been produced to test the 'worst case scenario' for the traffic impacts on the strategic highway network. This high level model seeks to identify whether the forecast impacts on the highway network in 2029 could be mitigated. Hampshire County Council and the Highways Agency have been engaged throughout the development process of the Transport Assessment. The Highways Authority agree that the scale and nature of highway works delivered may be different to those detailed in the study. As highways authority Hampshire County Council will have the final say on what mitigation measures are implemented on their highway network. The Council continues to work with HCC on proposals to deliver infrastructure improvements on the wider Basingstoke network to support development in the town. In terms of health care facilities, the IDP considers these requirements and highlights need, after engagement with local health providers.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mrs Lisa Robins	N/A	N/A	784670	234	Yes	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mrs Joanne Brooks	N/A	N/A	785047	358	Not Specified	Yes	I believe the Local Plan is sound, but in the case of Whitchurch would have liked to see the traffic survey include other roads than just the B3400, in particular Winchester Road, being the main route for both schools and the A34 slip road.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted but given the role of the Local Plan in outlining the strategic approach to development to 2029 this level of detail was not necessary. More detailed Transport Assessments will be required in relation to specific developments within the Town.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Stone	Stacey Developments	N/A	86066	517	Not Specified	Not Specified	Efforts should be made to negotiate with AWE over the status of Tadley. Tadley only exists/has grown in its current form because of the location of the AWE there in the 1950/60s. The area needs more facilities. A formula has been agreed for the Tadley Town Centre Development Brief, which is now stymied, is this forever? The attitude of the AWE is theoretical and unreasonable.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The current policy (SS7) in the Pre-Submission Local Plan, which includes the settlement of Tadley, reflects the agreed position between the Council, ONR and other affected local planning authorities. The Council continues to work with the relevant agencies to ensure an appropriate response to development needs in Tadley.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
General comments	N/A	Mr Albert W.R. Allwood	N/A	N/A	213361	599	Not Specified	No	The general direction of the planning policy is one of 'solve the problem with a big hammer'. More consideration should be given to the impact of large development on existing communities. Such developments have just as much adverse effect on the quality of life of those living in the area as to those who need and are seeking a house to live in. By taking a careful look at the structure and nature of the area where development is planned allows local people to accept such schemes, the planned schemes proposed are unsound for this reason.	Small scale developments attached to existing villages in the country has a less dramatic effect to an area, this is how one village system has developed in the past. It enables young people to remain in their own communities and does not fragment the family structure. General growth in our local landscape is far more acceptable than the 'ghetto' type developments that we have had in the past. It appears that Council owned land escapes the scrutiny of planning application that individuals one subjected to. Perhaps the need for more money in the council's coffers is more important.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal and site assessment processes. It promotes a balanced approach to development through the allocation of a variety of sites in different locations. The impacts of development on existing communities have been assessed, and improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the relevant site policies, and is supported by the council's IDP. The Plan's approach to development in the borough's settlements will enable local communities to consider and address such issues through neighbourhood planning.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Rodney Scott	Oakley and Deane Parish Council	N/A	461222	478	Yes	No	We support the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary as set out on Map 1a and would strongly object to any move to shift it to the west up to the road from the B3400 to Wotton St Lawrence. The boundary on the plan runs along the Scrapps Hill ridge and as stated in The Oakley Village Design Statement forms 'a natural and locally significant barrier between Oakley and Basingstoke'. The OVDS also states 'the ridge line, open fields and small woods to the east of the village are landscape features that are vital to the sense of Oakley being set within the surrounding countryside'.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted. However, following the outcomes of the consultation, the Manydown boundary is proposed to be moved further west.	No change	N/A	N/A	Superseded with updated representation.
General comments	N/A	Mrs Louise Dale	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	N/A	627212	474	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Mr Ted Blackmore-Squires	N/A	N/A	783889	507	No	No	IDP - Para 33.11. This para admits to there being no plan for the increase in the amount of waste water produced in the main urban area. Continued reliance on the EA turning a blind eye to the problem of effluent discharge into the Loddon is not good planning. The statement implies that BDBC would be complicit in any water company breaking the water directive.	The Plan should identify what waste water capacity there is and what fixed planned future investment would be necessary for a given population. Such a plan would identify a means of dealing with the current / predicted volumes / types of discharge.	Although the WFD specifies that good status should be met by 2015, there are circumstances where it is possible to delay meeting good status until 2012 or 2027, or where a lesser objective is required. These circumstances include technical feasibility, disproportional costs, or natural conditions (recovery times). It is likely that these circumstances will lead to an extended deadline to meet good status. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration acceptable within each classification or status would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Ted Blackmore-Squires	N/A	N/A	783889	508	Yes	No	IDP - Para 33.4. This statement is incomplete as it fails to take account of the fact that the early 1990s sewer (900mm brick built) through the town centre leaks in both directions, is often under positive pressure.	Thames Water should be asked to confirm their status report of this sewer. I have seen a Thames Water drawing with the words 'To be replaced at the earliest opportunity' written along side the line of the old sewer.	Thames Water have statutory responsibility to provide and maintain the sewerage infrastructure through the Water Management Plans. Further liaison will be taking place with key partners, including Thames Water, in light of flooding issues in the borough	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Ted Blackmore-Squires	N/A	N/A	783889	509	Yes	No	IDP - Para 33.12. This para is inaccurate. The statement excludes points from the WCS that the effluent levels measured in 2009 were set to increase within a band. The acceptance of such a situation is contrary to the statements made in other parts of the plan referring to the preservation / improvement of the habitat and environment.	The Plan should look for the stabilisation of the levels of pollution as a minimum objective, further the plan should put in place measures to commence the reduction of the pollution to the Loddon.	Although the WFD specifies that good status should be met by 2015, there are circumstances where it is possible to delay meeting good status until 2012 or 2027, or where a lesser objective is required. These circumstances include technical feasibility, disproportional costs, or natural conditions (recovery times). It is likely that these circumstances will lead to an extended deadline to meet good status. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration acceptable within each classification or status would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Ted Blackmore-Squires	N/A	N/A	783889	505	Yes	No	IDP - Para 33.3. The statement is incomplete, and does not include monies for regular maintenance. The statement does not include plans for the whole plan period, only until 2021 (9 years short).	Regular maintenance funds are not planned infrastructure funds. The plan should include values for the whole plan period to 2029.	The IDP includes costings where these are known. The maintenance of sewerage infrastructure is the responsibility of the relevant sewerage undertaker, with the costs borne by that company through separate funding regimes	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Ms Janet Grieve	N/A	N/A	786162	577	Not Specified	No	Plans for various villages/small towns around Basingstoke fail to take into account inadequate and stretched infrastructure i.e. roads (width and ability to cope with increased traffic x 2 cars for each new house, roads are already at capacity, A33 at a standstill and A340 very busy); sewerage (plans need to be in place to avoid overflows); schools (Bramley school is full even after 5 new classrooms added this summer); recreational and youth facilities (already lacking); medical provision (surgery busy, rooms will need to be extended to cope).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The IDP schedule sets out the likely infrastructure requirements (for education, transport, community and sports facilities) for sites across the borough, with these supplied by the relevant service provider where a need has been identified. It is proposed that a proportion of future CLIL revenue will be passed to Parish Councils where development has taken place in order to fund local infrastructure improvements.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mrs Julie Peteas	N/A	N/A	786367	694	Yes	No	I think the plan is sound but feel Whitchurch will have difficulty absorbing 350 houses. I feel that the traffic assessment should have taken into account the fact that five roads meet in the centre of Whitchurch.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Transport Assessment looks at the borough strategic highway network which includes the B3400 which passes through Overton and Whitchurch. The Transport Assessment took account of 'pinch points' on the local road network. Planning applications to deliver the local plan allocation (ss3.6) and future Neighbourhood Planning allocations will be required to submit a detailed Transport Assessment.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mrs J Peters	N/A	N/A	86160	1229	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
General comments	N/A	Philip J Lynch	N/A	N/A	442206	826	No	No	The council has been overly influenced by the previous legal action and pressure exerted in respect of the previous core strategy and subsequent legal action. In addition the decision making process excluded one councillor from voting when there was no valid justification for so doing, which consequently undermined the decision making process.	Removed SS3.9 from the Plan.	A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Ms Suzanne Denness	N/A	N/A	636861	879	No	No	Landscape and Environmental Assessments have not been completely completed. The local communities have been informed but not consulted, there is a difference. Our local community group survey results are attached. The main reasons people want to live in our community are its proximity to the countryside and easy access to main trunk routes - both these features will be destroyed by the development as detailed in the local plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The evidence base for the Local Plan includes a variety of assessments including landscape and biodiversity assessments completed both in-house and by consultants on the council's behalf. Such studies have informed the development of the Plan's spatial strategic directly feeding into the site assessment and Sustainability Appraisal processes. These were technical documents and therefore not appropriate for public consultation. However, consultations that have taken place on the Plan have provided the opportunity to comment on issues relevant to local communities and changes have been made where it is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	764	Yes	No	IDP - Para 34 . HCC is concerned that the IDP does not make a clear commitment to give consideration to appropriate low carbon and renewable energy technologies. There is potential to incorporate renewable energy into new development and the IDP should be designed to maximise this opportunity. Currently, it does reflect the guidance in para 10 of the NPPF.	Add the following to para 34.2 - 'Existing opportunities, as set out in the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study (2010) ' Add the following to para 34.3 ' Existing renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in Basingstoke. Provision of suitable land for renewable energy infrastructure ' Add the following to para 34.12: ' Estimates of renewable energy infrastructure required to support the Local Plan based on feasibility studies '.	Noted. It is proposed to amend the IDP to reflect these points.	Amend the IDP accordingly	In response to representation from HCC.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
General comments	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	759	Yes	No	IDP - Para 26.14 - HCC supports the references to the need to ensure good pedestrian / cycle links within the allocated sites that connect to the wider network. However, HCC is concerned that there needs to be recognition of the desirability of new links to provide effective connections between the proposed development and the wider network of rights of way and countryside access.	Include an additional bullet under para 26.14: 'Where possible and appropriate, providing new pedestrian and cycle links to the wider countryside access network'.	Noted. It is proposed to amend the IDP to reflect this point	Amend the IDP accordingly	In response to representation from HCC.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
General comments	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	750	Not Specified	Not Specified	Proposals Maps - Where land is proposed for safeguarding for transport infrastructure, there are no corresponding indicative plans. It is also unclear what the split of 3,080 dwellings between the parcel of land shown as 'area in which masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints' is proposed for development within the plan period and to what scale this development may be.	Identify on policy maps land proposed for transport infrastructure safeguarding. Clarify limits of development area on map 1a.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The suggested change is overly detailed for the Local Plan and such matters are and will continue to be considered through the masterplanning exercise undertaken by HCC/BDBC and ultimately the development management process. This approach is in line with representations received from HCC as local highway authority.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
General comments	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	751	Yes	No	IDP - Para 26.21 - 26.29. HCC welcomes the references to the provision of a country park. However, there is a need to emphasise and clarify that this will meet the needs of Basingstoke town and the wider community of the borough, not just those within any new community development within Manydown.	Add the following text to the IDP schedule: 'Provision of a country park to serve communities within the town of Basingstoke and the wider area, with pedestrian and cycling access from surrounding / adjacent neighbourhoods.;	Noted. It is proposed to amend the IDP to reflect this point	Amend the IDP accordingly	In response to representation from HCC.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
General comments	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	753	Yes	No	HCC welcomes reference to the Countryside Access Plan (CAP) for the Hampshire Downs, but reference should also be made to the CAP plans for the Forest of Eversley and the Test and Itchen areas, plus the County Overview CAP, which provides the summary of HCC's overarching objectives for improving the countryside access network.	Include the following strategies under 14.2 of the IDP: 'Countryside Access Plans for the Forest of Eversley, Countryside Access Plans for the Test, Countryside Access Plans for the Itchen'	Noted. It is proposed to amend the IDP to reflect this point	Amend the IDP accordingly	In response to representation from HCC.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
General comments	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	866	Not Specified	No	At present there is no specific policy in the pre-submission document that underlines the presumption in favour of sustainable development as outlined in the Framework. The only reference to the presumption in favour is located within the glossary of the Local Plan in reference to development located within the Settlement Boundary Policy. Inspectors at Local Plan examinations in Bourne mouth, Eastbourne, and Selby have required modifications to the plan to ensure that a specific policy is included in the plan that sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development in order to be found sound.	A policy concerning the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be included within the Plan to make it compliant with the NPPF.	The guidance for 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development' is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and it is not considered necessary to repeat this within the Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	888	Not Specified	Not Specified	General Objections The Plan and its "Evidence Base" are too volumous for detailed consideration in the time available. New homes will simply encourage more people to move into the area. This will, eventually, lead to further demand for housing and facilities and will lead to a never-ending spiral of building and coalescence. A similar argument applies to major road improvements (e.g. the proposed changes to J6) - more people decide to use a road and the end-result is the same old jam with even more cars pumping out even more pollution. The main focus should be on encouraging local businesses and providing local shops thus reducing the need to travel.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The local planning authority has a duty to produce a local plan which meets the borough's objectively assessed housing need for the future. This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA. In terms of roads, a Transport Assessment (TA) has been produced to support the plan which identifies junction mitigation measures that may be required on the Strategic Highway Network by 2029 to mitigate the local plan allocations. The provision of local facilities is encouraged through the criteria of the site policies and is supported by the draft development management policies and the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mrs Teresa Barnard	N/A	N/A	786893	904	Yes	No	Reduction in Whitchurch Town Boundary, Map 1e Whitchurch The removal of the site south of the railway line at the northern boundary of Whitchurch seems short sighted and I could not find in the local plan the reason for its removal. It only appeared as a deletion on Map 1e Whitchurch. I do not see how it can be justified. The section being removed could be used for the station car park, employment of housing. It is an area of land, which has been allocated for employment for many years and would therefore not be seen as surprising if it were allocated for development as a possible site for station car parking or housing. That area of land has already had a planning application for housing refused. It is therefore of interest to developers.	Re-instate the previous Whitchurch town boundary. This is necessary to make the local plan sound as there is no evidence to support the removal of this area from the town boundary.	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. The site in question also has had deliverability issues and therefore as the Plan must be proven to be deliverable, the inclusion of such an allocation at this stage would be unsound. Whitchurch Town Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Miss Clare Gibbons	Southern Water	N/A	787164	1013	Not Specified	No	We seek a change to paragraph 33.16 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to reflect our operating regime. Wastewater treatment works are operated in accordance with 'environmental permits' rather than 'discharge consents'. This permitting system ensures that the Environment Agency's water quality objectives are achieved. Southern Water can apply to the Environment Agency for new or amended environmental permits to accommodate new development and this should be reflected accordingly. Additional investment at the wastewater treatment works to accommodate additional growth or more stringent environmental standards would need to be determined through the price review process. This will depend on the progress of new development to construction, as well as the level of population growth that actually occurs in the future. Therefore, we seek a change to the timing of the delivery indicated in Appendix A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	We propose minor amendments to the wording of paragraph 33.16 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan so that it reads as follows: A. The current environmental permits can accommodate the proposed development and there is no need to review them. If necessary, Southern Water can apply to the Environment Agency for new or amended environmental permits to accommodate new development. We propose that the timings of the delivery of infrastructure at Overton WTW, Whitchurch WTW and Oakley WTW in Appendix A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should read as 2015-2029 rather than 2015-2020.	Noted. It is proposed to amend the IDP accordingly	Amend the IDP accordingly	N/A	N/A	Agreed with change.
General comments	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1106	Yes	No	Policies map 1f The Local Plan should clarify the basis upon which the Town Centre Boundary has been determined, and how policy EP3 applies to retail and other main town centre use developments within that area given the difference in edge-of-centre definitions between those uses (see NPPF Annex 2).	No detailed site assessment of sites for development opportunities with the town centre boundary.	The Town Centre boundary has been defined based on national guidance and the Local plan evidence base and has been expanded to include areas with redevelopment potential.The supporting text outlines how the policy will be applied.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1112	Yes	No	Policies map 4 The Churchill Plaza site and adjoining land is suitable for redevelopment to accommodate much of the identified retail need in a location which would ensure that such a retail development would have a beneficial effect on the centre's vitality and viability. It is likely to become available for redevelopment in the early part of the Plan period and should be identified as an allocated redevelopment site within the planned expansion of the PSA. The suitability and availability of the Council's Central Short Stay car park off Red Lion Street should be similarly considered for allocation.	The Churchill Plaza site and adjoining land should be identified as a potential site for the future expansion of the PSA. It is suitable for major retail-led development and other uses, and is likely to become available during the early part of the Plan period. The Council's Central Short Stay car park site, opposite Red Lion Street, should be similarly assessed. As Crown Heights should be excluded from the SSF, it should, as a consequence, be excluded from the PSA. To be consistent with national policy on allocating sites and PSA & SSF designations, and responding appropriately to the Local Plan retail evidence base.	The Primary Shopping Area defines the area where retail development is concentrated. Churchill Plaza is currently in an office use and therefore its inclusion within the Primary Shopping Area is unjustified. It is included within the Town Centre boundary and therefore would be considered as edge of centre for retail proposals. If the site was to change use this should be tested through the sequential test where the factors raised by the respondent can be considered appropriately. There is currently no certainty over deliverability of the Churchill Plaza site given its current use and ownership and therefore it would be inappropriate to allocate the site within the PSA. Crown Heights is included within the secondary frontage reflecting its retail use on the ground floor	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1109	Yes	No	Policies map 2 The Local Plan should clarify the basis upon which the Town Centre Boundary has been determined, and how policy EP3 applies to retail and other main town centre use developments within that area given the difference in edge-of-centre definitions between those uses (see NPPF Annex 2).	no detailed site assessment of sites for development opportunities with the town centre boundary.	The Town Centre boundary has been defined based on national guidance and the Local plan evidence base and has been expanded to include areas with redevelopment potential. The supporting text outlines how the policy will be applied.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
General comments	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1110	Yes	No	Policies map 3 The 2009 RSU (4.5) considered that the town centre comprises three areas: (1) Festival Place and the Walks, (2) The Malls and (3) 'Top of the Town'. The Malls area is described as including the railway station to the north and extending east to "include the multi-storey car park, along with the Crown Heights located at Alencon Link". It (11.47) concludes by recommending that the PSF should comprise all of Festival Place and The Malls and that the SSF should comprise the Top of the Town Area. It does not contemplate definition of Crown Heights as comprising the SSF. Whilst the Top of Town provides a diverse range of main town centre uses, Crown Height is a residential building comprising very limited town centre uses at ground floor level and restricted development opportunities. Festival Place Unit Trust do not consider that Crown Heights falls within the definition for a SSF.	Crown Heights does not comprise SSF and should be removed from the SSF policy designation. To be consistent with national policy on shopping frontages	Crown Heights is included within the secondary frontage reflecting its links to the town centre and the retail use on the ground floor.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
General comments	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1258	Yes	No	Policies Maps Where land is proposed for safeguarding for transport infrastructure within individual site policies there are no corresponding indicative plans in the 'Policy Maps' document detailing the area of land required. It is also unclear in the Local Plan DPD what the split of the 3080 dwellings between the parcel of land shown in Map 1a 'Manydown Site Allocation'. It is also unclear whether the parcel of land shown as an Area in which masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints' is proposed for development within this local plan period, and to what scale this development may be.	Identify on policy maps land proposed for transport infrastructure safeguarding. Clarify limits of development area on Map 1a	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The suggested change is overly detailed for the Local Plan and such matters are and will continue to be considered through the masterplanning exercise undertaken by HCC/BDBC and ultimately the development management process. This approach is in line with representations received from HCC as local highway authority.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
1.1	N/A	Mr Keith Oborn	N/A	N/A	637521	54	No	No	I have no alternative to objecting on both grounds. In common with most private individuals I do not have the time to read extensive local and national planning legislation and policy documents, nor do I have time to read the entire document set relating to the specific plans. Thus I am unable to determine that the plan is either "legal" or "sound" and must therefore assume it is not until proven otherwise It is essential to provide summary guidance and plan data, in a graphical and tabular format, to allow the layman to make informed decisions within a reasonable time. Failure to do this means BDBC has failed to provide required information for this stage of the consultation.	It is essential to provide summary guidance on the legal framework, the adherence of this plan to that framework (in the form of a compliance matrix cross referenced to specific items in the legal framework summary) and a matrix of specific decisions and alternatives considered. Make it readable: what you provide at the moment is totally impenetrable unless one has days and weeks to spend on it. The documents provided in the mailshot are useless, as they provide no information on specifics. For instance the section "How many new homes" provides no tabulated evidence, or pointer to such evidence, on how the housing numbers were arrived at. How can I consider this part of the plan "sound" or "legal" when the only information I have is "-- councillors looked closely at evidence--" What evidence? From whom? Finally, 1000 characters are simply insufficient to reasonably express objections at this level. Therefore BDBC is failing to provide the required facilities to consult at this stage.	The summary information was designed in order simplify the information and make it more accessible to the general public. Providing condensed evidence concerning how housing numbers have been arrived at would be likely to only complicate matters further by not allowing the information to be considered in its proper context. A Statement of Procedure document formed part of the consultation documents. This document provided information on how to engage in the consultation, what the consultation was on and what the Local Plan covers. Officers from the council's Planning Policy and Implementation Team are available to try to answer any queries that people may have. The council is happy to accept longer submissions in hard-copy or via e-mail, a facility which has been utilised by numerous respondents. The council held 8 exhibitions across the Borough which also provided the opportunity for the public to ask questions.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.1	N/A	Mr Keith Oborn	N/A	N/A	637521	55	No	No	I have no alternative to objecting on both grounds. In common with most private individuals I do not have the time to read extensive local and national planning legislation and policy documents, nor do I have time to read the entire document set relating to the specific plans. Thus I am unable to determine that the plan is either "legal" or "sound" and must therefore assume it is not until proven otherwise It is essential to provide summary guidance and plan data, in a graphical and tabular format, to allow the layman to make informed decisions within a reasonable time. Failure to do this means BDBC has failed to provide required information for this stage of the consultation.	It is essential to provide summary guidance on the legal framework, the adherence of this plan to that framework (in the form of a compliance matrix cross referenced to specific items in the legal framework summary) and a matrix of specific decisions and alternatives considered. Make it readable: what you provide at the moment is totally impenetrable unless one has days and weeks to spend on it. The documents provided in the mailshot are useless, as they provide no information on specifics. For instance the section "How many new homes" provides no tabulated evidence, or pointer to such evidence, on how the housing numbers were arrived at. How can I consider this part of the plan "sound" or "legal" when the only information I have is "-- councillors looked closely at evidence--" What evidence? From whom? Finally, 1000 characters are simply insufficient to reasonably express objections at this level. Therefore BDBC is failing to provide the required facilities to consult at this stage.	The summary information was designed in order simplify the information and make it more accessible to the general public. Providing condensed evidence concerning how housing numbers have been arrived at would be likely to only complicate matters further by not allowing the information to be considered in its proper context. A Statement of Procedure document formed part of the consultation documents. This document provided information on how to engage in the consultation, what the consultation was on and what the Local Plan covers. Officers from the council's Planning Policy and Implementation Team are available to try to answer any queries that people may have. The council is happy to accept longer submissions in hard-copy or via e-mail, a facility which has been utilised by numerous respondents. The council held 8 exhibitions across the Borough which also provided the opportunity for the public to ask questions.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.1	N/A	MS Jeanette Fogg	N/A	N/A	783873	74	No	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Insufficient information has been provided in order to facilitate a response.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.1	N/A	ms j Braithwaite fogg	N/A	N/A	784567	188	No	No	WATER SUPPLIES We have protected species in the area which have neglected by the Borough Council. I have been pressuring the council to conduct a survey of several reptilian species, e.g. slow worms, grass snakes in the area where areas to be developed are situated to no avail. These areas need protection. Protection of reptilian species depends heavily on the water supply as they require damp conditions to go about breeding and feeding. The areas within bramley which support these species are water starved. The local brook, Bramley Green Brook dries out periodically for longer and longer each year, which according to an environment agency spokesman is due to demands on ground water supplies. Southern waters report on Environment for 2013 reports on sensitive water supplies in this area.	Southern Waters proposals to provide water to the area following development is to extract water from local rivers in the winter to supplement summer supplies. We have been in a drought condition for many years. The brooks in the area are not flowing into the river Loddon as they should but are completely dry in some places. This means that everything relies on a regular rainfall, something we do not have here in the south any longer because of continuous use of concrete developments and excessive housing. The river Loddon is polluted beyond EU levels and water not flowing into it is making the situation worse. We cannot continue to rely on rainfall with the IPCC report on climate change this is just part of drying out with climate change and no actions by consecutive governments. To build more they have suggested a desalination plant. This is not even in the planning stage from what I can gather. So how is the water supply for 13000 more houses to be sustained?	The evidence base which underpins the Local Plan includes a Biodiversity Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and Water Cycle Study. There are also several relevant policies in the Local Plan, such as EM1 (landscape impact), EM3 (Thames Basin Heath's Special Protection Area), EM4 (biodiversity and nature conservation), EM5 (green infrastructure) and EM6 (water quality). The council has been in regular contact with the utility providers in relation to water quality and provision issues. Therefore, it is considered that the matters raised have been adequately addressed in the evidence base and Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.1	N/A	Mr George Watson	N/A	N/A	784768	314	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Insufficient information has been provided in order to facilitate a response.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.2	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	636	Not Specified	No	1.2.3 There is no mention of one of the most significant topographical features in the borough that is the chalk ridge south of the M3 (and crosses it at Beggarwood) linking the North Downs in Surrey to the AONB north of the B3400. The view from Basingstoke town to Farleigh Hill and from the latter to the Chilterns and the NWD AONB is very fine and needs to be preserved. As far as I can see there is nothing specifically on this in the Plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is informed by a number of landscape studies including the Landscape Capacity Study (2010), which forms part of the council's evidence base. The site specific policies also include the requirement to respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape and its location, which would require consideration of the visual impact of proposals in longer views. Policy EM1 also requires landscape visual impact to be considered. Paragraph 6.3 of the Local Plan does refer to the diverse pattern of landscapes in the borough including rolling chalk downland. Therefore, it is considered that the plan suitably addresses the issue of landscape impact. The plan provides the framework for the protection of such views where appropriate.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.3	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	N/A	N/A	205715	250	Yes	No	There is a very real wish from members of the community to respond to the Local Plan consultations.(Appreciating that this is a very complicated subject), it does seem that the response documents are off putting to many because of the way that they are formatted. The documents direct people to answer questions in a certain way with very little freedom to give sensible opinion. The parish council is unhappy that the Local Plan is available only in the library which has limited opening hours and during previous consultations, the reception staff at the Civic Offices were unable to find the relevant documents. Notice of consultation periods have been variable and parish councils, bound by meeting dates and publication deadlines of newsletters need time to be able discuss matters at meetings and disseminate information to parishioners. Notice of consultation events within the village have been pretty much non-existent, almost as if the borough would prefer people not to attend.	More coherent and inclusive consultation.	The parameters upon which the response forms were based reflects the NPPF, and the council was happy to accept more general responses either via letter or e-mail in order to prevent members of the public feeling overly constrained when providing their responses. The consultation period was also for 6 weeks which is line with regulations. The documents were available to view at Planning Reception but the council apologises on the isolated incident that the reception staff were unable to find them. The plan was also available on-line. In addition, the consultation was publicised via various means: leaflets were distributed to all residents in the borough, an article was placed in the borough news which was distributed to all residents in the borough, letters were sent to everyone on the consultation database and the consultation was advertised on the BDBC website. A Statement of Procedure document formed part of the consultation documents. This document provided information on how to engage in the consultation, what the consultation was on and what the Local Plan covers. Officers from the council's Planning Policy and Implementation Team are available to answer any queries that people may have. The council also held 8 exhibitions across the Borough which provided the opportunity for the public to ask questions.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
1.4	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	N/A	N/A	205715	251	Yes	No	It seems that Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is playing a numbers game to allocate housing and there is concern from the parishes that large scale developments are being considered for villages without thought for infrastructure restraints or the lives of the existing inhabitants.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Paragraph 4.6 to 4.12 of the Local Plan provide information on how the housing target has been derived including what information has been taken into account. This includes a report by Edge Analytics who undertook independent demographic forecasting. The housing sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and are considered to be a suitable locations for housing. The IDP in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Policies CN5 and CN8 also address the issue of infrastructure provision.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.4	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	102	Yes	No	The infrastructure to support the new housing is inadequately funded - no additional station to serve north Basingstoke - insufficient provision for amenities The infrastructure plans "need to be developed in advance of the housing completion" but - this depends on negotiations with individual developers, - the timescale for laying down required infrastructure will be longer than that for building houses, - the houses will be built before the infrastructure is in place, - causing unmanageable pressure on existing facilities and infrastructure. The funds from the new houses are not being applied to the parishes where the houses are constructed and the need will arise. - Razors Farm and Cufaude are in Bramley, and will add many commuters to Bramley station. - No funding for extra off-street parking at Bramley station or improvements to the level crossing which will see added cars and additional freight trains on the Reading to Basingstoke line.	Funding should be secured and guaranteed to allow for: - additional parking at Bramley station - footbridge over the rail line at Bramley - additional station at Chineham/Sherfield park to serve housing between Basingstoke and Bramley This would ensure that the Plan was sound, in being able to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support the required housing growth.	The IDP in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Policies CN5 and CN8 also address the issue of infrastructure provision. Policy SS10 aims to improve rail transport provision in the form of Chineham Railway Station. Work is continuing with HCC, Network Rail and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development. However, generally, improvements to the rail service is beyond the remit of the local plan, and not something which the council can control.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.4	N/A	Mrs Teresa Barnard	N/A	N/A	786893	906	No	Not Specified	The process of making comments has been far from easy. There was a short time span between the exhibition in Whitchurch and the deadline for comments There are a complicated set of supporting documents to go through in order to fully understand the policies in the local plan. It was difficult to find the relevant documents on the website. It was difficult to work out how to make comments on the internet. Using a hard copy for each comment meant a lot of duplication and photocopying costs for those wanting to take part in the consultation process.	Extend the consultation period by 2 weeks. Ideally the exhibitions should have been scheduled earlier in the consultation process. Relevant sections for the supporting documents need to be more clearly signposted in the local plan text Have a representation form in the internet site to be completed online	The consultation period complied with the statutory requirements and every effort was made to provide members of the public with sufficient information in a usable format. There was also an electronic means of submitting comments, including simply e-mailing comments to the planning policy team, in order to prevent the need for hard copies and duplication etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.4	N/A	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	937	Not Specified	Not Specified	1) insufficient time to respond I only found out about this after receiving the special newspaper that was delivered to my house early September (just before going on holiday). I have since downloaded the various documents from the council web site. There is a lot to read. Ordinary members of the public do not have lots of free time to spend, at no notice, to review and understand the implications of these plans. 2) consultation? The response form requires responses to follow a very formal format, which most members of the public (like me) will not understand. It seems to only allow comments on technical legalities, which few people will understand. This is NOT a public consultation in which ordinary people can take part.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The consultation period complied with the statutory requirements and was extensively publicised. The guidelines for the scope within which comments could be provided were designed to accord with the national planning guidance (the National Planning Policy Framework) and Regulations Summaries of the information were also provided wherever possible, for example the summary of the Sustainability Appraisal. The Planning Policy and Implementation Team were happy to accept more general comments in whatever form members of the public wished to submit them. Officers from the council's Planning Policy and Implementation Team are available to try to answer any queries that people may have.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.4	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	N/A	N/A	787505	1127	No	No	Basingstoke and Deane Borough does not function in isolation and there are strong links with neighbouring authorities, for example West Berkshire, a matter which is evidenced through the analysis of travel to work patterns (e.g. from the Census) and as suggested in the DTZ analysis of housing market areas. It is unclear how the Council's assessment of housing need and ultimately their overall housing requirement has factored in needs of neighbouring authorities. This is a fundamental flaw of the Local Plan and an issue that goes to the heart of whether the document is sound and based on robust evidence. See attached response	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The relationship with neighbouring authorities is outlined in the Duty to Co-operate Statement, whilst the relationship with neighbouring housing markets will be set out in detail in an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.5	N/A	Deborah Reavell	N/A	N/A	417272	49	No	No	As an individual resident I cannot possibly tell whether the Local plan is legally compliant or sound. The last LDF also asked these questions and it clearly was not as there was the enormous Manydown problem. The council appeared to have acted illegally and chosen sites in an unsound method. So all one can do is hope that you have done better this time. There are only about 3000 homes for Manydown which we were led to believe some 15 years or so ago was land in joint HCC/BDDBC ownership and would be developed. So it is still in my view not clear whether the council has behaved properly this time or not.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The format of the consultation, in terms of legal tests etc, is stipulated by central government. Manydown has been extensively assessed by the council including through several detailed studies, for example the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.6	N/A	R Cheke	N/A	N/A	86092	342	Yes	No	The proposed development at SS3.3, 3.8 and that which is proposed for Bramley as per policy SS5 would be contrary to paragraph 1.6 which has the stated objective of improving economic viability in the area. The additional development will cause traffic problems in the business park and discourage businesses from relocating to the area.	The Manydown area, which was purchased specifically to cater for future housing needs in Basingstoke should be used to much greater capacity. It could take 9000 homes, thus obviating the need for development in Bramley.	The two sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. It is considered that residential use of the sites is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace. The council's Transport Assessment sets out mitigation measures in relation to transport infrastructure, as reflected within the criteria of the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.6	N/A	Mrs Henrietta Pullan	N/A	N/A	636570	364	Yes	No	By potentially increasing non-business traffic into the Business Park (next to SS3.3) the plan will be potentially alienating current businesses. One has stated they will shut down if the Razors Farm development does ahead. This area was originally allocated as an expansion area for business.	The housing allocation at Manydown should be increased to the usual amount per hectare and start earlier. The idea that Manydown cannot begin until a 'masterplan' is in place is unfair as the areas north and east of Basingstoke make up a large combined area which will have no such benefit and can be started straight away. Manydown should be allocated for 4000 houses as stated by the 'builders' and the houses proposed at SS3.3 and 3.8 should be removed from the plan, as this will alleviate a potential traffic nightmare in relation to the A33 at Chineham.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. The need to retain the site for a future employment use has been considered in light of the borough's Employment Land Review which concludes that the site is not required. It is considered that residential use of the site is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace. The council's Transport Assessment sets out mitigation measures in relation to transport infrastructure, as reflected within the criteria of the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.6	N/A	Mr Nigel Clarke	N/A	N/A	781086	75	No	No	What is proposed to protect native wildlife which is rich in this area, including species currently struggling? We understand a conservation area is proposed, but how will this be protected? The identity of this area would be devastated, Winklebury is currently semi-rural, it would become an urban area, with reduced open space for the local people. The currently overstretched utilities would be put under even greater pressure, reducing the quality of life of present residents, run off from water which presently soaks into the fields, could flood the present homes. The roads in this area are already extremely busy, with bottlenecks happening frequently, additional traffic from 3000 homes would be intolerable. We realise homes must be built, but it is imperative that we act as considerably as possible to look after our wildlife, planting native trees and hedgerows, provide nesting sites for our barn owls, kestrels etc.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	All of the sites in the draft plan have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Various evidence and policies specifically address the comments raised. For example, the site specific policies set out requirements in relation to high level biodiversity and transport issues. In addition, the Local Plan contains policies in relation to Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (EM4), Green Infrastructure (EM5) as well as community and physical infrastructure (CN5 and CN8 respectively). The council has also prepared a Biodiversity Assessment and Transport Assessment, as well as an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. These matters were also recognised in the site assessments and sustainability appraisals and have been given due consideration through the site selection process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
1.16	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update to the development plan diagram to include CIL and EqIA and update format as per AMR.	Factual update.	N/A	N/A
1.19	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update consultation dates	Revised plan for new round of consultation	N/A	N/A
1.21	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	N/A	N/A	86126	431	Yes	Yes	Paragraphs 1.21, 1.22, 1.23 are excellent. We particularly agree: Infrastructure has not kept pace with the level of growth that has occurred and the existing infrastructure is in need of upgrading or replacing. This is particularly the case with regard to local congestion issues which occur at peak times, school provision and sewage infrastructure; Also: the natural environment of the borough is highly valued by residents and visitors to the borough, both for the quality and diversity of the biodiversity and also for the attractive setting and recreational opportunities that it provides. A key feature for Basingstoke, despite significant growth since the 1960s is the accessibility and attractiveness of the surrounding countryside.1.32: Better variety of retail services in Basingstoke would cut down travel to Newbury and Reading. The long-promised station at Chineham would help take the strain off the A33.	intentionally left blank	Support noted. The provision of the Chineham Railway Station is addressed through policy SS10, and work is continuing with HCC , Network Rail, and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development (paragraph 4.77).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.22	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczczyk	N/A	N/A	638003	214	Yes	No	Housing number requirement is excessive given that the borough already provides significantly more housing than required to meet the need of local employment Para 11 and 17 show that 47% of residents do not work in the borough	A housing target of ~ 500 homes per year would seem to be more reasonable in the light of current trends in population excluding inward migration.	Paragraph 4.6 to 4.12 of the Local Plan provide information on how the housing target has been derived including what information has been taken into account. This includes a number of reports by Edge Analytics who have undertaken independent demographic forecasting. 500 house pa would not be sufficient to meet the council's objectively assessed housing need.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.22	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	N/A	N/A	641907	969	Yes	No	Agrees with the paragraph but it does not go far enough to describe the wider housing needs in the borough. Appendix 1 of the representation sets out the current status of affordable housing in the borough. In particular it looks at need, past delivery and future supply. Appendix 1 explains that: Q) For the purposes of the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment 2013 the council have assumed the delivery of 91 (net) affordable homes per annum however note the difficulty and uncertainties in making future predictions. This will be far below both the target and the projected need. R) It is therefore imperative that the Local Plan outlines sufficient measures to ensure affordable housing delivery over the plan period.	Whilst affordability is an issue for first time buyers, the paragraphs should indicate that need for affordable housing extends beyond first time buyers, including low income households who cannot access home ownership, as set out in Appendix 1 of representation.	The evidence base in relation to the need for affordable housing will be contained within the updated version of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment where the issue of affordable housing is fully acknowledged including households on low incomes. Agree to make a change to paragraph 1.22. The need for a delivery of affordable housing is addressed by means of policies CN1 and CN2.	Para 1.22 Third sentence to read "There is an acknowledged housing need and affordability is an issue in the borough for first time buyers ~~in the borough and households on low incomes who cannot access home ownership. This is particularly the case in rural areas where house prices tend to be higher.~~	In response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.22	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Population figure for the borough as per the 2011 census is 167,800.	Update first paragraph to state "...167,800 (2011 census), rather than "...168,699 (2011)".	ensure consistency with the IDP.	N/A	N/A
1.24	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	142	Yes	No	Whilst English Heritage welcomes and supports the recognition of some of the borough's heritage assets in this paragraph, we feel that a more detailed description should be given of the borough's historic environment, especially the historic development of Basingstoke and the historic towns in the borough, in order to give a more comprehensive context for the Local Plan and, in particular, the eighth 'issue to address' in paragraph 2.16 , Policy EM11 and paragraphs 6.83 - 6.87. We also agree with the comments and suggested additional wording of the Hampshire County Archaeologist, although we would prefer 'protect, conserve and enhance' as 'conserve' indicates proactive management whilst 'protect' suggests a more reactive position. (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	Paragraph 1.24 should explain more about the historic development of Basingstoke and the historic towns in the borough. "These historic assets contribute to the sense of place, community and local identity of the borough, as well as to recreation education and the tourism economy. It is an important objective of the plan to protect, conserve and enhance the Borough's historic environment." should be added to the end of the paragraph.	It is considered suitable to amend the paragraph along the lines recommended in the representation, as that would accord more closely with the NPPF and the English Heritage approach to the definition of heritage assets.	1.24 Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed and locally listed/notable buildings, <u>Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites, including</u> important historic tourist attractions <u>such as</u> Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. <u>The borough's heritage assets make an important contribution to local distinctiveness as well as local recreation, education, and the tourism economy.</u>	In response to representation.	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.24	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	142	Yes	No	Whilst English Heritage welcomes and supports the recognition of some of the borough's heritage assets in this paragraph, we feel that a more detailed description should be given of the borough's historic environment, especially the historic development of Basingstoke and the historic towns in the borough, in order to give a more comprehensive context for the Local Plan and, in particular, the eighth issue to address in paragraph 2.16 , Policy EM11 and paragraphs 6.83 - 6.87. We also agree with the comments and suggested additional wording of the Hampshire County Archaeologist, although we would prefer protect, conserve and enhanceas conserveindicates proactive management whilst protectsuggests a more reactive position. (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	Paragraph 1.24 should explain more about the historic development of Basingstoke and the historic towns in the borough. "These historic assets contribute to the sense of place, community and local identity of the borough, as well as to recreation education and the tourism economy. It is an important objective of the plan to protect, conserve and enhance the Borough's historic environment." should be added to the end of the paragraph.	It is considered suitable to amend the paragraph along the lines recommended in the representation.	1.24 Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed and locally listed/notable buildings, <u>Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites, including</u> important historic tourist attractions <u>such as</u> Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. <u>The borough's heritage assets make an important contribution to local distinctiveness as well as local recreation, education, and the tourism economy.</u>	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.24	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	N/A	N/A	658243	743	Yes	No	HCC does not consider the Local Plan gives enough value and weight to the historic envt, which could be improved if Para 1.24 were expanded beyond a statement of fact to a statement of objective.	Amend Para 1.24 as follows: '...The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. These historic assets contribute to the sense of place, community and local identity of the borough, as well as to recreation, education and the tourism economy. It is an important objective of the plan to protect and enhance the Borough's historic environment.	It is considered suitable to amend the paragraph along the lines recommended in the representation, as that would accord more closely with the NPPF and the English Heritage approach to the definition of heritage assets.	1.24 Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed and locally listed/notable buildings, <u>Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites, including</u> important historic tourist attractions <u>such as</u> Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. <u>The borough's heritage assets make an important contribution to local distinctiveness as well as local recreation, education, and the tourism economy.</u>	In response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn
1.24	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	588	Yes	No	The whole value and weight of the historic environment within the aims and objectives of the plan would be better supported is paragraph 1.24 were expanded beyond a statement of fact to a statement of objective.	"Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed buildings and locallylisted buildings, scheduled monuments and other archaeological sites, including important historic tourist attractions, including Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement of Silchester. These historic assets contribute to the sense of place, community and local identity of the borough, as well as to recreation, education and the tourism economy. It is an important objective of the plan to protect and enhance the borough's historic environment."	It is considered suitable to amend the paragraph along the lines recommended in the representation, as that would accord more closely with the NPPF and the English Heritage approach to the definition of heritage assets.	1.24 Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed and locally listed/notable buildings, <u>Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites, including</u> important historic tourist attractions <u>such as</u> Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. <u>The borough's heritage assets make an important contribution to local distinctiveness as well as local recreation, education, and the tourism economy.</u>	In response to representation.	N/A	withdrawn
1.24	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	588	Yes	No	The whole value and weight of the historic environment within the aims and objectives of the plan would be better supported is paragraph 1.24 were expanded beyond a statement of fact to a statement of objective.	"Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed buildings and locallylisted buildings, scheduled monuments and other archaeological sites, including important historic tourist attractions, including Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement of Silchester. These historic assets contribute to the sense of place, community and local identity of the borough, as well as to recreation, education and the tourism economy. It is an important objective of the plan to protect and enhance the borough's historic environment."	It is considered suitable to amend the paragraph along the lines recommended in the representation.	1.24 Overall, the borough benefits from a range of historic assets which contribute to the character of the environment, including over 40 designated conservation areas, a significant number of listed and locally listed/notable buildings, <u>Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites, including</u> important historic tourist attractions <u>such as</u> Basing House, Highclere Castle, The Wyne and the Roman settlement at Silchester. <u>The borough's heritage assets make an important contribution to local distinctiveness as well as local recreation, education, and the tourism economy.</u>	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
1.29	1.30	officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert paragraph regarding economic context of the borough.	new evidence	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
1.29	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	101	Yes	No	Basingstoke's growth will continue to be driven by its close proximity to road and rail links to London and other areas. Therefore as houses increase, so will commuters, and the development of the road and rail infrastructure is vital. The road network will be improved by the investment at junction6, but there is almost no investment guaranteed for the rail network, either in the form of a new station for north Basingstoke, or additional investment in parking facilities at Basingstoke or Bramley stations where there will be increased usage.	Investment in the rail network is vital. - off-street parking at Bramley - increased pressure on the Bramley level crossing, which will see more road and rail/freight use - better parking facilities for disabled users at Basingstoke (where there are 2 disabled spaces for the entire station)	The IDP in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Policy SS10 aims to improve rail transport provision in the form of Chineham Railway Station. Work is continuing with HCC, Network Rail and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development. However, generally, improvements to the rail service is beyond the remit of the local plan, and not something which the council can control.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.1	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	N/A	N/A	786309	646	Not Specified	Yes	We support the vision and, in particular the aim to be an environmentally responsible and distinctive place. We are satisfied that the Issues to address' include, need to support improvements to sewerage infrastructure, improve water quality, WFD, susceptibility to groundwater flooding, protection and enhancement of biodiversity, improved green infrastructure. You mention about 3% of the borough being in the floodplain and groundwater flooding susceptibility. However, no mention has been made of surface water flooding. Surface water flooding should be added to cover all aspects of flood risk in the borough. We support the inclusion of objective K and welcome the inclusion of more efficient use of natural resources.	K) Minimise our contribution to climate change and its effects through.....' This provides further clarity to the objective as not all natural resource use contributes to climate change (e.g. water consumption) and the efficient use of energy and natural resources, increased use of renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure, and adaptation and mitigation will also minimise the effects of climate change. We have no concerns with regards to objective M) and N) and support their inclusion.	Comments noted, however, it is considered that by implication the objective already covers this issue, and no change therefore required to make the plan sound. Surface water is covered by policy EM7 (Managing Flood Risk).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.2	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	N/A	N/A	130498	1159	Yes	No	Paragraph 2.2. p15 states, "The Vision was prepared through detailed discussions with partners and the community" to represent the type of place that the borough should be in the future. This is a completely correct assertion, the Vision Statement on page 13 took several months to thrash out beginning in or before September 2009; the public and other bodies were much involved and contributed to the final version and rightly expect its principles to be followed in the final document. There are many instances of failure and we explain these under relevant paragraphs and policies. The Pre Submission Local Plan is therefore unsound.	We explain under our relevant representations what changes are necessary to the Local Plan.	Table 1, paragraph 2.9, page 20, sets out how the vision has been carried through in the rest of the document.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.2	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	1050	Yes	No	With reference to SS3.9 and SS3.7 we have seen no evidence in any supporting document which shows that any of Basingstoke's residents would want to live close to the incinerator or sewage treatment works. The Plan is therefore unsound.	Individual failures, which we have identified in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are covered in our representations on individual paragraphs and policies.	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution and landscape matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 and SS3.9 contain specific criteria in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. See more detailed comments in relation to the site specific policies.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.4	N/A	Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	637355	203	Yes	No	Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 talk about "enjoying an excellent quality of life" and enriching the character and vitality of our villages and outstanding countryside". The plans for Bramley parish propose 1010 new dwellings on green field sites, this is a reduction in the rural character of the area with a loss of over 60ha of productive farm land and open views. Poor infrastructure already stretched to capacity with very limited practical opportunities to make significant changes/improvement will not lead to an improving quality of life for residents. Following recent development there is a significant number of residents isolated not only by circumstance but also location. Local employment opportunities, i.e. those not incurring commuting costs, are minimal, with many empty industrial units, a product of earlier large scale development remaining empty.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Whilst the plan prioritises development on previously developed land, given housing needs in the borough, greenfield allocations are required. Matters such as rural character and agricultural land were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of site specific policies and is supported by the council's IDP. The comments raised in relation to this chapter are also more specifically addressed in relation to the policies which relate to these issues, and accordingly it is considered that there is no need to change this particular paragraph.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	N/A	N/A	86126	434	Yes	Yes	2.5: Even re-generated premises in surrounding areas struggle to find occupants in the present economic climate. It is important to keep the Borough an attractive place. 2.6: Agree that Basingstoke has an excellent road network out of peak times. The peak times must be managed to keep the traffic flowing and measures found to reduce the volume of traffic. Agree that infrastructure must be planned before development. We strongly support the provision of independent and sheltered housing for older people and would like to see these built in a way to foster a suitable community environment along the lines of the developments for Alzheimer's patients in the Netherlands ie Retirement villages or gated communities. We need low cost housing. Strongly agree with Para 8.2 but do not understand how this is compatible with large scale development.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted. Policy SS2 addresses regeneration, with the Transport Assessment, the IDP and policy CN5 addressing infrastructure provision. Policies also addresses the need for specialist forms of accommodation in the borough, including accommodation for older people.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	N/A	N/A	130498	1161	Yes	No	The Vision at paragraph 2.5 we create inviting places and communities where people want to live and we live and work in harmony with the natural elements and systems on which we depend. With reference to policies SS3.9 and SS3.7 we have seen no evidence in any supporting document which shows that any of Basingstoke's residents, current or future, would want to live close to the incinerator and the Sewage Treatment Works, which we understand is to be developed to treat solid waste shipped in from outside the Borough, e.g. Guildford plus other authorities. Additionally, building 900 homes in the open countryside, on top of a substantial hill, where it will dominate a valley precious to a great many of the Borough's residents cannot be claimed to be in harmony with the natural elements and systems. The Pre Submission Local Plan is therefore unsound.	We explain under our relevant representations what changes are necessary to the Local Plan.	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Matters such as biodiversity, landscape and odour and noise pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water. Whilst the comments are noted, it is not considered that they necessitate amending this paragraph. The more specific comments in relation to policies SS3.9 and SS3.7 will address the matters raised in more detail.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	N/A	N/A	132338	377	Yes	No	Paragraph 2.2. p1 5 states: 'The Vision was prepared through detailed discussions with partners and the community to represent the type of place that the borough should be in the future.' It states, 'we create inviting places and communities where people want to live' and 'we live and work in harmony with the natural elements and systems on which we depend'. Plans for development on SS3.9 and SS3.7 do not take account of the natural elements and systems on which we depend in the Loddon Valley. (See our response to SS3.9.) Plans for development on SS3.9 and SS3.7 do not create inviting place where people want to live, in siting development near to the Sewage Works and Incinerator and without a funding source identified for the infrastructure required. Development on SS3.9 and 3.7 are therefore not in accordance with the Vision and therefore not positively prepared, justified or effective.	Remove SS3.9 and SS3.7. See our response to SS3.9	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as biodiversity/ ecology and odour and noise pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The concerns set out in this representation are addressed in more detail in relation to the site specific policies for the allocations in question.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
2.5	N/A	Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	637355	204	Yes	No	Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 talk about "enjoying and excellent quality of life" and enriching the character and vitality of our villages and outstanding countryside". The plans for Bramley parish propose 1010 new dwellings on green field sites, this is a reduction in the rural character of the area with a loss of over 60ha of productive farm land and open views. Poor infrastructure already stretched to capacity with very limited practical opportunities to make significant changes/improvement will not lead to an improving quality of life for residents. Following recent development there is a significant number of residents isolated not only by circumstance but also location. Local employment opportunities, i.e. those not incurring commuting costs, are minimal, with many empty industrial units, a product of earlier large scale development remaining empty.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Whilst the plan prioritises development on previously developed land, given housing needs in the borough, greenfield allocations are required. Matters such as rural character and agricultural land were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of site specific policies and is supported by the council's IDP. The comments raised in relation to this chapter are also more specifically addressed in relation to the policies which relate to these issues, and accordingly it is considered that there is no need to change this particular paragraph.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	N/A	N/A	638003	215	Yes	No	Recent history has shown that even during an economic growth period the amount of Business Park accommodation in the borough and its surrounds exceeds demand to the extent that even newly built or refurbished accommodation with the same or better links to transport infrastructure have remained empty or only been let at the expense of nearby tenants moving in from older buildings or parks. A redeveloped Basing View will not significantly increase the employment in the borough, merely displace it. A plan based on excessive housing build in response to this non-existent employment growth is unsound.	A redeveloped Basing View should not be used in whole or in part as a justification for an increase in the local population and therefore housing need. It should be justified on improving energy efficiency and providing employment near to existing population and therefore reducing the need to travel by car.	The evidence base underpinning these two issues is has been updated through a revised Employment Land Review and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The housing number required is derived from numerous factors as set out in section 4 of the Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	N/A	N/A	641907	973	Yes	No	Given that affordability issues are identified as an issue to address in order to achieve the vision, this should be mentioned within the vision itself, particularly the requirement for more affordable housing - bullet point 8 of paragraph 2.5.	Bullet point 8 of paragraph 2.5 should be amended to " New homes meet local needs, with both market and affordable housing..."	Comment noted. Affordable housing is a significant issue, and is addressed comprehensively in policy CN1. The vision for the plan is shared with the Sustainable Community Strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	145	Yes	No	English Heritage considers that the aim that the local built and natural environment are in tune...is too vague. In addition, not all the historic environment is 'built' (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	The aim for the local built and natural environment should be more specific and comprehensive e.g. the local historic, built and natural environments are conserved and enhanced....	The Objectives are not seeking to set out specific criteria for assessing such issues, and therefore it is considered reasonable to retain a fairly general wording in this part of the plan, but provide a framework for the more detailed assessment of this issue in the relevant policies e.g. EM1 and EM11. The supporting text has been updated in line with other comments submitted by English Heritage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	145	Yes	No	English Heritage considers that the aim that "the local built and natural environment are in tune..." is too vague. In addition, not all the historic environment is 'built' (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	The aim for the local built and natural environment should be more specific and comprehensive e.g. the local historic, built and natural environments are conserved and enhanced....	The Objectives are not seeking to set out specific criteria for assessing such issues, and therefore it is considered reasonable to retain a fairly general wording in this part of the plan, but provide a framework for the more detailed assessment of this issue in the relevant policies e.g. EM1 and EM11. The supporting text has been updated in line with other comments submitted by English Heritage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	mrs jane love	N/A	N/A	780377	12	No	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	the bullet points outlined in this section are pure speculation and are very subjective, I for one have never been asked for my opinion on what kind of place Basingstoke is and believe that all residents should be asked to respond to these suggestions before they are published in such a document of fact.	Paragraph 2.2 sets out how this vision has been devised. The NPPF sets out that Local Plans should be aspirational, but realistic (Para 154). It is considered that this section and the plan as a whole fulfils that requirement.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	N/A	N/A	784488	133	Yes	No	At a late stage the semi-colons after each bold heading was added to assist readability. Should in fact be colons not semi-colons! This was a misunderstanding of what was said in committee. Example: A prosperous and thriving place where; should read: A prosperous and thriving place where: May seem trivial but there are still people out there whose reading is disrupted by inappropriate punctuation!	Change to colons.	Agreed and update plan accordingly.	Change to colons	In response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agree to change
2.5	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	902	Not Specified	Not Specified	Oakley needs more local shops and businesses, not more houses that will simply overload the existing infrastructure, generate a dormitory estate and gobble up yet more green space - this is not "enriching the character and vitality of our villages".	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan provides a strategic context for development in Oakley over the Plan period, meeting the village's housing needs. Infrastructure requirements are set within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.5	N/A	Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	N/A	787467	1066	Yes	No	Festival Place Unit Trust generally supports the 2029 Vision, but finds it to be deficient in not providing an explicit vision for Basingstoke Town Centre. Such an approach would accord with the promotion of vitality of Town Centres in the NPPF (23), the explicit Local Plan objective for the town centres (LP 2.8 D), the regional role of Basingstoke town centre (LP1.26), and the underlying retail evidence base (SP Retail Study Updates (RSU), January 2009 and December 2012).	The introduction of a new (first) bullet to the 'A prosperous and thriving place - where' section of Para 2.5 to read: "The regional shopping centre role of Basingstoke Town Centre is maintained, particularly through enhancement to its retail and leisure offer". To ensure the Vision is consistent with national and local policy	The vision for the plan is shared with the Sustainable Community Strategy and is a general vision as opposed to addressing specific aspects of the economy. In addition, the reference to all businesses flourishing in 2.4 implies that the regional shopping role ought to be maintained. Moreover, policies in the economy section address more specifically the representation made, in particular EP3.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.6	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	606	Yes	No	NPPF 9,109,113,114, 117 The inclusion of references to natural environment issues are welcome but understate the known position. The most important is that this Borough has itself listed over 300 species that are protected or county notable but it is known that this understates the real position plus, the Borough should use opportunities to try to boost populations elsewhere ("net gains") when small threatened populations are found. We need that flexibility. The Borough's own reports highlight that Hampshire has lost 50% of its ancient woodland in the last 70 years (no separate figure for B&DBC unfortunately). These are really important statistics that the Borough itself has published and should influence decisions about resource allocation to protect, enhance, expand and reconnect.	This section should highlight concerns that over 300 species are in decline and that Hampshire has lost 50% of its ancient woodland.	Comments noted. This section is not intended to include the level of detail recommended in the representation. Policy EM4: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation provide a suitable framework for addressing such issues.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.6	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	N/A	N/A	641907	978	Yes	Yes	We agree with the summary of issues to address, particularly in relation to housing and affordable housing. As such affordable housing should be recognised as a key, if not the key, priority for the borough.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted. Whilst affordable housing is a key priority for the borough (as reflected in Policy CN1), it will be balanced with other key strategic priorities, in line with the plan's vision and objectives.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	146	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, 'The need to preserve and enhance the character of the borough's high quality natural and historic built environment...'	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	179	Yes	Yes	(Revised comment) English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, 'The need to preserve and enhance the character of the borough's high quality natural and historic built environment...'. However, we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve' as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place within the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Change preserve to 'conserve' where appropriate in order to make the terminology more consistent with the NPPF.	Change preserve to 'conserve' where appropriate.	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agree to change
2.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	146	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, 'The need to preserve and enhance the character of the borough's high quality natural and historic built environment....'	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	179	Yes	Yes	(Revised comment) English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, 'The need to preserve and enhance the character of the borough's high quality natural and historic built environment....'. However, we would prefer conserve to preserve as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place within the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is recommended that the wording in the plan be amended to use conserve instead of preserve.	Where 'protect' or 'preserve' is used, change to ' conserve ' unless it refers to specific wording in legislation (such as the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990).	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agree to change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
2.6	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	N/A	N/A	658243	745	Yes	No	HCC does not consider that Para 2.6 and Objective O give enough detail defining the full extent of the historic environment, these only deal with the built historic environment.	Amend objective O with the following text: '...farm buildings and cottages distinctive of our rural areas. This highly varied resource ranges from conservation areas and listed buildings including the large country houses, numerous brick, flint and timber framed farm buildings and cottages distinctive of our rural areas, to archaeological sites from the monumental like Silchester Roman town to local assets such as the Roman Roads that can still be traced today.'	It is proposed to amended the wording of policy EM11 and the supporting text in order to reflect the need to ensure that the full range of heritage assets are properly addressed, including the insertion of specific paragraphs in relation to archaeology. Therefore, it is considered that such amendments will suitably address the concerns raised. In addition, reference to Silchester is made in paragraph 1.24.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
2.6	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	15	Yes	No	The vision and objectives are laudable and their linkage to specific policies is explicit. The same is not true here, so similar tables are needed - either linking issues to policies or to objectives.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The 'Objectives' address the issues outlined in paragraph 2.6. Accordingly, Table 1 in paragraph 2.9 on page 20 already addresses the point made.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.6	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	591	Yes	No	Refers to the historic built environment as opposed to heritage assets more generally.	The wording needs to be amended to reflect the full range of heritage assets.	Delete 'built' from bullet point 8 of paragraph. Archaeology has now been addressed in more detail in EM11, which is considered to suitably address the concerns raised.	delete 'built' in order to convey the full breadth of the scope of heritage assets, as per the NPPF and English Heritage guidance in relation to the historic environment.	In response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agree to change
2.6	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	591	Yes	No	Refers to the historic built environment as opposed to heritage assets more generally.	The wording needs to be amended to reflect the full range of heritage assets.	It is recommended that the word 'built' be removed in order to indicate that all heritage assets are covered.	Remove references to 'built'.	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agree to change
2.6	N/A	Dr Roger Walters	N/A	N/A	784665	245	Yes	No	The development of Basingstoke and the surrounding areas over the last 30 years has been characterised by the steady loss of the wide manufacturing base, the loss of large multi-national company bases and the closure of central government offices. There is an excess of often poor quality and expensive office space especially within Basingstoke but also in the rural "villages". There has been a failure to progress the development of fast broadband and other communication technologies that are essential if businesses are to be attracted to Basingstoke. The effect has been to condemn Basingstoke to become a dormitory town whose residents travel to work elsewhere; more and more of the residents need to travel to employment in London, the Thames Valley and the south of Hampshire.	There is a need for the Borough Council to fully understand develop a clear vision of the future potential of Basingstoke as a centre for employment both in manufacturing and the service sector and use this information as the basis for the planning of all aspects of the borough's infrastructure. The idea that redevelopment of Basing View in isolation will bring about significant change this is manifestly absurd. A better use of this area of the town is already envisaged by the proposed retail developments. Perhaps it is time to consider the site as one on which a new modern hospital for the residents of North Hampshire could be best located.	The economic strategy of the plan has been reviewed following consultation, in light of a revised Employment Land Review. The plan has therefore been updated, including the introductory section, and further views from the respondent would be welcomed during the reconsultation.	Changes have been made to the summary of issues at 2.6 and Objective A. Issues at 2.6 now read "The need to ensure that the current diverse local economy is able to grow and develop in the future to maintain prosperity through the provision and protection of employment sites and premises that meet the needs of both established businesses and inward investors. The regeneration and or redevelopment of regenerating existing employment areas for employment uses (such as Basing View) and the need to allocate a new employment site to meet the needs of the storage and distribution sector, rather than identifying new sites. The scope to take advantage of the opportunities provided by 'smart growth sustainable economic growth', in addition to a continued trend for greater working from home in service based sectors". Objective A reads "Maintain and enhance the borough's position as a prosperous economic centre with a diverse economy by supporting a range of employment sectors through the availability of employment land and premises of the right quality, type, location and size. This will be delivered through the protection and regeneration and/or redevelopment of the established strategic employment areas (such as Basing View) and the allocation of a new employment sites through a future DPD".	Response to rep and new evidence.	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.6	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	N/A	N/A	786050	1130	Yes	No	Para 2.6 identifies that in Mach 2013 there were 6,900 households on the housing register. By the council's own admission this is an exaggeration. Fewer than 4,000 ever bid for housing association houses for which they are eligible. Under the Localism Act Councils no longer need to accept applicants from outside the area. This has led to double counting throughout the country in recent years. The BDBC is currently consulting on changes to the housing list eligibility so 6,900 will reduce substantially. Gradually falling household size is misleading and not supported by the latest evidence. Figures released by the DCLG in April 2013 confirmed the decline in household formation and increasing household size over the last 10 years. We do not believe the Borough Officers have taken this into account in the housing target.	Regular reviews of the housing statistics. Take account of current trends away from smaller household sizes.	The issues addressed within the representation will be discussed in more detail in the borough's Strategic Housing Market Assessment . The borough's objectively assessed housing need has been derived as a result of numerous factors (see section 4 of the Local Plan), and is underpinned by detailed analysis produced by Edge Analytics who undertook independent demographic forecasting for the council.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	607	Yes	No	ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE AND DISTINCTIVE This document is "Plan" with "Objectives" but has no commitment to apply resources either to increase areas of sustainable natural green space or wetlands for wildlife or for enjoyment. On Old Down at Kempshot we know we have visitors from: Oakley, North Waltham, Cliddesden, Popley, Oakridge, Winklebury, South Ham and the Town Centre. The NPPF says there should be a balance between economy, society and environment. WE do not see a balance. If the Council can commit to provide new housing for people that takes away habitat then it can and should provide new housing for wildlife displaced and driven to near extinction by people. Additionally waterways objectives are about pollution and should also be about habitats and species as well. Ignores the real habitat and species losses Borough itself has recorded. Ignores the disconnection between nature and people that is absent from discourse and thinking in the town.	The Council should commit under Environmentally Responsible and Distinctive to provide new natural green spaces for wildlife to thrive and for all ages to enjoy, experience and learn about. It should also commit to restoring water habitats and species.	It is considered that this issue is addressed through policies EM4 and EM5 and the council's Green Infrastructure Strategy. Whilst the comments are noted, it is not considered that they necessitate changing the paragraph.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	637355	205	Yes	No	Paragraph 2.8 talks about reducing the risk of pollution in the waterways. Yet, chapter 4 - "Delivery of the Strategy" contradicts the delivery of this objective. Paragraph 4.10 states that sewage treatment is: "currently failing to meet 'good' status under the Water Framework Directive" and admits that "there is no way of preventing this increase which is potentially damaging the biodiversity of the river". This is an astonishing admission; there has been no serious attempt to address this problem, with no published plans to alleviate the situation. We are in effect being told that the 13464 houses in the Plan will be built whatever the effect on the river Loddon. This cannot be justified, nor is it consistent with National Policy. This also contradicts Policy EM6, Water Quality.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The council's Water Cycle Study 2009 addresses the issue of water quality in detail. In addition, the council has engaged in an on-going dialogue with the relevant water companies and the Environment Agency in respect to water quality. Furthermore, policies SS4 and EM6 specifically address the issue of water quality and the relevant stakeholders have supported this approach. The site specific policies also address this issue where relevant.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	N/A	N/A	641907	979	Yes	No	Supports objectives F and I. In Objective H, specific mention should be made to affordable housing to ensure the objectives reflect the need for such housing.	In Objective H, specific mention should be made to affordable housing to ensure the objectives reflect the need for such housing.	Comment noted. Affordable housing is a significant issue, and is addressed comprehensively in policy CN1. However, there is no need to change the objective as it does not imply any priority. Affordable housing is covered by the term ' mix of tenure'.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	148	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, Objective O "Proactively manage the boroughs rich historic and built environment.....", although the examples cited of the highly varied resource should include archaeological sites such as Silchester Roman Town.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is proposed to amend the wording of policy EM11 and the supporting text in order to reflect the need to ensure that the full range of heritage assets are properly addressed, including the insertion of specific paragraphs in relation to archaeology. Therefore, it is considered that such amendments will suitably address the concerns raised. In addition, reference to Silchester is made in paragraph 1.24.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	148	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, Objective O "Proactively manage the borough's rich historic and built environment..... although the examples cited of the highly varied resource should include archaeological sites such as Silchester Roman Town.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is proposed to amend the wording of policy EM11 and the supporting text in order to reflect the need to ensure that the full range of heritage assets are properly addressed, including the insertion of specific paragraphs in relation to archaeology. Therefore, it is considered that such amendments will suitably address the concerns raised. In addition, reference to Silchester is made in paragraph 1.24.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (If changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
2.8	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	N/A	N/A	648691	815	Yes	No	Point B under Paragraph 2.8 raises the point of addressing issues around Junction 6 of the M3. This is a vague statement that we take to mean the fact the junction is heavily trafficked at peak hours. Do not consider the plan goes far enough in setting out how it is to deal with this problem. Policy SS3.10 relating to the Manydown development seeks to safeguard land for a potential western by-pass for Basingstoke. However, the plan makes no firm commitment to providing the western bypass, which we consider to be a major omission of the plan, as the bypass would deal with a number of current excessive traffic issues (especially Junction 6 of the M3) while also increasing the prosperity of Basingstoke. A western bypass would go some way to mitigating the impact that a number of planned developments for Basingstoke would have on the current road infrastructure.	Local Plan needs to make a firmer commitment to ensuring that a western bypass for Basingstoke comes forward as early as possible in the lifespan of the Local Plan in order to free up capacity at Junction 6 of the M3, and make Junction 7 of the M3 more attractive to use than is currently the case. This is especially the case because of the planned expansion of Basingstoke and the impact this will have on the existing road infrastructure. A firmer commitment to the western bypass would ensure the plan was sound from the being positively prepared perspective. Local Plan needs to be clearer on what exactly is meant under point B of paragraph 2.8 by 'issues around junction 6 of the M3'.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is also supplemented by the council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The site specific policies identify a number of potential highways improvements. Given that the bypass is not required in relation to the proposals outlined for the current plan period, Policy SS3.10 is considered appropriate in that it ensures that the ability to connect a link road to the south in the future is not prejudiced.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Mr Michael Wales	N/A	N/A	784586	192	Yes	No	Transport Infrastructure is not sound or effective in the following areas: - Existing Ring Road insufficient capacity - New Addition to Ring Road to add additional capacity - A33 to Reading and A339 to Newbury to add additional capacity and road safety	The Existing Ring Road needs to be completed with flyovers at the following junctions- Hackwood Road, Winchester Road, Morrisons, A339/ Ring Road North. It is 40 years since the Ring Road was started and it is a disgrace these flyovers have not been built although promised in the original plans. With the expansion proposed there will be sever traffic delays / disruption which is occurring now and will adversely effect the economic development of the town. New Ring Road needed at the West of the Town, to join the M3 at a new junction area already set aside on the Motorway - to join the A339 Newbury Road. This to provide the traffic capability to avoid traffic having to cross the town to get to Newbury / villages / developments at the Western Side of Town. The A33 to Reading and A339 to Newbury need to be upgraded to dual carriageway to accommodate the additional traffic that both expansion of Basingstoke will bring and the additional housing developments in the rest of the M3 environs.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Policy CN8 also addresses this issue. Whilst the comments are noted, it is considered that they do not necessitate amending this paragraph.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	Mr Michael Wales	N/A	N/A	784586	209	Yes	No	Providing sustainable and fully accessible transport opportunities is not explained or adequately supported in the documents.	As a minimum a 'Park and Ride' interchange should be provided in the vicinity of Junction 6 to the M3. Such a 'Park and Ride' interchange would allow travellers to leave their cars during the day / evenings and travel to both business and leisure facilities. An integrated facility would allow buses to interconnect with the railway station, town centre (Top of Town / Festival Place / The Malls), business parks. The documents only refer to considering the existing 'Park and Ride' which is not a very good facility and shares car parking with leisure facilities and requires users to travel to the west of the Town to access it. I consider an effective 'Park and Ride' such as in York catches travellers before they enter the local road system.	The site specific policies set out requirements to provide for non-car transport modes, including through improvements to cycle and pedestrian routes. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Efforts are also being made to improve public transport, as evidenced by policy SS10 Chineham Railway Station.	No change	N/A	Remains outstanding	
2.8	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	589	Yes	No	Objective O only deals with the built historic environment.	Objective O could be amended in order to include the following: "This highly varied resource ranges from conservation areas and listed buildings including the large country houses, numerous brick, flint and timber framed farm buildings and cottages distinctive of our rural areas, to archaeological sites from the monumental like Silchester Roman town to local assets such as the Roman roads that can still be traced today."	It is proposed to amended the wording of policy EM11 and the supporting text in order to reflect the need to ensure that the full range of heritage assets are properly addressed, including the insertion of specific paragraphs in relation to archaeology. Therefore, it is considered that such amendments will suitably address the concerns raised. In addition, reference to Silchester is made in paragraph 1.24.	No change	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
2.8	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	589	Yes	No	Objective O only deals with the built historic environment.	Objective O could be amended in order to include the following: "This highly varied resource ranges from conservation areas and listed buildings including the large country houses, numerous brick, flint and timber framed farm buildings and cottages distinctive of our rural areas, to archaeological sites from the monumental like Silchester Roman town to local assets such as the Roman roads that can still be traced today."	It is proposed to amended the wording of policy EM11 and the supporting text in order to reflect the need to ensure that the full range of heritage assets are properly addressed, including the insertion of specific paragraphs in relation to archaeology. Therefore, it is considered that such amendments will suitably address the concerns raised. In addition, reference to Silchester is made in paragraph 1.24.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.8	N/A	The Basingstoke Jersey Limited Partnership	N/A	N/A	787221	1012	Yes	Yes	We support the Council's strategic objective relating to the strengthening the role of the Town Centre and the requirement to achieve a well-connected town centre. We consider this is in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF, thus ensuring compliance with national policy in relation to the delivery of local plans.	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.8	N/A	Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	N/A	787467	1069	Yes	No	Festival Place Unit Trust generally supports the Objectives of the Local Plan. The LP (3.8) recognises that Basingstoke Town Centre should continue to be the main focus for retail development and a key location for leisure and entertainment uses, and that Festival Place plays an important role in underpinning its vitality and viability as a regional shopping centre (LP 1.26). Festival Place is therefore pivotal to providing and developing a more diverse and attractive retail, cultural and leisure offer, an attractive environment and improving connectivity. The Local Plan should promote the principle of further investment and development at Festival Place, and elsewhere in the town centre. To do so would ensure that the Local Plan adopts a sound planned approach to identifying the town centre use requirements and allocating a range of suitable sites to meet those needs in full, as part of promoting a competitive town centre environment.	The introduction of a new middle sentence is inserted to Objective D (LP 2.8) so that D reads: "Strengthen Basingstoke Town Centre's role as a destination of choice, for residents, workers and those living outside the borough for retail, culture and leisure. New investment and development at Festival Place and elsewhere within the Town Centre is secured to enhance Basingstoke's regional shopping centre offer. Progress the Central Area Vision and the new Town Centre Programme to achieve a well-connected, vibrant and attractive town centre, while supporting a distinctive cultural and historic area at the Top of the town. To ensure this Objective is consistent with national policy and reflects the Local Plan evidence base.	Whilst the council recognises the importance of Festival Place, it is not considered appropriate to be overly specific in the objectives, and consequently, the existing wording is regarded as suitable. More specific reference to Festival Place is made in the supporting text of policy EP3.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.9	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	16	Yes	No	There is no explicit link between these issues and policies	A table such as that done lining objectives to policies. There's also needs to be some quantitative measures to monitor improvement annually	The 'Objectives' address the issues outlined in paragraph 2.6. Accordingly, Table 1 in paragraph 2.9 on page 20 already addresses the point made. Each policy in the plan will be subject to monitoring in line with the implementation and monitoring boxes included at the end of each policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
2.9	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update Table 1 - Policies to deliver the objectives to include Ney Policy CN4 and EM2 against relevant objectives and update existing policy numbers.	to correct omissions and changes to policy numbers	N/A	N/A
3.1	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	921	Not Specified	Not Specified	On housing whilst the draft talks about housing for all as an objective, seeking to restrain housing growth at Tadley due to AWE safety reasons may not be wholly realistic. It would appear that more needs to be done by the relevant authorities to calibrate the degree of risk associated with most likely disaster scenarios at AWE and provide an appropriate policy response and guidance. In this connection it is queried what research has been done to investigate how development planning manages high risk sites in other areas and what can be learnt from such investigations coupled with the long track record of good safety at AWE .	intentionally left blank	As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan, 'the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will need to be met elsewhere in the borough'. The Plan needs to outline a deliverable housing strategy in order to be NPPF compliant and be found sound. The Council will continue to work with the relevant authorities to respond to this issue.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	Member of Parliament	N/A	121767	422	Not Specified	No	There is much to be welcomed in the new plan to 2029, and with the abolition of housing targets, it is clear that it should be for local communities to decide what sort of development that want. The draft plan recognises the undoubted need to meet the needs of our growing and ageing population. However, I have concerns around the scale of new housing development and issue linked to infrastructure, transport, the environment and biodiversity, including water quality and sewage treatment. Infrastructure has not kept pace with development.	intentionally left blank	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The NPPF states that population and demographic changes should be fully met. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper. The Plan sets out the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives, based upon the Plan's evidence base including the sustainability appraisal and site assessment process which considered alternative scenarios and the impact of potential housing allocations on the landscape, biodiversity etc. Improvements to local infrastructure are supported by the council's IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Mrs Anne Francis	N/A	N/A	139935	208	Yes	No	Although the local plan states the intention to protect existing open spaces and depicts this graphically it does not consider the need for a buffer zone around these spaces. Without the buffer zone the impact of development could affect the open space directly.	Please introduce a buffer zone (e.g. 50m) around existing open spaces which would be included in any plans and measures to mitigate the effects of development on the local area.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policies EM5 and EM10 sufficiently address these matters.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
3.1	N/A	Dr Tom Ridler	N/A	N/A	406827	134	Yes	No	Insufficient account has been taken of LOCAL need - the number are based on the Borough as a whole. Need should be more closely linked to jobs - it should not encourage excessive cross borough traffic.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The methodology for deriving a local housing requirement is to take account of the full borough's objectively assessed need. More information can be found in the Housing topic paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Mrs Jill Eckersley	N/A	N/A	440684	70	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comment noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.1	N/A	Mrs Jane Fletcher	N/A	N/A	641462	345	Not Specified	No	Does not consider the Plan to be sound as there is a preference for large scale developments. This type of development goes against the idea of having the least effect on the surrounding landscape. Basingstoke Golf Course will be a large development with a severe impact on highways, landscape and many other issues. There is a need for small scale development in the villages to sustain communities. These seem to be declined. Sympathetic developments on a small scale added to existing villages are need at they would cause the least harm, more consideration should be given to these applications. Allows for growth and the ability to sustain organically and sympathetically the villages. Young and old people need to be given the opportunity to remain in the villages.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan sets out the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives, following the outcomes of the detailed site assessment and sustainability appraisal processes. The Plan also takes into account such issues as infrastructure capacity including transport impacts and mitigation, landscape and biodiversity studies. The Plan includes the requirement for 150 units to be provided in the borough's smaller settlements through neighbourhood planning and other policies, such as SS6 (Housing in the Countryside) allow for suitable development outside of the borough's larger defined settlements.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	980	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.1	N/A	Mr Clive Fletcher	N/A	N/A	784814	309	Yes	No	The Plan focuses future development on larger existing settlements. Smaller settlements should also be included so as to allow them to the chance to evolve.	The Plan needs to include suitable sites from smaller settlements.	The Plan sets out the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives, following the outcomes of the detailed site assessment and sustainability appraisal processes. The Plan also takes into account such issues as infrastructure capacity including transport impacts and mitigation, landscape and biodiversity studies. The Plan includes the requirement for 150 units to be provided in the borough's smaller settlements through neighbourhood planning and other policies, such as SS6 (Housing in the Countryside) allow for suitable development outside of the borough's larger defined settlements.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	401	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.1	N/A		Bovis Homes and Pye Homes Ltd	N/A	786429	731	Yes	No	Tadley is a sustainable settlement appropriate for accommodating additional development and there is no evidence to justify the exclusion of Tadley from the Spatial Strategy. Despite the recognition that Tadley is a sustainable location, and the fact there Tadley has its own local housing needs, there is no mention of Tadley at all within the Local Plan spatial strategy explanatory text nor within the Greenfield Site Allocations at Policy SS3. Tadley is also omitted from the list of settlements specifically identified in Policy SS5 Neighbourhood Planning to make a contribution towards the housing needs of the Borough. The omission of Tadley from the spatial strategy cannot be justified. Additionally, the re-drafting of Policy SS7 acknowledges that it is not necessary to refuse all applications for development but that proposals will be considered on their merits on the basis of their individual characteristics and the submission of an appropriate Off Site Nuclear Emergency Plan.	New Section after 4.18 'Tadley' The addition of text to recognise the status of Tadley as a sustainable District Centre within the settlement hierarchy, its role in maintaining and enhancing prosperity, serving day to day needs of its local population and providing access to services for neighbouring areas across and beyond the borough (Paragraph 7.25 refers). Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning The addition of: 'f) Tadley - approximately 200 homes'	As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan, the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will need to be met elsewhere in the borough. The Plan needs to outline a deliverable housing strategy in order to be NPPF compliant and be found sound.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.1	N/A	Mr Peter Lord	N/A	Southern Planning	787067	934	Not Specified	Yes	Our client supports the overall strategy of the Plan to concentrate most of the new development in and around Basingstoke and the larger settlements of Whitchurch, Overton, Bramley, Kingsclere and Oakley. These places have the greatest range of facilities to support the increase in housing, economic development and community facilities proposed in the Plan. Our client supports the strategy for the smaller villages, such as Echchinswell, where: - development will continue to be restricted to that required to meet local needs, and - the need for and location of new development will be identified by the community through neighbourhood planning.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.2	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	279	Yes	No	Paragraph 3.2 states that new development will be directed to previously developed land first, and encourage the regeneration of neighbourhoods whilst delivering new and sustainable communities around the borough's main settlement. However, it is considered that it is exactly this strategy that has resulted in unsustainable infrastructure and quality of life in Bramley parish and in particular the village environs. Should this strategy continue into the next plan period it will have the effect of joining the surrounding villages, no longer rural in nature, with Basingstoke thus creating another conurbation which will over time leave little green space north of the M3 motorway to the borders of adjoining counties.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan sets out the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives, in light of the findings of the Local Plan evidence base including the site assessment and sustainability appraisal processes.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.2	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	983	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.3	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	17	Yes	No	This paragraph is a mouthful and not clear. Our parish is not a "designated neighbourhood planning area" and we are not a "new rural community" so do we get a greater say?	Rewording in simpler language to make intentions unambiguous. Allowing all communities to have a greater say.	Agree and update text to improve clarity.	Updated text: <u>The Local Plan supports neighbourhood planning and provides the framework for the development of neighbourhood plans and orders, including community right to build. This approach enables local communities to have a greater say in shaping and managing development within their local area.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.3	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	140	Yes	No	The word 'new' in 'and new rural and urban communities' is misleading, it gives the impression that NP opportunities apply only to 'new communities'. This may seem a trivial change but its important that the LP is readily understandable by all residents.	Replace 'new' with 'additional', as in: 'and additional rural and urban communities'	Agree and update text to improve clarity.	Updated text: <u>The Local Plan supports neighbourhood planning and provides the framework for the development of neighbourhood plans and orders, including community right to build. This approach enables local communities to have a greater say in shaping and managing development within their local area.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.4	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	insert and replace existing wording after 'a key ambition of the Local Plan is to support the' the following "regeneration or redevelopment of the established employment sites for future employment uses. The regeneration of Basing View will result in the creation of a 21st Century business park in the centre of Basingstoke and provide up to 4000 additional jobs in the borough. Growth in the local economy will be predominantly through sustainable economic growth".	to reflect other changes made in the plan for consistency.	N/A	N/A
3.5	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	923	Not Specified	Not Specified	Policy SS6 provides for new housing in the countryside with paras 4.57 & 4.58 adopting a pragmatic approach to this subject in spite of Para 3.5 of the Plan stating that the focus in rural areas will be to provide support to new & existing businesses implying that providing homes in rural areas is of lesser importance.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comment noted. Paragraph 3.5 of the plan relates specifically to the rural economy and does not imply that providing homes in rural areas is of lesser importance. Policy SS6 deals with new housing in the countryside outside of SPB's and Policies EP4 and EP5 deal with the rural economy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	149	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, the statement "We will protect and enhance the borough's... heritage assets...., although we would prefer 'protect, conserve and enhance' as 'conserve' indicates proactive management whilst 'protect' suggests more a more reactive position.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agree and update text to improve clarity.	Update wording as follows: 3.6 We will ~~conserve~~ ~~protect~~ and enhance the borough's environmental	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
3.6	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	149	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, the statement "We will protect and enhance the borough's.....heritage assets...., although we would prefer "protect, conserve and enhance as conserve indicates proactive management whilst protect suggests more a more reactive position.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed. It is recommended that the wording in the plan be amended to use conserve instead of preserve.	Where 'protect' or 'preserve' is used, change to 'conserve' unless it refers to specific wording in legislation (such as the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990).	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
3.6	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	647	Not Specified	Yes	We are pleased that new development will respect the environment and the impact of the new development on the water bodies will be monitored closely and limited through careful phasing. Paragraph 3.6 should refer to careful phasing of residential development and not just Greenfield development. The strategy should recognise that additional large scale Brownfield redevelopment may also have WFD implications - although we appreciate that the Water Cycle Study assessed impacts in respect of number of dwellings, not whether the development was Greenfield or Brownfield. Therefore, later policies should concentrate on delivery of housing in number terms as opposed to release of Greenfield land should the phasing policy SS4 be triggered.	"3.6...careful phasing of residential development."	Agree to make a change.	Update wording as follows: "...environments will be limited through careful phasing of <u>residential development</u> . <u>Greenfield development</u> . This approach will ensure that....	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change.
3.7	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	924	Not Specified	Not Specified	Para 3.7 of the Plan states that all additional infrastructure and services required to serve any new development will be provided but is silent on the mechanisms for achieving this.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The detail on infrastructure provision is set out in the supporting evidence base including the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.7	N/A	Mrs Jaki Robbins	N/A	N/A	632517	30	No	No	This plan is not deliverable, as the council has not enough money to complete all the needed infrastructure. The East side of Basingstoke is struggling with its roads, doctors surgeries, schools etc, in fact the majority of Basingstoke is. To have roads already groaning under heavy use, the extra roadworks and construction traffic will bring Basingstoke to a standstill. Build all the houses on Manydown land, release the money, and stop putting so much infrastructure strain on the current residents.	Build all the houses on Manydown, enough money would be released from the sale of the land to complete all the infrastructure needed for now and into the future, including the Western by pass.	The distribution of housing and sites relates to several considerations including land availability and site capacity. The housing requirement cannot be met on one single site or just on smaller developments. The site assessment work, SHLAA and sustainability appraisal have informed the selection of sites. Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The IDP sets out further detail.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.7	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	282	Yes	No	Paragraph 3.7 states that "New Infrastructure will be provided to serve new development when it is required." Also in Chapter 4, it is stated that: 4.4 "The strategy includes the development of three major new housing areas to the west, east and south west of Basingstoke, each [of] which will provide opportunities to create the high quality neighbourhoods of the future, supported by the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs [of] existing and future residents" The proposed plan speaks of mitigation but neither offers meaningful suggestion as to how mitigation will be achieved nor "necessary infrastructure" delivered. Without such proposals the Plan cannot be considered sound or justified.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The detail on infrastructure provision is set out in the supporting evidence base including the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.8	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	644	Not Specified	No	Overton is mentioned in many within the Plan as a District Centre with many services and facilities to support its population and that of the surrounding villages. But there is no certainty that the services and facilities will continue as now especially if most of the population get frustrated by the inadequate parking and ... to shop elsewhere. Overton has not been designated for any commercial development - Whitchurch has - and this is detrimental to Overton's long term viability.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base and 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.9	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	1294	Not Specified	No	Site unsuitable due to central location of sewage plant and incinerator making the site completely unsuitable for residential development. Site should be removed and replaced with BAS 133 Hounsme Fields site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Neighbouring uses were considered in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. This matters is covered by criterion n) of the site policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.11	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	920	Not Specified	Not Specified	The Plan refers to support for and provision of high quality health facilities but it does not appear to have undertaken any detailed work to try and help remodel health and social care with primary & secondary health care providers in light of above forecast demographic changes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The evidence base to support the provision of health care facilities is contained within the IDP. This work is undertaken in liaison with the relevant partners.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.11	N/A	Mr Michael Wales	N/A	N/A	784586	194	Yes	No	Specifically supporting proposals that seek to support energy and heat production from waste is in my view unnecessarily restrictive.	To support 'green energy' and address climate change, a broader approach should be taken to include: Supporting "Solar Farms, Solar Panels on domestic and industrial premises, Wind Farms and energy from waste (domestic, green, animal and industrial)	Comment noted. This paragraph has been amended to reflect other changes to the Local Plan including policy EM8.	Update Para 3.11 to reflect the changes made to the policies in the plan. Delete the wording from "The Local Plan seeks to support measures, where appropriate...."	Response to representation and for consistency throughout the plan.	N/A	Remains outstanding
3.13	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1073	Yes	No	Festival Place Unit Trust notes that the Leisure Park is described as being the 'primary focus' for any major new leisure facilities. However, leisure and entertainment uses are main town centre uses (as defined in the NPPF glossary) which the NPPF (23-27) and Local Plan policy EP3 direct to existing town centres wherever possible in the first instance. Any leisure development at the established Leisure Park should complement the town centre offer. As the Basingstoke Retail Study Update (December 2013) advises "The underlying objective of policy at all levels is to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres, as well as to promote new development in town centre locations first" (Para 2.24). Currently, the wording of Para 3.13 is inconsistent with the NPPF and unjustified when considered against the Local Plan evidence base.	The following amendments are made to Local Plan paras 3.8 and 3.13: "...As the largest centre, Basingstoke will continue to be the main focus for new retail development, and for leisure and entertainment uses..." (3.8) "Cultural and leisure facilities will be protected and enhanced, meeting the needs of residents and encouraging additional visitors to the borough by offering new and exciting leisure opportunities; this will help protect such services and ensure their long term retention. Basingstoke Town Centre will continue to be the main focus for any major new leisure facilities for the borough. If sites are not available within the town centre, or in edge of centre locations, leisure uses will be directed to the Leisure Park, so long as there is no significant adverse impact on the Town Centre or any other centre. The potential for different types of private and public sector leisure uses will be supported." (3.13)	Comment noted. This paragraph has been amended to reflect other changes to the Local Plan including policy EP3 and SS9.	Update Para 3.13 to reflect the changes made to the policies in the plan, as follows: The Leisure Park in Basingstoke will continue to be a ~~the~~ <u>primary</u> focus for <u>any</u> major new leisure facilities for the borough and the potential for different types of private and public sector leisure uses will be supported.	Response to rep and consistency throughout the plan.	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	Mr James Stevens	N/A	N/A	86266	856	Not Specified	No	There is an expectation that local planning authorities will attempt to mitigate or resolve obstacles through its plan in order to meet their objectively assessed needs in full. Water issues are questions that can only be properly addressed at a wider than local basis. This is a matter that should be addressed through the duty to cooperate (as the section of the dNPPG entitled When is an issue a strategic matter on which cooperation is required?). It is also unclear from the plan and the supporting papers to what extent the capacity of water treatment facilities has suppressed the objective need (i.e. how many homes). It is unclear how this issue influenced the Council's decision to adopt the figure of 748 dpa as being representative of the borough's objective need. We are concerned that the Council might have used the issue of water treatment capacity as a reason not to consider one of the higher scenarios set out in the Demographic Analysis & Forecasts paper.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	85	Yes	No	The plan highlights failings in the local sewerage provision, yet has not plan to address this problem. Housing built with no due regard to the effect on the River Loddon cannot be justified and is not consistent with national policy. This is also contradicts Policy EM6, Water Quality	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy EM6 is relevant and states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The Water Cycle Study supports this proposed level of development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.1	N/A	Mrs Henrietta Pullan	N/A	N/A	636570	365	Yes	No	There is already pressure on the river Loddon from the sewage treatment works and failure to meet "good" status. Housing in Bramley (SS5) plus SS3.3 and 3.8 will put intolerable strain on this situation and will result in a certain detrimental impact.	The housing allocation at Manydown should be increased to the usual amount per hectare and start earlier. The idea that Manydown cannot begin until a 'masterplan' is in place is unfair as the areas north and east of Basingstoke make up a large combined area which will have no such benefit and can be started straight away. Manydown should be allocated for 4000 houses as stated by the 'builders' and the houses proposed at SS3.3 and 3.8 should be removed from the plan, as this will alleviate a potential traffic nightmare in relation to the A33 at Chineham.	Policy EM6 is relevant and states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The Water Cycle Study supports this proposed level of development. The distribution of housing and sites relates to several considerations including land availability and site capacity. The site assessment work, SHLAA and sustainability appraisal have informed the selection of sites.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	286	Yes	No	Paragraph 4.1 states that "The housing figure [748 per annum] recognises the constraints on growth imposed by the existing infrastructure of the borough." The housing figure as it relates to Bramley parish and in particular the village environs takes no account of the constraints which are imposed by existing poor infrastructure nor the worsening effect that further development will bring to the area. The plan does not also adequately address the constraints imposed by the existing major road network throughout the borough, in particular the A33 as it approaches the borders of Basingstoke and surrounding settlements.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted. Infrastructure has been considered throughout the process and this is set out in the IDP. Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The IDP sets out further detail.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	60	No	No	The paragraph states that sewage treatment is "currently failing to meet 'good' status under the Water Framework Directive" and admits that "there is no way of preventing this increase which is potentially damaging to the biodiversity of the river". This is an extraordinary admission; there has been no serious attempt to address this problem, with no published plans to alleviate the situation. We are in effect been told that the 13,464 houses in the Plan will be built whatever the effect on the river Loddon. This cannot be justified, nor is it consistent with National Policy. This is also contradicts Policy EM6, Water Quality.	A plan be put in place as to how the Borough intend meeting their responsibilities under the Water Framework Directive to maintain water quality.	Policy EM6 is relevant and states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The Water Cycle Study supports this proposed level of development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	93	Yes	No	The plan highlights failings in the local sewerage provision, yet has no plan to address this problem. Housing built with no due regard to the effect on the River Loddon cannot be justified and is not consistent with national policy. This is also contradicts Policy EM6, Water Quality	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy EM6 is relevant and states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The Water Cycle Study supports this proposed level of development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.1	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	649	Not Specified	Yes	We support the inclusion of Para 4.10 which recognises that the housing numbers are limited by existing infrastructure and the effect of the sewage treatment works at Chineham into the River Loddon which is currently failing to meet "good" status under the WFD.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.2	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	162	Yes	No	The word 'suitable' is open to interpretation and is not needed, since the sentence is already conditioned by the concluding phrase, "where appropriate".	For the avoidance of misinterpretation and in the interests of good English, remove the work 'suitable'.	Comments noted. It is agreed to remove the word 'suitable'.	Remove the word 'suitable' from Para 4.2, last sentence.	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed to change
4.2	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	213	No	No	While there is a vague reference to making provision for a proportion of self-build units on three of the larger sites, Manydown, East of Basingstoke and the golf course. As there has been no evidence produced to support demand, nor an indication of what proportion we are think of. I fail to see how this will be achieved. In the recent past self-build mainly small builders were able to produce a large percentage of the total new, market housing stock. However in recent decades they have been excluded by planning policies that favour the large developers by allocating large strategic sites instead of smaller sites that are usually more acceptable to local residents anyway. Without a realistic figure to work to and by only considering large sites the small builders will struggle to survive.	Quantify the demand for self-build, it could not only provide an alternative but will also reduce the impact of land banking and the propensity of large developers to drip feed housing into the market to keep prices at their already inflated levels.	The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF. However, it would be inappropriate at this stage to quantify the level of demand for such units. Further work on this element will be progressed through the masterplanning of the larger sites.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.3	N/A	Mrs Henrietta Pullan	N/A	N/A	636570	366	Yes	No	The council is not allowing the local community to identify their own approach to the allocation of sites in Bramley, as site SS3.8 is located within Bramley parish, and yet is an allocated site.	The housing allocation at Manydown should be increased to the usual amount per hectare and start earlier. The idea that Manydown cannot begin until a 'masterplan' is in place is unfair as the areas north and east of Basingstoke make up a large combined area which will have no such benefit and can be started straight away. Manydown should be allocated for 4000 houses as stated by the 'builders' and the houses proposed at SS3.3 and 3.8 should be removed from the plan, as this will alleviate a potential traffic nightmare in relation to the A33 at Chineham.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.3	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	300	Yes	No	Paragraph 4.30 refers to the availability of services within Bramley. It can be demonstrated that these services are already stretched to the limit with the existing population. The plan offers no suggestion on or proposals as to how the services can be increased to meet new demands for development in the parish. Bramley's NDP application is for the whole parish not just the village, and whilst an allocation is preferable to a specific site it must be remembered that there are two specific sites allocated within the parish related to policies SS3.3 and SS3.8. Please also see response for SS5.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.3	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tellow King Planning	641907	993	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.3	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	103	Yes	No	Bramley already has insufficient infrastructure to support the recent growth in housing (schools, parking). The additional housing in the parish (Razors Farm and Cufaude Lane) will add significantly to this lack of infrastructure, increasing demands on schools, commuting etc. But funding from these houses will be diverted to support Basingstoke and not Bramley which will increase strain on the village. Funds from these houses must be directed to improve the Bramley infrastructure which these residents will expect to be able to access.	Ensure funds from Razors Farm and Cufaude Lane developments are spent on improving the infrastructure in Bramley parish, where these new residents will come for schooling, shopping, commuting etc	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	84	Yes	No	No details are given as to what form improvements to the local infrastructure will take, especially with regards to upgrading/improving the road network e.g. the A33. Without this, the plan cannot be deemed sound or justified.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The proposed infrastructure, phasing and funding is all set out in the IDP. Information on roads is provided in the Transport Assessment.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.4	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	285	Yes	No	Paragraph 3.7 states that "New Infrastructure will be provided to serve new development when it is required." Also in Chapter 4, it is stated that: 4.4 "The strategy includes the development of three major new housing areas to the west, east and south west of Basingstoke, each [of] which will provide opportunities to create the high quality neighbourhoods of the future, supported by the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs [of] existing and future residents" The proposed plan speaks of mitigation but neither offers meaningful suggestion as to how mitigation will be achieved nor "necessary infrastructure" delivered. Without such proposals the Plan cannot be considered sound or justified.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The proposed infrastructure, phasing and funding is all set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	289	Yes	No	Paragraph 4.4 states: "General infrastructure constraints including education, the historic road infrastructure which leads to local congestion and sewerage treatment will be addressed, where possible, in the site specific policies and through the IDP". Nowhere in the plan are there any meaningful suggestions for any infrastructure beyond such phrases as "measures to mitigate" or "include provision of physical infrastructure". Without real specific proposals with indications of sources of funding the plan cannot be considered sound or justified. We do not believe that such infrastructure issues as sewage treatment and drainage would, or can be, addressed on a site specific basis. The very real concern is that whilst services are delivered to a specific site as part of the build it is the significant adverse impact created when these are joined with the wider network serving existing development that this plan fails to address.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The proposed infrastructure, phasing and funding is all set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	994	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.4	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	59	No	No	Para 4.4 states: "The strategy includes the development of three major new housing areas to the west, east and south west of Basingstoke, each if which will provide opportunities to create the high quality neighbourhoods of the future, supported by the necessary infrastructure to meet the needs to existing and future residents." Nowhere in this plan are there any meaningful suggestions as to how this "necessary infrastructure" might be achieved. Without such proposals the Plan cannot be considered sound or justified.	There needs to be detailed costed proposals for the necessary infrastructure.	The proposed infrastructure, phasing and funding is set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	92	Yes	No	No details are given as to what form improvements to the local infrastructure will take, especially with regards to upgrading/improving the road network e.g. the A33. Without this, the plan cannot be deemed sound or justified.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The proposed infrastructure, phasing and funding is all set out in the IDP. Information on roads is provided in the Transport Assessment.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	164	Yes	No	The use of the expression 'The housing strategy' is inappropriate and misleading here. The Council has a 'housing strategy' which mainly concerns itself with social rented housing availability and allocation and with the alleviation of housing problems. As such it is a dynamic document and open to regular revision quite separately from and, in the main, independent of the LP.	Amend the opening of the paragraph to read: "Relevant policies of this Plan seek to maintain"	Agreed and paragraph updated accordingly	Update wording as follows: <u>Relevant policies of the Plan seek to</u> ~~The housing strategy will~~ maintain a network of sustainable towns and villages,	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.4	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	third line from bottom, the 'if' should be an 'of' and in the last line the last 'to' should be and 'of'.	typo	N/A	N/A
4.5	deleted	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	174	Yes	No	1. No local plan can provide 'certainty of delivery', as witnessed by the many sites locally and nationally where there has been no delivery on long-consented sites. 2. This local plan cannot provide "certainty to residents as to where and when development will take place", since many aspects of policy leave it to either the market to determine sites (windfalls) or such mechanisms as neighbourhood plans or community right to build. Indeed the housing numbers quite rightly depend on such mechanisms. Both statements are misleading in ways that can be seriously damaging to the reputation of the planning process and the local planning authority.	Remove the paragraph, it adds no value and diminishes the credibility of the plan.	Agree to delete.	Delete paragraph: ~~The Local Plan provides certainty of delivery but also certainty to residents as to where and when development will take place and the standards we expect to achieve.~~	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.5	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1203	Yes	No	Neighbourhood plans and orders including community right to build orders this is misleading since CRIBOs can be created without a NP, see other related comments. While experts may (and in some cases do) understand the subtleties, the LP should make sense to any resident who needs to understand it.	Amend to read "development of Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders, or Community Right to Build Orders (which can be made without a Neighbourhood Plan process)"	The wording is considered to be sufficiently clear as currently stated.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.6	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	216	Yes	No	There policy quotes consultation with the local communities as part of the justification for the housing number, but in fact the housing target has been constantly argued against by a majority of those whose opinion has been sought. The justification for such a large housing number is actually that the Borough believes that a lower target would be challenged by the planning inspector but is unwilling for political reasons to argue with a higher figure. The current population would seem as a result of consultation to be much more content with a growth figure of around 500 homes per year for the plan period, allowing the vast infrastructure deficit from the previous over-development periods to be corrected.	A local housing target of ~500 homes per year is a more realistic appraisal of the true need and a sustainable growth that infrastructure can keep pace with.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.6	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	995	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
SS3	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	830	Yes	No	Support the proposed 748 dwellings per annum target. However, this target is not achievable in the early years of the local plan, given the 3 most substantial housing developments (4,980 dwellings and approximately 37% of the total housing number) being delivered towards the end of the plan period (2020-2029) as set out in Policy SS3. Furthermore, it is likely that the houses required in policy SS5 will again come on board at the earliest around 2018-19. Unlikely that the 748 dwelling figure will be exceeded until the 2020s and the latter end of the lifecycle of the local plan. Council should be doing more to encourage housing development to come forward earlier in the plan period to ensure the 748 dwellings per annum target will be met or exceeded across the entire lifetime of the plan. The current strategy will certainly make it more difficult for the Council to demonstrate a continual 5 year supply of housing, a requirement of the NPPF, over the earlier stages of the plan.	The Local Plan needs to make much stronger emphasis for allowing housing development to take place on brownfield sites in sustainable locations across the borough, particularly over the early plan period. The Council should consider bringing forward at least one of the larger developments planned for Basingstoke to ensure housing numbers are compliant with the annual target across the plan period. Bringing forward a development such as the Manydown site would also potentially have the benefit of bringing forward a western bypass for Basingstoke (also see representations on paragraph 2.8), which would benefit not just the new developments, but Basingstoke as a whole.	A number of the housing allocations have been brought forward in terms of delivery, following the consultation.	See changes to the phasing of sites within Policy SS3.	In response to reps and further updated evidence	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.6	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	18	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change - just wish to comment that the methodology seems thorough and the end target is a good balance between the earlier figures of 594pa in the emerging plan of 2 years ago and the SE regional plan of 945pa.	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.6	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	890	Not Specified	Not Specified	No provision is made for the people affected by this plan to examine the assumptions fed into the modelling software that generates that generates the "requirements". It is a well established fact, for any modelling process, that small changes in initial conditions can often make a big difference to the final result. We would be able to satisfy ourselves that the final figure of 748 new houses per year is robust. Reducing local requirements by a few hindered houses can make a big difference to the local quality of life.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and updated SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.7	N/A	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Rydon Homes	N/A	749508	912	No	No	Consider that the local housing requirement of 748 dpa does not reflect an objectively assessed housing need. The housing figure should be more in line with the 5 year migration led scenario (983 dpa), which is evidenced in the Demographics Assessment 2013. Plan does not have adequate regard to unmet housing need from other authorities and meeting those housing needs. The 'What Homes Where' worksheet indicates that an average of 897 dwellings per annum needs to be achieved, representing a 16,146 dwellings over the plan period 2011-2029. The current plan provision of 13,464 undershoots this projection by 2,682. This assessment provides further evidence that a higher housing provision should be accounted for within the Local Plan. The SHLAA Jan 2013 identifies that, generally, there is the ability to plan for higher numbers based on the level of greenfield sites that can accommodate additional supply. See representation for more detailed justification.	The housing requirement provision of 748 dpa in its current form does not constitute a level of housing that has been objectively assessed. It is critical for Basingstoke to engage with neighbouring authorities to consider how it can assist in meeting any un-met housing need.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and updated SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.7	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	861	Not Specified	No	This housing requirement is in part based on findings from the Central Hampshire and New Forest SHMA published by DTZ in 2007 that have been updated (briefly) annually since. The SHMA reported an annual need of 580 affordable dwellings a year for a five year period. Gladman recommend that this evidence is updated in full to meet standards as outlined in Para 159 of the NPPF. Gladman have commissioned a report by Development Economics Ltd provided which concludes that higher housing targets are needed to fulfil employment growth aspirations, and that the housing requirement is inadequate to meet affordable housing need (in 2007 a shortfall of between 780-1130 between 2008 and 2013). The level of housing proposed has the potential to impact negatively upon the economic development and future prosperity of Basingstoke and Deane. It is therefore clear that the plan does not plan to meet the full objectively assessed housing need and is in conflict with the NPPF.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and updated SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.8	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1128	Yes	No	Recent History (10-15years) shows that even during an economic growth period the amount of business park accommodation in the borough has exceeded demand. Even newly built buildings with good infrastructure remain empty. The Basing View occupation rates calls into question the increase in 6,500 jobs over the plan period.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The employment section of the Plan has been updated following the completion of an updated Employment Land Review. There will be an opportunity to comment on the updates through the consultation on the Revised Pre-submission Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Richenda Power	Countryside Stewardship	N/A	85938	337	Yes	No	Table 2 (page 26) assumes development of all identified sites. No allowance is made for non implementation of sites, particularly unallocated and new allocations. An allowance of 10% to 15% should be made to allow for non implementation. This will obviously increase the supply requirement. Further, the most recently published demographic calculations should be reviewed and amendments made if needed.	Increase the requirement by 15%, i.e. (13,464-693)+15% = 14,671. Add line to include above and recalculate table.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMAA. Table 2 includes a non-delivery allowance of 10% on the urban/opportunity sites outlined in the SHLAA. Also, the Plan includes an over supply of sites and therefore has a buffer of approximately 500 units.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1227	Yes	No	It is noted in Table 2 on page 26 of the draft document that a total of 700 units are included within the supply as "small site windfalls". Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that LPAs may make an allowance for windfall sites in the 5 year supply if they have compelling evidence (my emphasis) that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. In the absence of evidence to confirm the availability of this source of supply, such sites are neither deliverable nor, developable. We would therefore question whether this approach satisfies the tests of soundness in the NPPF, particularly the 'Effective' test given the inherent uncertainties surrounding delivery from such sources within the plan period.	There is no compelling evidence to justify the inclusion of windfall sites in the overall land supply. On this basis, windfalls should be deleted from the housing supply, which is likely to result in the need for additional greenfield site(s) to meet the shortfall in the residual greenfield requirement over the plan period.	The SHLAA outlines why the inclusion of a windfall allowance is considered a robust approach. Further information is also contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1228	Yes	No	2,247 units are identified in the land supply as "urban/brownfield opportunities (un-allocated). It is unclear how this source of supply differs from the definition of "small site windfalls and how much reliance the Council can realistically place on the delivery of these units over the plan period. We have reviewed this component of the housing land supply and raise concerns regarding the deliverability of some of the sites for the following reasons: multiple ownership of some sites; The deliverability of all the sites in Tadley given the proximity to the AWE). policy constraints for some sites The Council's approach does not therefore satisfy the tests of soundness in the NPPF, particularly the 'Effective' test given the inherent uncertainties surrounding delivery from such housing land supply sources within the plan period.	In the absence of evidence to confirm the deliverability of these sources of supply and/or testing to justify that such sites are not unduly constrained, these sites are neither deliverable nor, developable and should not be included for the purposes of land supply.	The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. Opportunity Sites in the SHLAA have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Dr Tom Ridler	N/A	N/A	406827	135	Yes	No	The process started wrongly with too much emphasis on the SHLAA (that is to say seeking people who wanted to sell land) rather than planning for where the jobs are and where people need to live. This should have been followed with appropriate sustainable transport requirements - this would steer where the best places to build new housing would be. Only at this point should land owners should have been asked if they wished to sell their land. The numbers would suggest that a new small town is required an opportunity has been missed to construct a sustainable community with modern infrastructure. The current plan will just overload an already creaking infrastructure in many outlying parts of the borough.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The distribution of housing relates to several considerations including land availability. The SHLAA follows national guidance and is a requirement as evidence base to support the Local Plan. Further explanation for the number of homes and distribution is contained within the 'Housing Topic Paper' which may be of interest. Infrastructure requirements for the plan period are outlined in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Corinne Wakefield	N/A	N/A	442418	489	Yes	No	building 748 new homes in and around the Basingstoke area, which could potentially produce 1,800 extra cars on the road per year! At present the infrastructure cannot cope, in busy times and rush hours there will be more gridlock. Pack Lane was once a reasonably quiet road and now it is a main route from oakley and Kempsford because the other surrounding 'main roads' cannot cope. I want the site identified at Down Grange to be removed from the SHLAA. Fantastic recreational resource for local people. Concerned about potential traffic congestion from developing the site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Local Plan Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The number of units allocated for development at Pack Lane have been reduced following consultation. The Down Grange site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Ms Claire Bennett	N/A	N/A	630259	46	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.11	N/A	Ms Zoe Bennett	N/A	N/A	630279	42	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Ms Nadia Bennett	N/A	N/A	630425	43	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Dave Luff	N/A	N/A	630827	40	No	No	Request that BAS 069 is removed from the SHLAA, concern that the green space will be lost, which is currently used for recreational purposes and concern over the potential traffic generation and highways safety.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mrs Gina Oxe	N/A	N/A	630834	1	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr and Mrs D Hing	N/A	N/A	630842	41	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Ms Becky French	CPRE Hampshire	N/A	637125	1255	Yes	No	Fully supports the conservation and enhancement of the Borough's high quality natural and built environment. The North Wessex Downs AONB covers 30% and, otherwise, the Borough is largely rural in character and includes high quality landscapes which are valued by both residents, all of which limits development potential. The need for new housing as set out in the Local Plan is accepted, but within the AONB, and its setting, furtherance of the statutory purposes which apply to AONBs will prevent allocation of sites which would be a significant incursion into the countryside of the AONB or its setting. Outside the AONB the allocation of greenfield sites will be a significant incursion into the countryside. Windfall allowances recognise that unforeseen sites come forward in the Plan Period and thereby minimise the need for greenfield allocations. They further a policy of giving priority to the use of previously developed land, as provided in the Local Plan and encouraged by the NPPF.	Paragraph 4.11 - Table 2 The Local Plan must make a full allowance for windfall sites coming forward throughout the Plan Period is the most appropriate strategy for Basingstoke & Deane Borough. CPRE Hampshire recommends changes to Table 2 of the Local Plan to render the Local Plan sound. These changes can be viewed in CPRE's full representation. The allowance for windfall sites set out in the amended Table 2 is justified by NPPF Para 48 and should be included in assessing housing land supply for the Plan Period.	The SHLAA outlines why the inclusion of a windfall allowance is considered a robust approach. However, it is considered unsuitable to increase the allowance further in light of the available evidence base. Further information is also contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	124	Yes	No	unclear as to why the only SHMA available to view on the website is out of date (2007). Unclear as to some of the assumptions made, such as on the issue of affordability (the Government are suggesting that where affordability is worsening the supply of new homes should be increased) and on the impact on growth in jobs. The jobs growth in the preferred scenario is 328 pa which is else than the jobs-led scenario. It is unclear how this fits with the ELA, which seems to show a job growth of 7516 jobs in B class use over the period 2006-2026 which is 376 pa, or how it relates to the proposed regeneration of Basing View which is forecast to contribute another 5,000 jobs to the local economy over the plan period. Clarity is sought. Additionally, given that there appear to be higher population growth rates earlier on in the plan period - is housing development to be phased accordingly - clarity is sought.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMAA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	996	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.11	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	837	Yes	No	Questions whether relying on circa 3,000 houses to come forward through small sites, regeneration and other allocated sites) over the plan period is too high a figure, taking into account the higher costs associated with housing development on brownfield sites, which will make some developments on brownfield sites unviable. Given the comments we also submitted relating to paragraph 4.6 (i.e. the larger housing allocations and neighbourhood plan sites not being deliverable in the early stage of the local plan), the local plan needs to more actively support residential development on brownfield sites that come forward early in the plan period.	The local plan appears to have heavily back loaded all of the larger housing developments planned for Basingstoke, while neighbourhood plan housing developments also seem unlikely to be deliverable in the early period of the local plan timeframe. Accordingly, the Council and local plan need to make much stronger emphasis for allowing housing development to take place on brownfield sites in sustainable locations across the borough, particularly over the early plan period to ensure the plan is effective (flexible) and sound.	A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites and bring empty homes back into use but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA. The phasing of a number of allocations has been brought forward following consultation on the Pre-submission Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Angela Hope	SWAG Hatch Warren Residents	N/A	696929	47	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Rydon Homes	N/A	749508	929	No	No	The allowance for small site windfalls in table 2 is based on historic windfall rates of 50 dpa. Question the reliability of sites that unexpectedly become available throughout the Local Plan timeframe and moreover, as indicated in the SHLAA 2013, the rate of windfalls over the past 4 years from small site completions which have averaged 26 dpa. An increase to 50 dpa is optimistic, even with a general improvement in housing market conditions. Approach does not accord with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The reliance upon unallocated sites within the settlement boundary without planning permission (total of 1,200 dwellings) in table 2 is not fully supported by a credible evidence as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The justification for the 200 dwellings (from regeneration) in table 2 is based on the Council's previous experience that regeneration schemes will be developed for housing. This level of housing has not been fully justified in terms of being deliverable.	The housing supply elements indicated in Table 2 under Para 4.11 are lacking in a fully justified evidence base to support the specific levels of housing supply identified and this is contradictory to both paras 47 & 48 of the NPPF. We suggest that Basingstoke Council reassesses certain elements of its housing supply projections in order to demonstrate that the sites identified to support the levels of housing supply in particular windfalls and sites which are not allocated.	The SHLAA outlines why the inclusion of a windfall allowance is considered suitable. Although recent completion rates are noted, these reflect the downturn in the housing market and longer term trends provide robust evidence that small site completion rates will reach an average of 50 dpa over the Plan period. The opportunity sites come direct from the SHLAA and have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. The regeneration figure is based on the Council's approach to regeneration and an estimate of what is likely to come forward. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Amanda Laing	N/A	N/A	780043	2	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Alison Rayner	N/A	N/A	780184	3	Not Specified	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Chris and Sue Wilson	N/A	N/A	780198	4	Not Specified	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Mark Nightingale	N/A	N/A	782524	39	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Ms Kay Lawrence	N/A	N/A	782550	44	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Jason Rayner	N/A	N/A	782561	48	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.11	N/A	Mr Patrick Sweeney	N/A	N/A	784406	120	Yes	No	I do not believe sufficient thought has been given to the needs of smaller communities within the borough. For example, North Waltham does not appear to have any housing allocation. A previous planning inspector found a need for 32 dwellings at the current time. It is very important to the future viability of the village school, shop, and pub that a modest increase is allowed to counter the effects of the ageing population and reducing household numbers. Whilst significant development took place in the 80's and 90's there has been very little since. A few small scale projects, say 5-15 units each, with a good level of affordable housing supply in each will help secure the future of this community.	intentionally left blank	The Plan sets out the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives, following the outcomes of the detailed site assessment and sustainability appraisal processes. The Plan also takes into account such issues as infrastructure capacity including transport impacts and mitigation, landscape and biodiversity studies. The Plan includes the requirement for 150 units to be provided in the borough's smaller settlements, such as North Waltham, through neighbourhood planning, and development over and above this number can be delivered through the neighbourhood planning process if supported by the local community. Other policies, such as SS6 (Housing in the Countryside) allow for suitable development outside of the borough's larger defined settlements.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Chris and Sheila Deacon	N/A	N/A	784486	128	Not Specified	No	We are writing in response to the proposal to build 600 new houses along Pack Lane. As local residents, we are extremely concerned about the effect the additional traffic would have on the road networks. Pack Lane is a twisty and narrow road which can barely handle the existing traffic especially under the railway bridge where there have been a number of accidents. Also the junction of Pack Lane and Fox Lane is particularly dangerous especially at peak times. We trust these issues will be addressed if planning permission goes ahead for this development.	intentionally left blank	Local Plan Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The number of units to be delivered on the site have been reduced as a result of the consultation and other evidence.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	C & K Richardson	N/A	N/A	784493	129	Not Specified	No	Concern about the loss of Green Space from Down Grange, and the loss of land as a sports facilities and the potential traffic congestion.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan. Detailed issues associated with the site, such as the impact on the highway network, would be considered through the planning application process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Steven Pugh	N/A	N/A	784605	199	Not Specified	No	I want the site identified for development at Down Grange (BAS069) removed from the SHLAA and therefore removed from the local plan which is current out for public consultation. Down Grange (BAS069) is a green open space that has been used by many local people over several decades. It continues to be used for recreational purposes on a daily basis and it also becomes an overflow car park when major events take place within the Down Grange sports area. If Down Grange is developed it won't matter what traffic management schemes are put in place because more traffic on local roads is unacceptable and will reduce the quality of life for local residents. Down Grange is a fantastic resource that Basingstoke deserves, it should be kept as a space for recreation, not developed for housing. If this happens, the green space is lost for ever, its value cannot be measured in purely monetary terms and can never be retrieved, there would be no going back.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan. Detailed issues associated with the site, such as the impact on the highway network, would be considered through the planning application process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Clr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	317	Yes	No	The amount for regeneration is too low. In a town such as Basingstoke, the Council has significant ability to regenerate areas of the town (both existing residential and commercial) to deliver more new homes on brownfield sites.	intentionally left blank	The calculation is based on the Council's approach to regeneration and an estimate of what is likely to come forward. If other sites come forward these will be counted as windfall and will contribute towards the borough's overall housing delivery. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr and Mrs S Johnson	N/A	N/A	784986	334	Not Specified	No	I want the site identified for development at Down Grange (BAS069) removed from the SHLAA and therefore removed from the local plan which is current out for public consultation. Down Grange (BAS069) is a green open space that has been used by many local people over several decades. It continues to be used for recreational purposes on a daily basis and it also becomes an overflow car park when major events take place within the Down Grange sports area. If Down Grange is developed it won't matter what traffic management schemes are put in place because more traffic on local roads is unacceptable and will reduce the quality of life for local residents. Down Grange is a fantastic resource that Basingstoke deserves, it should be kept as a space for recreation, not developed for housing. If this happens, the green space is lost for ever, its value cannot be measured in purely monetary terms and can never be retrieved, there would be no going back.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Chris Mayhew	N/A	N/A	785303	390	Not Specified	No	I want the site identified for development at Down Grange (BAS069) removed from the SHLAA and therefore removed from the local plan which is current out for public consultation. Down Grange (BAS069) is a green open space that has been used by many local people over several decades. It continues to be used for recreational purposes on a daily basis and it also becomes an overflow car park when major events take place within the Down Grange sports area. If Down Grange is developed it won't matter what traffic management schemes are put in place because more traffic on local roads is unacceptable and will reduce the quality of life for local residents. Down Grange is a fantastic resource that Basingstoke deserves, it should be kept as a space for recreation, not developed for housing. If this happens, the green space is lost for ever, its value cannot be measured in purely monetary terms and can never be retrieved, there would be no going back.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr David Allingham	N/A	N/A	786146	566	Not Specified	No	Down Grange is a fantastic resource that Basingstoke deserves, it should be kept as a space for recreation, not developed for housing. If this happens, the green space will be lost forever. I want the site identified for development at Down Grange (BAS069) removed from the SHLAA and therefore removed from the local plan which is current out for public consultation. Down Grange (BAS069) is a green open space that has been used by many local people over several decades. It continues to be used for recreational purposes on a daily basis and it also becomes an overflow car park when major events take place within the Down Grange sports area. If Down Grange is developed it won't matter what traffic is lost for ever, its value cannot be measured in purely monetary terms and can never be retrieved, there would be no going back.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.11	N/A	Mrs Gwen Allingham	N/A	N/A	786153	570	Not Specified	No	I want the site identified for development at Down Grange (BAS069) removed from the SHLAA and therefore removed from the local plan which is currently out for public consultation. Down Grange (BAS069) is a green open space that has been used by many local people over several decades. It continues to be used for recreational purposes on a daily basis and it also becomes an overflow car park when major events take place within the Down Grange sports area. If Down Grange is developed it won't matter what traffic management schemes are put in place because more traffic on local roads is unacceptable and will reduce the quality of life for local residents. Down Grange is a fantastic resource that Basingstoke deserves, it should be kept as a space for recreation, not developed for housing. If this happens, the green space is lost for ever, its value cannot be measured in purely monetary terms and can never be retrieved, there would be no going back.	intentionally left blank	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	867	No	No	Table 2 ascertains the need for the plan to identify and allocate sites with the capacity to deliver 7,557 dwellings of the overall plan requirement. Gladman question the deliverability of the existing supply identified in Table 2, with particular concern in relation to the 2,247 dwellings identified to come from urban/brownfield opportunities (un-allocated sites). There appears to be a disparity between the SHLAA (page 17) and the Table 2 of the pre-submission plan. Gladman believe that a reliance on unallocated sites for the delivery of nearly 2,250 dwellings is unsound as this will not provide sufficient certainty that the full plan requirement will be delivered. Typically brownfield sites (of which many of these sites could be) are more exposed to none delivery due to viability as a result of higher costs in land remediation, and greater potential for unforeseen costs, that can reduce profit margins.	intentionally left blank	A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites and bring empty homes back into use but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. Opportunity Sites in the SHLAA have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. The Plan also includes an over-supply of sites amounting to approx. 500 units. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	892	Not Specified	Not Specified	The Plan (Table 2) states that space must be found for 7557 new houses. 7010 are to be allocated on greenfield sites (SS3) - this leaves a need for 547 on non-greenfield sites. Why then are there proposals for 750 to be allocated in the "villages" (SS5) and a further 150 elsewhere (SS5)? Reducing local requirements by a few hundred houses can make a big difference to the local quality of life.	intentionally left blank	The proposals are considered to reflect the characteristics and housing needs of individual settlements and are therefore considered to be suitable. The strategy includes an oversupply of sites to ensure that the Plan is flexible and deliverable in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	Catesby Kler Land	Turley Associates	787505	1133	Not Specified	No	it is noted in Table 2 on page 26 of the draft document that a total of 700 units are included within the supply as 'small site windfalls'. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that LPAs may make an allowance of windfall sites in the 5 year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. There is no compelling evidence to justify the inclusion of windfall sites in the overall land supply. On this basis, windfalls should be deleted from the housing supply, which is likely to result in the need for additional greenfield site(s) to meet the shortfall in the residual greenfield requirement over the plan period. In the absence of evidence to confirm the availability of this source of supply, such sites are neither deliverable, nor developable. We would therefore question whether this approach satisfies the tests of soundness in the NPPF, particularly the effective test.	intentionally left blank	The SHLAA outlines why the inclusion of a windfall allowance is considered a robust approach. Further information is also contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1190	Yes	No	The land supply as set out in Table 2 will not be effective in that it will fail to deliver the overall amount of housing required over the Plan period, having regard to: 1. the likely level of non-implementation rate of existing commitments 2. the substantial reliance on unidentified sources (windfalls and opportunities) contrary to Para 48 of the NPPF	see above	The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. Opportunity Sites in the SHLAA have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	Catesby Kler Land	Turley Associates	787505	1134	Not Specified	No	2,247 units are identified in the land supply as 'urban/brownfield opportunities (un-allocated)'. It is unclear how this source of supply differs from the definition of 'small site windfalls' and how much reliance the Council can realistically place on the delivery of these units over the plan period. We understand that this source of supply includes allocations from the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan Review 1996-2011, 'opportunity' sites with policy constraints and 'opportunity' sites without policy constraints (as set out in the SHLAA). We have reviewed this component of the housing supply and raise concerns regarding the deliverability of some of the sites. In the absence of evidence to confirm the deliverability of these sources of supply and/or testing to justify that such sites are not unduly constrained, these sites are neither deliverable nor, developable and should not be included for the purposes of land supply.	intentionally left blank	The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. Opportunity Sites in the SHLAA have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.11	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	781	Yes	No	Table 2 on page 26 sets out the components of housing land supply for the plan period, as at April 2012. This should be updated to reflect the position as at April 2013. It should also be amended to distinguish between the requirement and supply which will make it clearer and easier to understand. Table 2 includes 2067 sites which benefit from planning permission. A lapse rate of 10% should be included, amounting to 207 dwellings. Windfall - the inclusion of 700 dwellings as a windfall allowance is not considered to be appropriate in this case. The council has not provided the "compelling evidence". Urban/brownfield opportunities - there is no clear reference to how this figure has been arrived at. Regeneration - the provision for 200 should not be made within the table. The concerns identified above regarding the level of supply in the Borough raise serious issues in respect of the soundness of the plan in terms of whether it is justified or consistent with national policy.	We suggest the following changes:- Updating the table to reflect the April 2013 position Incorporation of a 10% lapse rate on sites with planning permission Reduction of windfall allowance to 450 (based on 28 completions per year) Justification is required for the inclusion of 2,247 brownfield units within the supply, otherwise a lower amount should be planned for. Deletion of 200 regeneration units from the housing supply	The table has been updated to a base date of 2013. It is not considered necessary to discount sites with planning permission by a further percentage as the annual housing monitoring process highlights which sites are unlikely to come forward and these have already been removed from the figures (approx. 10% of the total). The SHLAA outlines why the inclusion of a windfall allowance is considered suitable. The opportunity sites come direct from the SHLAA and have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. Regeneration is included to highlight the need for greenfield site allocations. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper.	Table 2 updated to a base date of 2013	To ensure Plan remains up to date.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
4.12	4.11	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update number of additional homes	For consistency	N/A	N/A
4.13	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	257	Yes	No	Consideration must also be given to the other proposed housing developments to the west of the Basingstoke and Deane borough. With 350 houses proposed for Whitchurch and 200 for Oakley many common facilities such as the secondary school will be stretched. The most important factor is the excessive strain that will be put on the B3400 which runs through all these communities. The development of Marydown and of houses to the east of Andover (outside the Basingstoke and Deane area) will also impact on the B3400.	intentionally left blank	Local Plan Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.13	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	997	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	intentionally left blank	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.13	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	19	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	None - this is a good strategy - putting most of the development in areas which have access to transport etc. and not major developments in villages which the inspector for the previous draft called unsustainable (poor transport links, few services and oil heating). Despite this we have one developer trying to force through an application in one of these villages (Woolton Hill) which in 2 years would supply over a third of the 150 earmarked in your plan for the next 18 years!.	Comments and support noted and future partnership working is welcomed.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.13	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	61	No	No	Chineham Parish Council does not accept the inclusion of the Parish as part of the settlement of Basingstoke Town. The Parish is separated from the town by the ring road, the railway line, two major business areas and the pattern of development in relation to adjacent parishes. Chineham is the local centre for services used by the residents of Old Basing, Lychpit and Sherfield on Loddon. Decisions on housing provision must be made taking this into account.	Chineham should be recognised as a distinct settlement.	From a planning perspective, given the location and form of Chineham, it is considered to form part of Basingstoke Town.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.13	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	765	Yes	Yes	The housing delivery strategy is predicated on the focussing of new development upon the most sustainable locations within the borough, primarily Basingstoke and the larger settlements of Whitechurch, Overton, Bramley, Kingsclere and Oakley (paragraph 4.13). We fully support this approach of directing growth to the main settlements which offer a range of services, employment and infrastructure to support this growth.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.13	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	Catesby Kler Land	Turley Associates	787505	1135	Not Specified	No	There is no evidence to justify the approach for identifying the provision of only 150 homes across the Borough, in areas outside those identified settlements. Spreading only 150 dwellings across the 18 year plan period would deliver only 8 dwellings per annum, representing a tiny proportion of homes for the rural area; a level of growth that in our view cannot possibly be sufficient to sustain community facilities and/or local services. In our view, a higher provision of growth should be spread across the rural area to meet local needs and ensure that rural communities can thrive. See full response	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	150 units is considered to be a deliverable total for the purposes of the plan's overall housing strategy. However, the Plan also provides the framework for the delivery of additional sites in area outside of the defined settlements, through both neighbourhood planning and also the specific policies of the Plan, including SS6 (New Housing in the Countryside).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.14	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	998	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.15	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	86	Yes	No	Chineham Parish is NOT part of the settlement of Basingstoke - it is a stand-alone parish in it's own right, fulfilling the needs of both it's own residents and the neighbouring areas of e.g. Sherfield on Loddon, Taylors Farm and Lychpit. Housing decisions should reflect this.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	From a planning perspective, given the location and form of Chineham, it is considered to form part of Basingstoke Town.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.15	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	62	No	No	Chineham Parish Council does not accept the inclusion of the Parish as part of the settlement of Basingstoke Town. The Parish is separated from the town by the ring road, the railway line, two major business areas and the pattern of development in relation to adjacent parishes. Chineham is the local centre for services used by the residents of Old Basing, Lychpit and Sherfield on Loddon. Decisions on housing provision must be made taking this into account.	Chineham should be considered a distinct settlement.	From a planning perspective, given the location and form of Chineham, it is considered to form part of Basingstoke Town.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.15	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	94	Yes	No	Chineham Parish is NOT part of the settlement of Basingstoke - it is a stand-alone parish in it's own right, fulfilling the needs of both it's own residents and the neighbouring areas of e.g. Sherfield on Loddon, Taylors Farm and Lychpit. Housing decisions should reflect this.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	From a planning perspective, given the location and form of Chineham, it is considered to form part of Basingstoke Town.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.18	N/A	Pellipar Investments Ltd	Pellipar Investments Ltd	N/A	787110	962	Yes	Yes	Supports the spatial strategy set out in paragraph 4.18 insofar as it promotes, in principle, housing development to the south-west of Basingstoke. Agrees that the most appropriate strategy is for new housing provision of greenfield land through allocations of varying sizes around the town rather than concentrating development in one area. See representation and appendices for further detailed justification.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.19	4.18	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	150	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports, in principle, the statement that the unique character of Whitechurch will be preserved and enhanced. However, we would prefer conserve to preserve as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place within the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed. It is recommended that the wording in the plan be amended to use conserve instead of preserve.	Where 'protect' or 'preserve' is used, change to 'conserve' unless it refers to specific wording in legislation (such as the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990).	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.21	4.20	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Job figures have been updated in light of latest ONS statistics (Feb 2014)	In response to updated information	N/A	N/A
4.23	4.22	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Change 'sewerage' to 'sewage'	typo	N/A	N/A
4.23	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	63	No	No	Para 4.23 states: "General infrastructure constraints including education, the historic road infrastructure which leads to local congestion and sewerage treatment will be addressed, where possible, in the site specific policies and through the IDP" Nowhere in this plan are there any meaningful suggestions for any infrastructure beyond emotient phrases such as "measures to mitigate" or "include provision of physical infrastructure". Without real specific proposals with indications of sources of funding the Plan cannot be considered sound or justified. We do not believe that such infrastructural issues as sewage treatment would, or can be, addressed on a site specific basis.	Real specific proposals with indications of sources of funding should be specified.	Infrastructure has been considered throughout the preparation of the plan and additional information is set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.24	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	252	Yes	No	Overton is a rural village, albeit with a valued industrial heritage where the road structure has evolved over many years to service what is a limited community and is already struggling to cope with the additional demands, both in quantity and size of vehicles using the local network. The basic infrastructure of the village has not really changed in past years, even though the size has increased substantially. Additional housing, would change the nature of the village out of all proportion. A recent study and meeting show that the majority of current residents do not want to see their community changed in such a dramatic way. The community is not blind to the need for additional housing in all parts of the country, but just because there is some perceived "spare land" in the village, it does not necessarily follow that this is the most suitable area to build upon.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.25	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	253	Yes	No	The parish council is concerned that Overton has been labelled as a District Centre.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Overton's shopping centre is defined as a district centre in light of its facilities, which meet the definition of a district centres as set out in planning guidance. Overton's shopping centre is already defined in this way in the Adopted Local Plan. The definition does not relate to Overton village as a whole.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.25	N/A	Dr Tom Ridler	N/A	N/A	406827	137	Yes	No	Overton for the moment is a village - developments of 120 and 150 houses are urban scale and bigger than any in the history of the village. These follow on quickly from two earlier developments at Foxdown and London Road neither of which blend in with the character of the village. As stated it has a medieval centre at the crossroads causing both traffic and parking issues. Although Overton is fortunate to have a railway station it is outside the village, the parking arrangements are already full to capacity as are the trains. Other aspects of infrastructure are inadequate - in particular the sewerage system but also the primary school and doctors surgery.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.25	4.24	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	648	Not Specified	No	Winchester is also served by bus from Overton. There is no mention of the village service, 74, operated by BCT operating three mornings a week which is vital in allowing those who live up to a mile from Overton's shops etc. to access them. I consider the wording about jobs confusing. No way does Overton, with Vaverstoke and Stevenon, provide 2300 jobs. There might be living there who are in employment but that's not what the paragraph states.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The section outlines key information only and therefore does not aim to include large amounts of detailed information. The figures reflect the most up to date available statistics at the time of going to print.	Update paragraph to include reference to Winchester.	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.25	4.24	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Job figures have been updated in light of latest ONS statistics (Feb 2014)	In response to updated information	N/A	N/A
4.25	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	687	No	No	The plan fails to recognise the limitations of the local bus services which already rely on a subsidy from BDBC. It also fails to highlight the fact that Overton station is remote from the centre of the village and can only be reached by a poorly maintained, un-adopted road, for which neither Network Rail, nor HCC accept any responsibility to maintain. The road system is based on a medieval layout and is unsuitable for modern traffic, particularly HGV's which routinely hit buildings in the High Street. While this was recognised as a constraint as far back as the 1985 Local Plan, nothing has been done to alleviate these problems, nor is it likely to be possible given the layout. The claim that Overton, Laverstock and Stevenon combined provide 2,300 jobs appears highly improbably. The 1985 plan quoted 1,180, which was probably accurate at the time, but since then 300 jobs have been lost in the area, with employment sites being redeveloped for housing.	Make reference to the limitations of the public transport in the area. Stop ignoring the financial problems inherent in providing safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the railway station. Compile a proper assessment of the actual employment prospects in the area.	The section outlines key information only and therefore does not aim to include large amounts of detailed information. The figures reflect the most up to date available statistics at the time of going to print. The constraints highlighted have been taken into account in the evidence base for the Local plan including the site assessment process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.25	4.24	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Replace "town" with "shopping"	for clarity	N/A	N/A
4.26	4.25	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	660	Not Specified	No	It is wrong to infer that Overton is involved in a Neighbourhood Planning project in response to the ambition of the local community. We were told instead that only by developing a Neighbourhood Plan would we have some influence on where 150 dwellings would be situated, a number already decided by BDBC	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted and paragraph updated to reflect this.	Paragraph 4.26 updated as follows: These homes will be delivered through mechanisms such as Neighbourhood Planning. ~~in response to the ambitions of the local community which are reflected in~~ Overton Parish became becoming a designated area for Neighbourhood Planning purposes in 2013.	For clarity	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.26	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	256	Yes	No	If these figures are correct then the 40% affordable housing that is proposed may be too low and yet there is genuine concern that there will not be the finances available to develop this number. The parish council could not support the development of land within the village with anything less than the 40% affordable housing proposed.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As a starting point for negotiation, Policy CN1 requires all new housing development to contribute 40% affordable housing. Viability testing of the Plan's policies has indicated that his level of provision is viable.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.26	N/A	Cllr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	180	Yes	No	I do not believe the evidence base demonstrates the need for this high level of development in Overton. As Overton has an ageing population who will become increasingly dependent on public transport, this level of development will turn Overton into a dormitory village with residents who become increasingly isolated and unable to access higher order services, including the essential one of main food shopping. This will fail to meet the stated objective of creating places where it is "easy to meet everyday needs".	The housing allocation for Overton in Policy SS5 should be reduced to 50 homes by neighbourhood planning.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base and 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.26	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	689	No	No	This paragraph claims that along with the 120 houses allocated at Overton Hill (SS3.5) "a further allocation of 150 homes has been made to meet the longer term needs of the village". This clearly contradicts the final sentence of SS3.5 which states that the purpose is to meet the requirement to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The reality is that the allocation of 270 houses to Overton has nothing to do with 'local' housing need. In the now defunct SE Regional Plan the housing allocation for Overton was barely a quarter of the 270 proposed now. In Overton the fact that there are 115 households in 'housing need' is used to justify 270 houses, yet in Oakley which has seen no large developments in recent years the fact that there 425 in 'need' results in an allocation of only 150 houses and these are beyond 2020...	There has been no assessment of local housing need, or the impact this level of housing will have on the existing community. It makes a mockery of the NPPF.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base and 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.27	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	669	Not Specified	No	There is no mention in this paragraph on infrastructure restraints that access to the station is a major reason for Overton being closed from significant development - is poor now that the station capacity and the two overflows are already oversubscribed.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Infrastructure has been considered throughout the preparation of the plan and further information is set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.27	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	255	Yes	No	The constraints on the infrastructure have been of concern to the parish council and residents of Overton for many years. The road system in the village centre (based upon the original 11 the century street plan) is not designed to cope with the large number of cars that are now part of everyday life. No amount of S106 funding is going to be able to change this situation - the road system is a permanent part of the village. There is deep concern regarding the supply of water and the current antiquated sewerage system which cannot cope now with existing population. There is recent and alarming evidence of sewage back up in many properties within the village already and so there is concern that further housing will cause further problems. It is noted that other infrastructure can all be rectified with the use of S106 monies - however by experience this is always too little too late (or just too little).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Infrastructure has been considered throughout the preparation of the plan and further information is set out in the IDP, water cycle study and transport assessment.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.27	N/A	Dr Tom Ridler	N/A	N/A	406827	136	Yes	No	A Neighbourhood plan should be a building block for the Borough's Plan - instead the numbers to be delivered are dictated leaving very little flexibility for the local community. Most importantly a NP should be based on local need not an external determined and arbitrary number. A great opportunity in local democracy and accountability has been lost.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The numbers of units to be delivered in settlements relates to such factors as housing need, in addition to infrastructure etc. There is the opportunity through NP to determine where the housing development will go and to increase numbers as suitable.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.28	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	298	Yes	No	Bramley has expanded from a base of 520 dwellings in 1984 to 1662 in 2011 and the plan calls for a further 1010 units by 2023/4 (delivered 5 years before the end of the plan period). The population now stands at 4233 yet there are no new roads, still only a small surgery, a public house and a primary school expanded recently to meet existing needs.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Infrastructure has been considered throughout the preparation of the plan. Further information is set out in the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.28	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	318	Yes	No	The number of houses for Bramley is currently set too high. It doesn't take into account the significant growth seen in the Parish over the last Local Plan (where Bramley grew well beyond the Borough average and far beyond comparable settlements such as Whitchurch and Overton). Moreover, there is 'double counting' as Bramley's housing needs will be met through development on the edge of the Parish, whereas this is not true in Whitchurch and Overton, so it would be right for them to have an allocation directly, but for Bramley's to be included in the overall NDP figure.	Delete SS5 part (a) - removing the 200 for Bramley. Amend SS5 block 4 from "150" to "350" - retaining the same overall number of homes for the Borough. Delete part of paragraph 4.30: "Given the size of the village... (Neighbourhood Planning)." Insert in place: "Bramley will progress a NDP to deliver a locally justified amount of housing, as part of the overall NDP allocation in SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning)."	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Manydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.29	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	299	Yes	No	This paragraph refers to Bramley's infrastructure, the implication being that it is a reason to allow further development of the village. The reality is that the infrastructure is stretched to capacity with the railway station and school attracting daily migration from surrounding settlements. The village is increasingly divided into two by the railway line's level crossing which brings traffic to a standstill for more than 50% of every day time hour. Rail traffic is planned to increase as this section of the "electric spine" is electrified creating further level crossing downtime due to both increased freight traffic and longer trains.	we suggest the following changes:- Updating the table to reflect the April 2013 position Incorporation of a 10% lapse rate on sites with planning permission Reduction of windfall allowance to 450 (based on 28 completions per year) Justification is require	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.29	4.28	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Job figures have been updated in light of latest ONS statistics (Feb 2014)	In response to updated information	N/A	N/A
4.30	4.29	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Replace comma with full-stop at the end of the 7th lines - "...accommodating growth rather than allocating a specific site."	typo	N/A	N/A
4.33	4.32	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Job figures have been updated in light of latest ONS statistics (Feb 2014)	In response to updated information	N/A	N/A
4.35	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	151	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes the reference to the historic core of Oakley.	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.35	N/A	Mr Martin Small	N/A	N/A	642684	151	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes the reference to the historic core of Oakley.	intentionally left blank	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.36	4.35	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Job figures have been updated in light of latest ONS statistics (Feb 2014)	In response to updated information	N/A	N/A
4.37	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	841	Yes	No	Given Oakley is acknowledged as one of the more sustainable settlements within the borough, consider that the planned 150 houses for Oakley are an insufficient number to cover the plan period, and that a number more in line with Whitchurch/Overton would be appropriate. Oakley has a higher population than any of the other settlements in the borough, barring Basingstoke. Oakley is bigger by population than Whitchurch, Overton and Bramley. Oakley has seen comparatively little new housing over the existing local plan period, certainly in comparison to smaller settlements such as Whitchurch and Overton. Paragraph 4.37 acknowledges that there is a high housing need in Oakley (425 households in housing need), and therefore, the current proposal of 150 homes will not make much of an effort to deal with the current housing need, exacerbating the current problems being faced with regard to housing need.	The local plan needs to recognise that Oakley should accommodate more housing development than is currently planned. In order for the local plan to be justified and sound, it needs to address current housing need. The paragraph 4.37 does not seek to address the current housing needs, nor cater for future population growth in Oakley. Accordingly, the proposed number of homes to be built in Oakley needs to rise substantially from the current planned figure, to something more in line with the housing numbers planned for Overton and Whitchurch.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but also its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.37	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	903	Not Specified	Not Specified	The figure of 150 houses for Oakley seems to have been plucked out of thin air as far as readers of the plan are concerned and, given the reader "this approach also reflects the relatively modest level of growth in the village compared to other settlements over the past 10 years", it seems that the allocation includes a "punishment" element rather than reflecting local needs accurately.	intentionally left blank	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but also its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The approach is based upon the evidence base compiled as part of the Local Plan process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.37	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1293	Not Specified	No	Paragraph 4.37 is factually incorrect and cannot, therefore, be 'justified'. Accordingly it fails the test in NPPF 182. The paragraph says that 'in 2013 there were 425 households in housing need in Oakley and North Waltham'. However, at the end of July 2013 there were only 100 applicants on the Housing Register living in Oakley or North Waltham. Of these, 14 were transfer applicants and the rest were General Needs. The figure of 425 is likely to include large numbers of people who live elsewhere in the borough (mainly Basingstoke) but who would like to live in Oakley or North Waltham.	The paragraph should be amended so that it is factually accurate and, hence 'justified'. 425 should be replaced by 100.	The paragraph reflects the evidence base supporting the Local Plan, including statistical information that was correct at the time of going to print. The figure stated includes bands 1-4 on the housing register (341 in general needs and 84 transfers). This includes people who do not currently live in Oakley.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.38	N/A	Mr Peter Lord	N/A	N/A	787067	935	Not Specified	Yes	Our client supports the approach for planning in the smaller villages set out in paragraphs 4.38 - 4.39. It is essential that local communities are able to manage their environment and that the best way of doing this is through neighbourhood plans. Our client considers this to be the right way to manage any change in the smaller villages, such as Ecchinswell.	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.39	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	925	Not Specified	Not Specified	Paragraph 4.39 of the Plan discusses appropriate development within settlement policy areas in terms of infill schemes which is too narrow and prescriptive in perspective and could encourage an overly restrictive stance by the LPA towards development proposals coming forward from this source. The comment that further review of SPBs will be dealt with by a subsequent DPD is unsatisfactory if some reliance is placed on unidentified sites coming forward from this source as this could lead to housing land supply delays.	intentionally left blank	Infill is considered to be a suitably broad term to describe development within settlements. There is no specific reliance on this source within the housing supply set out in the Plan in the short term as suitable schemes can be progressed through neighbourhood planning.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.39	N/A	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Rydon Homes	N/A	749508	944	No	No	Supports the review of existing settlement boundaries. However, the small site reference should be taken out and replaced with appropriate development in terms of size and range of settlement and its facilities.	The Council should amend wording to include appropriate scale of development based on scale and size of settlement.	The term small scale is appropriate as large scale and strategic sites are allocated within the Local Plan. The subsequent DPD will not be duplicating the Local Plan process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.44	4.43	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert "The allocations are defined on the Policies map". And update the contingency number.	in light of other changes to the plan and for consistency	N/A	N/A
4.45	4.44	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Delete "to be approved by the council and will"	in light of other changes to the plan and for consistency	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1010	Not Specified	No	The SHMA is almost six year old and therefore out of out of date. It is not compliant with the NPPF and only covers the period up to 2012/13. The SHMA fundamentally underestimates the level of housing need in the Borough and wider housing market area. The Borough Council is currently preparing a Housing Needs and Affordability Assessment for Basingstoke and Deane. The draft report is not compliant with the NPPF as it only considers the housing need (affordable housing only) within the Borough area. The Assessment does not identify the full housing need (both market and affordable) for the whole housing market area. Given the serious SHMA deficiencies the Borough Council has therefore not sought to identify and then meet its identified housing needs in full. Nor has it demonstrated how its housing needs will be met within the Borough or within the wider housing market area. It is not effective or justified and it is not consistent with Para 159 of the NPPF. See supporting document	On the basis that the current housing needs figure of 591 new dwellings per annum is likely to be a significant underestimate we are of the view that the most appropriate scenario to determine the Boroughs housing needs in full is 'Employment 800' from the Edge Analytics Report which provides a housing requirement of 1,714 new homes per annum. To meet this level of housing growth the housing requirement set out within Policy SS1 of the Local Plan would need to increase by 966 dwellings per annum.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Giuseppe Zanre	David Wilson Homes	N/A	85673	836	No	No	The main objection to the plan concerns the level of housing identified (SS1). In particular, DWH consider the level of housing proposed to be significantly less than the level of housing provision that is required to be provided in the borough, as required by the NPPF. The dwelling-led Chelmer scenario showed that even at the council's then upper range (770 dpa) the resultant population growth (1,136) was much lower than both the ONS 2008-based SNPP (1,480) and the ONS interim 2011-based SNPP (1,950). As such, the council's housing target would also result in a low resident labour force growth (174 per annum), compared with the council's job growth rate (6,500). This demonstrates the incompatibility of the council's proposed housing target with its own economic policy. The second Chelmer scenario showed a requirement for 1,109 dwelling per annum (2011-2029); a significant increase on the council's target. Lack of SHMA means plan not legally compliant.	Following our own assessment into the housing requirement of the borough, we consider the level of housing provision proposed under Policy SS1 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan to be significantly below what is required to deliver and sustain future economic growth. As acknowledged in the Basingstoke and Dean Borough-Wide Housing Assessment, along with the subsequent update, the housing provision within Policy SS1 should be increased from 748 dpa to between 990 and 1,109 new dwellings per annum 2011-2029. This would therefore result in a sound local plan, which delivers the council's economic growth aspirations and which is also NPPF compliant. Without this significant increase in the housing requirement during the plan period there will be a major conflict with the NPPF which is strongly in favour of promoting growth and economic activity. The council need to undertake a review of their housing requirement in line with the recommendations in this submission.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	833	Not Specified	No	The housing target is unsound because it is unjustified and the manner of its derivation is not in conformity with national planning policy. The objective assessment of need that the Council maintains it has carried out is unjustified because it has not been informed by an NPPF compliant SHMA; the objective assessment is based wholly upon projection modelling; some assumptions in the Demographic Analysis and Forecasts Paper are questionable; the constraints cited to suppress the objective need are unjustified in terms of national policy.	In order to encompass a range of probabilities, including the possibility that international inward migration does not decline to the extent the council imagines, we recommend that the Council lifts its level of provision to 900dpa, to bring the level of it's supply into line with the indications provided by the DCLG 2008-based household projections. This will provide an element of contingency not only in case the Council's modelling is at fault but also to accommodate potential new pressures emanating from Greater London and Basingstoke's neighbours.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	853	Not Specified	No	The plan allocates a prescribed number of dwellings to some of the smaller settlements but then surrenders responsibility for the identification of specific sites to the Neighbourhood Plan process. While this is arguably a legitimate approach, we are aware that the Borough does not have a five year supply. We would question whether it is wise, therefore, for the Council to surrender control over the delivery of its plan and whether it should allocate some sites among the smaller settlements. We are therefore wary about the Council abdicating too much responsibility because there is no guarantee that a Neighbourhood Plan will be produced at all or that they will be published and adopted in sufficient time for sites to get planning permission and then be built-out. We are concerned that the devolution of the detailed determination of sites to the parish level will present a problem for delivery.	In the context of plan making we feel it would be valuable if both these policies were amended to make it clear that the NPPF and dNPPG will apply equally to neighbourhood planning as to local planning. The plan should make it clear that matters of prematurity at Neighbourhood level should not delay the bringing forward of sites within a Neighbourhood Plan area by having regard to meeting the needs of the Borough as a whole.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Steve Opacic	N/A	N/A	86300	415	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	Member of Parliament	N/A	121767	425	Yes	No	We are planning in a different context from the national norm, due to high levels of house-building in the past. We have a significant infrastructure deficit and a figure of 748dpa is not sustainable unless and until there is a substantial investment in infrastructure. I challenge the assumptions around net migration, and consider that this should factor in the Gov't's target for reduction of 53%. I question the ruled out approach of nil net migration, as it is for the local community to decide. I raise concerns that the New Homes consultation has not been taken into account, when residents supported very many fewer houses.	This policy needs to set a maximum figure, which will only be delivered if this can be done in a sustainable way.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The methodology for calculating a local housing number is set out in the NPPF and draft National Planning Practice Guidance which requires migration to be factored into the calculations. The NPPF also states that population and demographic changes should be fully met. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper. Improvements to local infrastructure are supported by the council's IDP.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1186	No	No	Object as it has not identified and made provision for a sufficient amount of housing within the plan period. That proposed is significantly less than the level of housing as required by the NPPF. In addition we consider that this will result in the contraction of the Borough's working age population. See our borough wide housing assessment. It is not supported by evidence base. Inadequate level of cooperation between neighbouring authorities.	Each authority in this sub-region must meet the challenge of collaborative working. The shared aim must be to increase respective proposed levels of housing provision to meet the collective, objectively assessed demand for housing in these administrative areas. ZAL wishes to see economic growth delivered in this part of Hampshire with each authority providing its fair share of housing to meet identified needs.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1214	Yes	No	In respect of the draft Local Plan, the main thrusts of our client's representations are: That the provision of 13,464 new homes over the plan period will not meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing in the local market area; That the provision of 13,464 new homes over the plan period is inconsistent with and will undermine the Borough's economic prospects;	Our analysis suggests that a housing figure of approximately 1000 dpa would meet the Borough's housing needs. However, this figure excludes any unmet need from neighbouring authorities, so the housing figure could be higher as a consequence once wider needs have been factored in. The projection outputs of the Edge 2013 Report support a housing target in the region of 950 homes per annum meeting the objectively-based need linked to demographic trends as required by the NPPF. It would also allow for a credible level of employment growth. Applying a housing delivery target of less than circa 950 homes would demonstrably underprovide housing and not meet local requirements, or encourage appropriate levels of employment growth. In light of the flaws in the Council's approach, the spatial strategy is unsound and fails to accord with the NPPF. See full response for additional comments	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1219	Yes	No	The Housing Needs Affordability Assessment seeks to assess affordable housing requirements over a 5 year period, although it is unclear how the analysis links in or is compatible with the modelling undertaken in the Edge 2013 Report. This presents a range of affordable housing need outputs including a minimum (271 affordable new homes) and an upper estimate (1109 new homes). The upper estimate, which is purported to reflect Housing Waiting List Bands 1 to 4 (albeit with only Band 4 households in need taken into account), suggests a net requirement that exceeds the range of overall housing requirement outputs presented in the Edge 2013 Report. The implication is that the Council will fail to address the affordable housing needs in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 159 of the NPPF. The needs of the economically inactive population should be considered in the overall approach. The spatial strategy is unsound and fails to accord with the NPPF	Our analysis suggests that a housing figure of approximately 1000 dpa would meet the Borough's housing needs. However, this figure excludes any unmet need from neighbouring authorities, so the housing figure could be higher as a consequence once wider needs have been factored in.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1222	Yes	No	To achieve a level of employment growth in line with 2009 Employment Land Review job forecasts, a more realistic annual requirement of approximately 1,033 additional homes across the Borough per annum is identified. Past trends (as used by ONS/CLG) suggest a figure somewhere in-between these two figures at 954 homes per annum. The Council has not produced and tested alternative options that factor in employment growth. The latter is fundamental in our view in a District with an ageing population and declining population of working age. We recommend the Council test alternative options to accommodate more of their objectively assessed housing need. This should factor in affordable housing needs and housing needs associated with the employment growth proposed in the District and adjoining districts, as required by the NPPF. See full response	Our analysis suggests that a housing figure of approximately 1000 dpa would meet the Borough's housing needs. However, this figure excludes any unmet need from neighbouring authorities, so the housing figure could be higher as a consequence once wider needs have been factored in.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Wates Development (c/o Savills)	Wates Development Ltd	Savills	133038	1197	Yes	No	There is no dispute with regard to the methodology used by edge analytics in forming the Demographic Report. Specifically, the representation raises concern over the soundness of the specific scenario selected of 748dpa. The council has opted for 748 dpa, which is based on the headship rate of the 2011 projections to 2021 with a continued trend to 2029, while utilising a 10 year trend for internal migration and a 5 year trend for international migration minus 20%. Had the council selected the scenario with a consistent approach to UK migration and international migration the annual requirement would equate to between 983 and 1,084 dpa. The option selected by the council reduced the international migration by 20%, which is justified as pre-empting a potential future change in government policy. This is considered to be flawed approach and cannot be considered to be based on a robust and credible evidence base. (please see full rep for full details).	In order to make Policy SS1 considered 'sound', the annual housing requirement should be raised to in excess of 900 dwellings per annum, with further analysis required to refine the precise requirement based on a consistent migration trend pattern and be representative of the economic growth aspirations of the borough.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Alistair Craig	N/A	N/A	173028	393	Yes	No	80% of respondents to the New Homes consultation wanted housing spread out across the borough in smaller developments, yet the Manydown allocation in SS3 is heavily biased towards a major development. Other objectors suggest more development at Manydown and the removal of sites local to them, which is contrary to the consultation. The allocation of land at Manydown in preference to that owned by other landowners is anti-competitive under the Competition Act, with the withdrawal of the exemption for land charges in 2011.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. The plan provides a balanced strategy for meeting housing needs over the plan period. The housing requirement cannot be met on one single site or on smaller development. The site assessment work, SHLAA and sustainability appraisal have informed the selection of sites.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Nigel and Susan Clarke	N/A	N/A	212798	551	Yes	No	Brownfield sites should be developed first. Development of greenfield sites, such as Manydown, should be a very last resort.	Brownfield land, such as behind Basingstoke railway station, should be developed first. This approach will protect the local countryside for future generations.	A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites (Policy SS4). The plan's spatial strategy takes into account all brownfield sites that are deliverable for housing development in the plan period, as outlined in the SHLAA. However, greenfield sites are required on top of those to deliver the number of homes necessary.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Banner and Bewley Homes	Banner and Bewley Homes	Barton Willmore	458958	766	Yes	Yes	There are concerns with regard to the proposed housing target which we recognise does not reflect the full local objectively assessed housing needs. However, a housing target of 748 dwellings over the plan period 2011-2029 represents a positive increase from the previously proposed target (Pre-Submission Core Strategy 2012 of 594 dpa), which is supported. Policy SS1 sets out how the proposed housing target (748 dpa) will be met over the plan period 2011-29. This includes the development of approximately 7,010 dwellings on greenfield sites to be allocated in the PSLP (bullet d) which we support.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Daniel Hawes	Hart District Council	N/A	625619	468	Not Specified	No	Any unmet housing needs in the Basingstoke and Deane housing market area could have negative impacts on Hart District because in reality there are functional linkages or overlaps between them. Hart District Council therefore supports a strategy for Basingstoke and Dean that meets the objectively assessed need for housing within its housing market area. However, it is not clear from the published evidence base whether all relevant factors have been considered in determining the objectively assessed housing need figure of 748 dwelling per annum. The 748 figure has been derived from the Edge Analytics demographic work, rather than a full up to date SHMA. It is therefore not clear how other factors such as market house price signals and the need for affordable housing have influenced the figure fore objectively assessed need.	It is the council's understanding that B&DBC will publish an up to date SHMA. If upon publication of the SHMA the council is satisfied that 748 is a true reflection of housing need it is willing to withdraw the objection or clarify the position in a statement of common ground.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. On-going discussions are taking place with Hart Council on this matter.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Graham Smith	Test Valley Council	N/A	625620	481	Not Specified	Yes	The Council supports the approach taken to justify the housing requirement within Basingstoke and Deane. The issue of meeting the housing shortfall within the administrative boundaries of BDBC should be emphasised within the document.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted. The plan outlines the strategy for meeting the housing needs within the borough's administrative boundaries. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Graham Ritchie	Wokingham Borough Council	N/A	625631	547	Not Specified	Not Specified	Wokingham BC (March 2012) objected to the quantum of housing development (594dpa) required for BDBC between 2011 and 2027 as it was below the requirements of the SEPlan and the government's household projections. It is recognised that the Pre-submission Local Plan includes annual higher housing target (748dpa) than for the Pre-submission Core Strategy. Wokingham Borough Council requires further information on migration and other flows between BDBC and both Reading and Wokingham Borough's before it can be satisfied on the adequacy of the proposed housing target. Once this has ben provided, Wokingham Borough Council will review its position.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	999	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Gordon Simpson	N/A	N/A	780307	6	No	No	13,464 new houses....2 cars per household possibly more where young adults still with parents. Where are all these extra cars going to go? M3 already choked 10 years ago...since then Elvetham Heath developed. No money to developed roads, rail already overloaded, it just doesn't stack up Also where is the water coming from. You state that the Test and Loddon have to be protected...how are you going to do this with all the extra water extraction? Last year with a short dry spell we had drought procedures imposed, so where is all this extra water coming from? Hospitals and Doctors surgeries...already stretched beyond ability to render an acceptable service...where are another 50,000 people going to access facilities. You cant simply continue to build more houses without the infrastructure being put in place FIRST...making do or muddling through is no longer an option in a civilised society. Demand cant always be met, a fact of life.	Unless you can magic up new motorways and extra water supply it is not possible to sustain this plan	The local planning authority has a duty to produce a local plan which meets the borough's objectively assessed housing need for the future. In terms of infrastructure, a Transport Assessment (TA) has been produced to support the plan which identifies junction mitigation measures that may be required on the Strategic Highway Network by 2029 to mitigate the local plan allocations. The IDP identifies the strategic transport infrastructure that is required. The Council will work with the Highways Authority to deliver improvements to the transport network to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan development. It is important to note that the NPPF requires that 'all development generating significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement (TS) or TA. Plans and decisions should take account of whether... improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual or cumulative impacts of the development are severe'. Any TA or TS submitted by applicants to support applications will need to demonstrate that the impacts of the development on the highway network can be mitigated. The Highways Authority will review the planning application TA and work with the applicants to deliver appropriate mitigation measures on the highway network. Water supply is considered through the water companies Water Resource Management Plans and they have confirmed supply to support the number of homes proposed in the Plan. The Environment Agency monitor water abstraction. If the level of abstraction is deemed to be harmful then water companies are responsible for finding alternative sources of water for supply such as new reservoirs. The IDP considers the infrastructure required to support the additional homes. As part of the site specific policies new infrastructure will be a requirement of new developments.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	N/A	N/A	781298	66	No	No	Chineham Parish Council considers this Policy to have flaws, making it unsound. The housing numbers defined in 4.11. Table 2 are based on data gathered in 2010 and 2011 with the sites selected from the SHLAA of 2010. The sites brought forward for Site Selection in June 2013 had proposed yields matching the agreed numbers with no "headroom" and thus no choice. All the proposed sites had to be selected to make the agreed total of 13,464 dwellings, with 7,010 to come from greenfield site allocations. With no spare sites, the "selection" process was flawed and unsound as there was no actual selection as all greenfield sites had to be included to make the required total. With no Reserve Sites the situation will become critical if any one of these greenfield sites is found to be not viable. This could have serious consequences, including "planning by appeal".	Identification of some reserve sites and increased allocation on the Manydown site (SS3.10) to create some headroom.	This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. The site assessment process assessed all category 1 sites contained in the SHLAA and a number of Greenfield sites were not included within the draft plan as a result of this process. The plan includes a housing buffer to ensure flexibility and policies also include a trigger to review the plan if sites are not delivering as predicted. Further explanation for the number of homes and distribution including sites is contained within the 'Housing Topic Paper'.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Martin Baker	N/A	N/A	783682	58	Yes	No	I understand the need for growth in the building of houses in the borough for good economic and demographic change reasons. However, I believe the plan is based on erroneous statistics, particularly in respect of the growth figures for rural areas. It appears that rural communities are being disproportionately loaded with extra houses based on historic urban growth figures not the actual villages' growth over the same period. The rural infrastructure in terms of jobs, transport, sewage etc. is much less resilient to the increases in population proposed and will only have a detrimental effect on the whole environment. This is grossly unfair and could be construed as being influenced for political reasons rather than applying the data correctly and sharing the load more equitably across the Borough.	Re-visit and increase the apportionment of housing sites in the urban areas, where the economic and demographic necessity is proven, and thereby reduce the loading of rural communities with disproportionate additional building.	This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. Whilst development is focused around Basingstoke, some development within the borough's villages is suitable in order to meet local housing needs etc. Improvements to local infrastructure are supported by the council's IDP. Further explanation for the number of homes and distribution is contained within the 'Housing Topic Paper'.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Arthur Whittaker	N/A	N/A	784777	292	Yes	No	I don't think the Local Plan is sound as it has been prepared in a manner biased towards smaller developments and away from a more sensible larger development.	Apart from starting again and taking out all mention of small developments and concentrate on one large development at Manydown, I don't know.	The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. The plan provides a balanced strategy for meeting housing needs over the plan period. The housing requirement cannot be met on one single site. The site assessment work, SHLAA and sustainability appraisal have informed the selection of sites. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	D.T Dance	N/A	N/A	784785	297	Yes	No	Local highway network is at capacity. New development will increase congestion.	The A340 via Tadley to A4, A339 to newbury, A339 to Alton and the A33 to Reading should all be upgraded to at least dual carriage standard before the sites allocated in the plan are allocated.	Local Plan Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mrs Kate Mabbott	N/A	N/A	784821	312	Yes	No	Policy should permit new housing on the edge of villages, specifically North Waltham, rather than on the edge of Basingstoke Town.	Amend policy to allow new housing on the edge of villages, specifically North Waltham.	The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. Whilst development is focused around Basingstoke given the nature of the town, the plan has also allocated some growth around the borough's larger towns and villages as suitable, such as Whitchurch, Overton, Bramley, Kingsclere and Oakley whilst providing a framework for the delivery of further growth around smaller settlements through neighbourhood planning. Policies SS6 and CN2 specifically relate to the provision of new housing in the countryside. SPBs will be reviewed through a future DPD.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Grainger plc.	Grainger PLC	N/A	785596	471	Not Specified	No	Policy SS1 restricts development to within the settlement policy boundaries unless such boundaries have been reviewed as part of proposals to release greenfield land for development. The site, known as the Island Site at junction of A30 and Beggarwood Lane, is not inside the current settlement policy boundary, which Grainger considers to be an anomaly. Grainger consider that commercial and/or community related development would be appropriate for this site and that this anomaly should be corrected in the new plan. The Island Site lies adjacent to Area N, which is within the settlement policy boundary, and together they provide a unique opportunity to provide a package of proposals which address the current deficiency of local community facilities, improve the attractiveness of the local centre and deliver a set of related highway and environmental improvements at this important 'gateway' entrance to the neighbourhood. No timeframe for SPB review is unacceptable.	The proposed settlement policy boundary indicated on Map 1c Basingstoke Town Area West should be amended to include the Island Site (see attached site plan) within the defined urban area of Basingstoke.	At this stage of the preparation of the Local Plan, no minor amendments are proposed to the Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs), other than the inclusion of new sites for allocation. It would therefore be inappropriate to amend the SPB in this location to include the island site. However, it is considered that there is scope to consider the emerging proposals for this area through the planning application process, where account can be taken of site specific issues, in addition to the outcomes of community consultation and other research into the requirement for additional facilities for support the existing community.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Chris Quintana	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	N/A	785867	511	Yes	No	Housing figure of 748 dwellings per annum is unduly low and will not provide for sufficient growth in the local workforce, supporting an increase in the region of only 6,500 jobs over the plan period. This could result in the diversion of employment elsewhere outside the borough.	Housing figure should be increased. The right level of growth must be identified and delivered to enable the borough to prosper now and in the future.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Eric Livett	N/A	N/A	786154	573	Not Specified	No	I wonder if you could explain why no development appears to be planned for Basingstoke east of the M3? I recall from a flyer you issued sometime ago that only land offered for sale had been considered. Why can't compulsory purchase legislation be used.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The NPPF sets out guidance on what sites can be considered for development. This assessment is contained within the SHLAA. Sites must be suitable, available and deliverable and land to the east of the M3 is not available for development. All sites are assessed through site assessment and sustainability appraisal to determine the most appropriate sites/strategy. To compulsory purchase this amount of land would not be viable, or suitable given other available sites promoted to the borough council.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Miss Sarah Elliott	Homes and Communities Agency	N/A	786159	576	Yes	Yes	The HCA previously made a representation on-line regarding concern over the previously proposed level of housing supply (590dpa). We deemed this to be insufficient to meet local housing need. Together with the new increased proposed supply of 748dpa, we welcome the bringing forward of Greenfield Site Allocations, in particular the Manydown site in Basingstoke. This level of housing growth, whilst lower than recent years, is comparable to the long-term trend (for instance in 2006/07 housing completions were at 728). The level of affordable housing completions in the borough were at 27 in 2011/12. The HCA is keen to work with the Council to support an increase in affordable housing delivery, given the extent of local affordable housing need.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments, support and offer for future partnership working noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Miss Jane Neville	N/A	N/A	786280	627	No	No	There is no mention of supply and demand, who is going to be accessing houses, in terms of whether they are affordable to those of all generations and walks of life? Is there necessity for so many houses to be built? Were there surveys as to migration to and from the borough, those leaving higher education and moving onto degree level, are they likely to return? The amount of individual persons travelling to the borough to work in comparison with those who find a job in Basingstoke, to move onto progressively buy a property here? Have the council thought about the recycling of houses. Overspending can be avoided with more analysis and looking at trends within society.	There needs to be more analysis of movement of individuals in and out of Basingstoke before any precious farmland and valued countryside is given up to housing. For the good of conservation and habitation houses should not be built unless absolutely necessary.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Many of the questions raised appear to be answered by paras 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11 of the draft Local Plan. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	650	Not Specified	Yes	We have no overall concerns with this policy. We are currently working with you on a Water Cycle Memorandum of Understanding to confirm the validity of the Water Cycle Study with the revised housing numbers.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted and work on the MOU will continue	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Ms Sue Eastick	N/A	N/A	786358	690	Not Specified	Not Specified	The number of houses planned for this area are far higher than can be reasonably be expected to be required/affordable in the specific period. Government instructions re volume of houses required does not take into consideration local needs or desires. Putting such a large volume of houses in one area, as proposed north of B3400 will put too high a strain on local resources, i.e. water supply, transport (even if new roads are built). This will further exacerbated if the 600 houses proposed for building along Pack Lane are proceeded with. Fiveways is already a bottleneck at peak times and can only get worse. The demand on Oakley to build 150 houses within its boundaries does not make reasonable sense and building must not take place outside of the present limit of Oakley Lane and St. John's Road as this would further reduce the open area between Oakley and Basingstoke.	Thought should be given to spreading such a large volume of houses throughout a wider area around Basingstoke, although I realise that Government would prefer all to be built in one area as this reduces the infrastructure cost outlay. Why does the council steadfastly refuse to consider building South of the M3? This would give those new residents easy access to the M3.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. The plan provides a balanced strategy for meeting housing needs over the plan period. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources. A Transport Assessment has been completed which assesses the impacts of development west of Basingstoke and proposes potential solutions/junction upgrades etc. Such issues will be considered further through master planning etc. as appropriate. In terms of Oakley, this has been identified as a location for a limited level of development, given local housing need and the availability of services and facilities locally. It should be noted that other settlements in the Borough have also been allocated a future housing number and / or specific site for future housing, which recognises their relative sustainability. Under proposals, the local community would decide where the housing should be located. The area to the south of the M3 is not available for development.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mrs Louise Piper	Rushmoor Borough Council	N/A	786416	716	Yes	No	At the time of writing, BDBC has not published an up to date SHMA or Housing Topic Paper setting out an explanation of how the housing figures are a realistic representation of objectively assessed housing need, and that there will not be any negative impacts on Rushmoor Borough as a result. Rushmoor Borough Council raise a holding objection to Policy SS1. It fails to demonstrate that it can meet its objectively assessed housing needs as required by paragraphs 47 and 159 of the NPPF; it is not justified; the absence of an up-to-date SHMA gives rise to soundness issues it is not effective; it is not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities and therefore fails to meet the duty to cooperate. Is not consistent with National Policy; paragraph 159 of the NPPF outlines the need to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change.	The Council would wish to see the following changes made to the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan: Publication of an up-to-date SHMA and a convincing justification for the method of calculation used to determine the housing number for the District, the content of which could justify the withdrawal of Rushmoor Borough Council's objection to the Local Plan. Alternatively it could form the basis of a Statement of Common Ground between the two local planning authorities prior to the formal commencement of the Hearing sessions.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Nik Lyzba	Royal British Legion	N/A	786428	732	Yes	No	We agree that Bramley is a suitable location for further housing development (4.12 and 4.29). The borough-wide provision of housing across the period 2011-2029 of 13,464 has not, in our view, been properly justified. The figure is lower than the figure published in the South East Plan to provide 945 dpa/18,900 over the RSS period. The supporting SHMA dates from November 2007 and cannot be considered up-to-date. As a consequence of the overall under provision, the proposed distribution of housing in Bramley may also be an under provision. National planning policy, set out in the NPPF, places a strong emphasis on the reuse of previously developed land. The policy should place greater emphasis on making best and efficient use of previously developed land and then the allocation of greenfield land. The policy fails to do this. With regard to the proposed review of Settlement Policy Boundaries, it is considered that this review should form part of the current Local Plan submission.	The council's housing figure should be justified with an up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites (Policy SS4). The plan's spatial strategy takes into account all brownfield sites that are deliverable for housing development in the plan period, as outlined in the SHLAA. However, greenfield sites are required on top of those to deliver the number of homes necessary. It is considered that a review of SPBs can suitably follow the adoption of the plan, through a DPD process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	778	Yes	No	The figure included within the submitted Local Plan is based upon a migration-led scenario reflecting internal migration over the last 10 years and international migration over the last 5 years, with the latter reduced to 80% to align with national estimates. We support the principle of policy SS1 although consider that a minor alteration is required to bring the policy more in line with the soundness guidance set out in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework(NPPF) and, in particular, the "positively prepared" test. The requirement to provide 13,464 should be expressed as a minimum requirement to meet the needs of the district, as opposed to the current wording which suggests the number is a cap. The potential to exceed this number should be recognised within the policy text.	We suggest the wording should be amended to:- "Within the period 2011-2029, the Local Plan will make provision to meet at least 13,464 dwellings and associated infrastructure".	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	804	Not Specified	No	Object: The proposed housing requirement of 13,464 dwellings (2011-29) is too inflexible and is inadequate to meet objectively assessed need for housing over the plan period. The unallocated brownfield sites component in Para 4.11 table 2 (2247 dwellings) is too high and does not provide the certainty of supply required by the NPPF. Consequently, the greenfield housing component (7,010) is insufficient. This makes the Policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the NPPF.	To overcome the objection the Housing Numbers would be reassessed in their entirety having regard to up to date information from the SHMA.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The brownfield site component is robust, being based upon the SHLAA with a 10% discount for under delivery.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	817	Yes	No	P & I OSCOM agreed a revised housing target of 748 dwelling per annum, based on migration assumptions reduced by 80% (Scenario A). This does not reflect the full local housing requirement. The approach of focusing growth on Basingstoke is supported. However, as currently worded, SS1 implies that all sites outside of the Settlement Policy Boundaries will be considered to lie in the countryside until such time that they are amended through a future DPD. Greenfield site allocations should not be constrained by policies that relate to "development in the countryside" by virtue of the fact that they have been found acceptable in principle for development. This represents an inflexible policy approach, reducing the effectiveness of the plan.	Bullet a in SS1 should be amended as follows: "Permitting development and redevelopment within the defined Settlement Policy Boundaries, which contribute to social, economic and environmental well-being. Site[s] outside of defined Settlement Policy Boundaries, other than those allocated for development , will be considered to lie in the countryside."	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The strategic housing sites within Policy SS3 have their SPB changed to go around the sites as shown on the draft policies maps.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mrs Linda Oxford	N/A	N/A	786899	914	Not Specified	Not Specified	We all know that a high percentage of houses perceived to be required are for people coming to our country or for people already here, from the EU and other parts of the world. Why should the people of Oakley and Britain be asked to sacrifice our beautiful countryside to build houses for foreigners? This is a very sad situation brought on by mistakes made by past governments, especially that of Tony Blair who has opened our borders to people wanting to take advantage of this country's generosity, one result being that this government feels obliged to provide thousands of houses to home them.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The methodology for calculating a local housing number is set out by central government and now forms part of the draft National Planning Practice Guidance which states that migration must be factored into the calculations. This is not only international migration but internal migration within the UK.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Gleeson Strategic Land	Gleeson Strategic Land	N/A	787094	953	Yes	No	Housing requirement cannot represent the 'full, objectively assessed needs' for housing in the area as it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. Policy is not consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The credibility of the housing needs assessment is flawed in that it is wholly based upon projection modelling. Projections alone may not give a full, accurate reflection of housing need because they will reflect past trends. By comparison, the information provided by the DCLG 2008-based Household Projections indicates that a significantly higher number of households will form over the 18 year plan period. This points to doubts about the accuracy and reliability of the methodology the Council has used, and suggests that the housing requirement should be higher. Likely that by relying on projection modelling, the Council's assessment may significantly under-estimate housing need. Local Plan has not been supported by a full and up-to-date SHMA as required by the NPPF.	The Council must prepare a full, up-to-date SHMA to ensure a robust and credible evidence base to the assessment of housing needs. Account should be taken of the DCLG household projections, and the level of housing provision set out in Policy SS1 should be raised to achieve a more robust requirement given the doubts about the accuracy of the Council's methodology. This would be more in line with the requirement in National Policy to significantly boost the supply of housing.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Ms Gemma Avery	Southeast Water	N/A	787268	1026	Yes	Yes	Our WRMP assumes there will be 11,608 homes from 2012-2030 across Basingstoke and Deane. Your plan requirement of runs from 2011 to 2029 and includes properties already built, those with planning permission and those that will be located outside of our water supply catchment zone. Therefore we do not have any current concerns with your forecast. We review these figures every 5 years when we update our plan so we encourage you to work with us to ensure your figures are included in the numbers we use for forecasting.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A		Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1047	No	No	The SA considers 750dpa to be the objectively assessed need. There is the absence of an up to date SHMA. The proposed housing requirement does not correspond to the out of date SHMA findings. There is no evidence to explain why and how 748 is the objectively assessed housing need. The water cycle study supported the SEPlan housing figure and is therefore not a constraint on development.	A wholesale review of the housing requirement is necessary including the undertaking of a comprehensive SHMA before the policy can be found sound.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	787495	1078	Yes	No	Middleton and Portway Estates has an interest in KING005. The provision of 13,464 new homes over the plan period will not meet the requirements for market and affordable housing in the local market area. The proposed housing figure is inconsistent with and will undermine the borough's economic prospects; components of the housing supply are unsound. Kingsclere should accommodate housing growth in excess of 50 homes identified in the Local Plan and the Council's evidence to support the allocation of 50 homes is unjustified. SHLAA site KING005 is deliverable, viable and achievable and would contribute towards sustainable development in Kingsclere. Please also see attachment.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. 50 units at Kingsclere is considered to be a suitable level of development to meet the needs of the village. The plan sets the framework for the local community to direct where this development would most suitably be located.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	Catesby Kler Land	Turley Associates	787505	1116	Yes	No	We contend that the housing growth set out in the revised Local Plan will fail to meet the Borough's 'objectively assessed' housing needs. The Council has not assessed and consulted on alternative ways of meeting themselves, or with the help of adjacent authorities (under the Duty to Cooperate) some or all of these objectively assessed needs. We also question the manner in which the Council has assessed its overall housing need. Applying a housing delivery target of less than circa 950 homes would demonstrably underprovide housing and not meet local requirements, or encourage appropriate levels of employment growth. on this basis it is unclear why the Council would seek to provide only 748dpa, a figure which will constrain jobs, growth and / or increase commuting/travel-to-work distances. See full response for additional detail / evidence	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Romanina Real Estate	Romanina Real Estate Inc.	Romanina Real Estate	787564	1122	Yes	No	The housing distribution strategy of focusing primarily on Basingstoke, with appropriate levels of growth at Whitchurch, Overton, Bramley, Kingsclere and Oakley is supported. In particular, Overton is the next most sustainable settlement in the borough after Basingstoke. However, there is no evidence that Overton Parish Council is enthusiastically and proactively progressing a neighbourhood plan to include the required allocation of 150 additional dwellings, and this will have a further detrimental impact on housing land supply in the borough. The current SHMA was produced in 2007 and is demonstrably out of date. The new SHMA is not going to be completed until after consultation on the pre-submission local plan has been concluded. As such, the pre-submission local plan cannot be regarded as setting a sound housing target on this basis. Agree with HBF suggestion that the council deliver 16,146/900dpa. This would also provide the required buffer.	The proposal in the pre-submission local plan to defer the identification of land for an additional 150 dwellings at Overton to a subsequent neighbourhood planning process runs counter to urgent need to remedy and significantly boost the supply of housing locally. Indeed, it is a perverse proposal. Rather, SHLAA site OV004 - Two Gate Lane - should be allocated as part of a revised strategy to identify a higher, more robust housing target which will generally meet the borough's identified housing needs.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable. The spatial strategy outlined in the plan is considered the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, as tested through the sustainability appraisal process. 150 units at Overton, in addition to the Overton Hill allocation is considered to be a suitable level of development to meet the needs of the village. The plan sets the framework for the local community to direct where this development would most suitably be located and this is considered a suitable approach, in line with the Council's localism agenda.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1193	Yes	No	Not consistent with NPPF: The proposed amount of housing (748 dph) fails to significantly boost the supply of housing (NPPF Para 74). It is a substantial reduction from the former SE Plan figure of 945 pa and is below the delivery rate that has been achieved. - fails to meet the needs for market and affordable housing (NPPF Para 47) - does not support economic growth. The objectives will constrain Basingstoke's economic growth potential. Not Justified: - Limiting house building to 748 dph will constrain economic growth and/or lead to increased in-commuting - to propose a house building rate below (735-770 dpa) that which the Planning Officer acknowledges is un-inhibited - failing to address the backlog in housing delivery (2011-13) SHMA identifies an affordable housing need of between 589 and 933pa. Only 309 were completed 2011/12. The level of affordable housing need implies an overall housing provision of between 1450-2300 dpa is required. Over 1000 dpa is more realistic.	Para 4.2 should be amended to provide for a level of housing provision of at least 1,000 dwellings per annum.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Judith Ashton Ass.	787729	1206	No	No	The existing SHMA is now 5 years old and even the council accept it will not be adequate to support the new Local Plan. In addition, there has been no subsequent SHMA update against which to assess the more up to date housing requirements. This lack of an up to date SHMA means that the Pre-Submission Local Plan cannot be said to be based on a clear and robust assessment of the objectively assessed housing needs of the borough. A figure of more like 900 dpa would appear to be a more reasonable figure. In addition, in recent years Basingstoke has delivered a substantial amount of housing on average, and to reduce the level of provision would appear to go against the grain of the NPPF and government policy. The Edge Analytics report identifies an annual housing requirement of 550 (zero migration) - 1084 (migration based on last 5 years). The employment led scenario, which assumes a desire to provide for 600 jobs per annum suggest a housing requirement between 936 - 1036 dpa.	An updates SHMA is required, and the housing delivery set out in the plan needs to be increased in line with an updated evidence base.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The wording of the policy is considered suitable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS1 - Scale and Distribution of New Housing	N/A	Mr Jeremy Fareilly	Wates Development Ltd	Genesis Town Planning	787807	701	Not Specified	No	The 13,464 dwellings proposed over the plan period/748 per annum is significantly lower than the South East Plan requirement of 18,900 net additional dwellings/945 net additional dwellings per annum. Although the South East Plan has been abolished, it was the subject of a robust evidence base and detailed scrutiny. Most of the scenarios tested by Edge Analytics are flawed, especially the Net Nil Scenario, which is widely accepted as being unrealistic where in and out migration are assumed to be equal. Of the scenarios tested by Edge, the Employment 600 and Migration Trends (5 & 10 year patterns) are considered the most appropriate scenarios in assessing housing needs. The former is most consistent with the council's history. This scenario indicates an annual requirement of 936 and 1036 dpa based on 600 jobs per annum. However, the council has opted for a combination of trends and a 20% reduction in order to reach 748. Council has no definitive housing needs assessment.	The dwelling provision set out in Policy SS1 should increase to between 900 and 1000 dwellings per annum between 2011 and 2029. The change will ensure there is sufficient quantity of housing for the borough needs up to 2029 in compliance with the NPPF.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS1 -Scale and Distribution of new housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert the word "Policy" in front of policy title.	consistent formatting	N/A	N/A
Policy SS1 -Scale and Distribution of new housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update number of dwellings at criterion d)	updated evidence	N/A	N/A
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1000	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Clr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	317	Yes	No	The amount for regeneration is too low. In a town such as Basingstoke, the Council has significant ability to regenerate areas of the town (both existing residential and commercial) to deliver more new homes on brownfield sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The 200 figure is based on analysis of the areas, and trend data, and is considered to be reasonable. However, it is considered that a broader approach to the policy, as implied in this representation, would be more appropriate, as various sites could also be regenerated, not just residential neighbourhoods.	Title of the policy has been changed to regeneration, from regeneration of residential neighbourhoods. The first line of the policy is also amended accordingly.	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	225	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Winklebury Centre is in dire need of regeneration, and there is adjacent land to be used for new shops and properties.	The policy has been updated and retitled to refer to all forms of regeneration.	The policy has been updated and retitled to refer to all forms of regeneration, from regeneration of residential neighbourhoods, including within the priority areas of Buckskin, South Ham and Norden (indicatively illustrated on Figure 1 below), will be supported where they would result in a demonstrable benefit to the local community.	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	785	Yes	No	This policy sets out that regeneration initiatives will be supported at Buckskin, South Ham and Norden. However, the extent to which these initiatives should be considered strategic in the context of the delivery of new dwellings is questionable. The three sites are expected to provide an additional 200 dwellings towards the district housing requirements as set out in table 2. The inclusion of these 200 units towards the supply is not sound as it is not justified. There is no apparent evidence to suggest that this is deliverable, a point which is conceded in paragraph 4.43 of the Local Plan which states:- "It is acknowledged that appropriate regeneration schemes will not always result in the delivery of additional dwellings, depending on the characteristics of the site and the details of the proposal". Given that there appears to be no details of the proposals, there is no obvious basis for the allocation and the inclusion of 200 units within the housing supply table.	To ensure a sound plan, this policy should be located towards the end of section 4 of the Local Plan and reference to 200 units should be removed from table 2.	Since 2002 a significant number of large regeneration scheme have gained planning permission, amounting to 460 net dwellings (Oakridge 151, Maldives Faroe 117, Bishops Green 53, Longfellow Parade 39, Taverner Freemantle 100), an average of 33 dwellings per year. In addition, the Council is taking a proactive approach to regeneration through the strategic approach to Regeneration, working closely with RSLs such as Sovereign to deliver appropriate schemes. 200 units over the lifetime of the plan period is considered to be a reasonable expectation.	No change. Some additional justification for the policy will be prepared to support the council's position at examination	Response to representation	Agreed	Superseded with updated representation
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference to 'supported as part of a comprehensive area-based regeneration programme.' removed.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Officer	N/A	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N/A	N/A	Include the word 'within' before ' the priority areas' in order to make the sentence correct as a result of amendment to first line.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Member	N/A	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N/A	N/A	Community', changed to 'communities'.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS2 - Regenerating Residential Neighbourhoods	Policy SS2 - Regeneration	Officer	N/A	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N/A	N/A	Delete "Regeneration proposals will be permitted which".	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
4.40	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	994	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.42	4.41	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		The word 'focus' changed to 'identification' in order to indicate the policy is aimed at regeneration in general.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
4.42	4.41	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		The words 'and areas' added after neighbourhoods in order to illustrate that the policy does not just apply to neighbourhoods.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
4.42	4.41	Member	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		words 'and the local environment' included after the words 'quality of life'. End sentence here and new sentence starts "Masterplans".	the need to ensure that regeneration proposal encompass environmental improvements.	N/A	N/A
4.42	4.41	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		phrase 'for larger scale proposals' added in order to allow for a more proportionate approach.	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
4.42	4.41	Member	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Section which reads 'Schemes must result in improvements in residents' overall quality of life and masterplans or development briefs should be prepared, in full consultation with local community affected, to outline how any proposals will provide benefits to the local area whilst also positively supporting any wider comprehensive development.' Replaced with: 'Schemes must result in improvements in residents' overall quality of life and the local environment. Masterplans or development briefs should be prepared for larger scale proposals. Where masterplans or development briefs are required, they should be developed in full consultation with the local communities affected, and should not negatively impact upon wider, comprehensive development which may be forthcoming in the area.	For clarity	N/A	N/A
4.42	4.41	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Include footnote referencing appendix 5 - 'See Appendix 5 – Masterplan and Development Brief Protocol'	In order to ensure that this appendix is referred to when any masterplans or development briefs are produced in relation to this policy.	N/A	N/A
4.43	4.42	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		First paragraph amended to read: 'Whilst regeneration schemes generally result in the increased provision of residential units, it is acknowledged that this is not always the case.'	Response to rep and in order to be more accurate and positive.	Agreed	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.43	4.42	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Words '(including pursuant to the community right to build)' added.	Factual update	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1017	Not Specified	No	Policy SS3 requires the preparation of a masterplan or development brief, to be approved by the Council prior to the submission of a planning application. This requirement is also echoed in the Local Plan Appendix 5 - Masterplan and Development Brief Protocol. There is no clarity on what procedure would be followed and what would be the status of the MP/DB once "approved"? This requirement has potentially serious implications for development programmes and delivery. We question what status such a document would have in planning terms and what weight it could reasonably be given in considering a planning application. The Council applied a similar requirement within its previous Local Plan which resulted in significant delays in planning applications and therefore much needed new homes coming forward. A repeat of this should be avoided. See full response	Wonder whether the Borough Council's intentions would better be fulfilled by instead requiring that masterplan or development brief for each allocated site are worked up with the Borough Council and the community and submitted as part of any planning applications. This would ensure that key local issues are addressed and that the Borough Council and community is involved in the process, but it would importantly ensure that any planning permissions could be granted subject to Conditions that require the development to adhere to the principles submitted within the submitted Design Brief.	The involvement of the community in the completion of masterplanning is considered suitable and in line with national guidance. The policy is worded to allow flexibility in that it is the Council's preference for this approach but it is not restrictive.	Change wording to read "Development on the sites is expected to come forward through the preparation of a masterplan or development brief, where appropriate, prepared in partnership with the landowner and with consultation involving the local community, to be approved by the council prior to the submission of a planning application. Where two or more sites are adjacent to each other, Masterplanning should be undertaken jointly".	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	678	Not Specified	No	3.5 Overton Hill - the phasing should be delayed to allow the residents of 174 properties built on 2 major estates in last 5 years to settle in. 3.5a How can a development of 120 homes possibly preserve and enhance the village's Conservation Area or Grade 2 listed Quad Hampton Mill?	intentionally left blank	The Council needs to ensure that it has a five year housing land supply at the start of the Local Plan period, and therefore a number of allocation sites within the borough have been phased for development in the first five years of the plan period. These sites have been phased based on deliverability information. The Council must identify and allocate sites that are deliverable at various points of the plan period to ensure that the housing supply is maintained. The policy criteria will help to ensure that development preserves and enhances the heritage assets of the area through an appropriate layout, design etc., and ensure sufficient mitigation measures are provided when required.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	438	Yes	No	This policy states development within areas of flood risk from any source of flooding will only be acceptable if it is clearly demonstrated that it is appropriate at that location and that there are no suitable alternative sites at a lower flood risk. Areas of the East of Basingstoke site are prone to flooding and although they say they will avoid developing those specific parts they have not demonstrated that they have sufficiently considered the increased risk brought by climate change in the next 50 -100 years nor considered how the development of land which now acts as a sponge will increase run-off and flooding. The River Loddon did not used to be a spate river but already now rises dramatically after rainfall due to hard surface run-off. No credible proposals are in place to manage this risk, Alternative sites are available.	Site SS3.10 is not prone to flooding and could take up to 6000 houses (BDBC report to Cabinet meeting 30/7/13 item 15 - report) which would avoid the necessity to develop SS3.9 or at least delay it into the next plan when proper infrastructure could have been put in place. Similarly the site known as Hounsme Fields could be made available and could take 1000 houses.	The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage were considered within the evidence base for the Local Plan, and the Plan's policies address such issues. Specifically, matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of policy SS3.9 which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. The yield on Manydown has been increased in response to the consultation but due to lead in times etc. 6000 units on Manydown are not deliverable over the Plan period.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1149	Yes	No	Site SS3.9 has been selected in direct contravention of the Sequential Test based on flood risk as defined in the glossary p143, and which is National Policy as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. SS3.9 is listed as the highest risk area (band8) in the list of selected sites whereas there are other sites which are reasonably available namely BAS 133 Hounsme Fields (1000 houses), BAS 099 Scrapps Hill (80 houses), BAS 141 Land at Worthing Road (280 houses), possible additional yield at Manydown and numerous sites at Tadley with a lower risk that have not been selected.	Site SS3.9 should be removed from the Local Plan	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base. The site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues. The Environment Agency has not objected to the Plan's spatial strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1170	No	No	Object to the allocations SS3.2 and SS3.10 and considers SS3 to be unsound insofar as it relates to these proposed allocations. The decision to allocate these sites is premature in light of no assessment of objectively assessed needs at the sub-regional level and an assessment of more suitable locations at the sub-regional level. Are not the most appropriate strategy given no assessment at the sub-regional level. The Local Plan is not legally compliant given the absence of an appropriate level of cooperation with neighbouring authorities.	Requests these allocations are deleted. Requests a decision should be taken at the sub-regional level to locate the uplift in housing requirements to a more sustainable location elsewhere.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. The Pre-submission Local Plan was agreed at full Council for public consultation. The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information, including housing need arising from economic growth. The sites in SS3 are required to meet this housing need. Further information is set out in the updated SHMA and housing topic paper. The Council continues to work with neighbouring authorities to address any cross boundary matters/issues but the borough's housing market is relatively self contained.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	368	Not Specified	No	Policy SS3. Greenfield Sites, p35 - Hounsme Fields (SHLAA BAS133), adjacent to Kennel Farm (SS3.2), should be included as an alternative to sites SS3.9 East of Basingstoke and SS3.7 Redlands. Hounsme Fields BAS133 was included in previous versions of the SHLAA. The Flooding sequential test alone places this before SS3.9. The number of houses on BAS 133 directly matches those on SS3.7 and SS3.9. Failure to apply the Sequential Flooding Test is not consistent with NPPF. This is unsound. Newnham Parish Council supports the Country Watch comments on this.	Using the flooding sequential test Hounsme Fields should replace SS3.9 and SS3.7.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base. The site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues. The Environment Agency has not objected to the Plan's spatial strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	372	Not Specified	No	Flooding - Policy EM7 (p91) states that a sequential approach to development will follow national guidance, i.e. sites with a lower risk will be developed first. The Local Plan contravenes the Flood risk policy, as defined in the glossary p143, since it has put the East of Basingstoke site (SS3.9) ahead of other sites with a lower flood risk. SS3.9 is listed as the highest flood risk (band 8) in the list of selected sites whereas other sites (Hounsme Fields SHLAA BAS 133 and sites on Manydown, BAS099 and BAS141). Many low risk sites at Tadley have not been selected.	Ensure that the Flooding Sequential test is applied correctly across the Borough. Hounsme Fields and Tadley Sites must be developed ahead of East of Basingstoke.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base. The site policies, along with other policies contained in the plan, in combination address such issues. Development will not take place within the floodplain or in high risk areas. Additionally, the Environment Agency have been consulted and they are satisfied that development will not take place in the flood plain for site SS3.9 and therefore the relevant tests have been complied with. As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan, 'the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will need to be met elsewhere in the borough'. The Plan needs to outline a deliverable housing strategy in order to be NPPF compliant and be found sound.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Alistair Craig	N/A	N/A	173028	383	Yes	No	SS3.10 requires new transport, water and power infrastructure to support it, yet the existing adjacent infrastructure is not adequate to support any meaningful development, masterplanning has not commenced and it will take a considerable time the design of supporting infrastructure. For example, the IDP refers to 24 weeks for sewerage modelling and 3 to 5 years lead in time. It is difficult to see how the necessary infrastructure will be in place to allow housing to be occupied at the start of the plan period.	A more realistic schedule for development at Manydown would commence in 2022 to allow for planning, design and infrastructure construction.	Policy SS3 sets out a phasing strategy for each of the sites. This takes into account availability and lead in times. The phasing of Manydown has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Cllr Laura James	BDBC	N/A	216341	553	No	No	We believe that the changes made to the Manydown Policy by the Portfolio Holder have meant that development on Manydown will be unviable. This in turn means that the 3080 units previously planned for Manydown will need to be developed elsewhere. As for us, we are aware there are no fall-back plans for these 3080 units to be built elsewhere, therefore the plan becomes unsound.	We believe that is for the portfolio holder for Planning to properly understand the major concerns that the landowners of Manydown have over this policy in order to produce a plan that will be found sound and to avoid a costly and damning legal action for a second time.	It is not considered that the Manydown policy makes the delivery of the site unviable but rather will ensure the completion a high quality development. Updates to the policy as a result of the consultation are outlined in the schedule for SS3.10.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr A Simmill	N/A	N/A	441324	523	No	No	The way the Manydown site has effectively been withheld over the past decade has been detrimental to the overall development of Basingstoke. This has led to overdevelopment of the A33 corridor. Those sites have compromised the environmental integrity of the Loddon valley, added large number of vehicles to the already choked A33. Building more houses around the Chineham incinerator puts yet more people at risk of health problems associated with the gases and dust particles.	To make the plan legally compliant the Manydown site must be properly included. The site will provide the area with a "sound" development site capable of allowing environmentally friendly housing and infrastructure on the west side of town where the current roads are not already at capacity. The site is large enough to allow schools, shops, health centres etc. to be built specifically to meet the needs of the residents. Remove Cufaude Farm - its infrastructure, drainage, services and in particular the roads in that area cannot cope with yet more vehicles. Remove Redlands - this would impinge on and degrade the important Loddon valley, its natural habitats and tranquility. There is also a flooding risk with the valley which will be increased by more housing, roads and paving. The development of these sites will also cause even more congestion, and potentially increase the pollution of the river.	The allocated sites has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and are considered to be suitable locations for housing. Manydown now forms part of the strategy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Noise and odour pollution associated with the incinerator were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Specific criteria in Policy SS3.9 address this issue. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1141	No	No	Rather than choose Manydown on the basis of a well-reasoned case, it appears that the Borough Council has simply caved in to pressure from the Manydown Company now that it has a high court victory under its belt. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Councillor Rob Donnell, Cabinet member for Environment and Climate Change said following the approval by the cabinet of the Draft Plan "the judicial review leaves us no choice". (Basingstoke Gazette 1 st August 2013) This clearly suggests that the selection of this site to be a political one by the council members rather than a choice on merit and planning criteria by the officers. If this is the case then such a decision is not acceptable and is not a credible basis upon which to select sites for development.	The influence from outside sources that affect the process of the officers needs to be clear and understood. With either a clear overseeing process that shows there to be no outside influence on the selection process or a clear declaration of influence. This point should be highlighted to the Inspector at the forthcoming EIP and for the scope of the EIP to specifically include investigation into these areas.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. The judicial review meant that Manydown site should be considered in the site assessment work as an available site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1148	No	Not Specified	The Pre-Submission Local Plan before us is the result influenced by many factors. The relationship between BCBC as joint landowner and BDBC as the planning authority and the conduct and decisions of Borough Councillors in influencing such decisions needs to be scrutinised and if the plan is to be deemed as sound, then the relationship between these, often conflicting, responsibilities need to be seen to also be sound. With the purchase being a voluntary arrangement there is an erroneous presumption or obligation towards development and BDBC is misinforming councillors by incorrectly stating there to be an obligation towards development. There appears to be no clear distinction between the interests of the landowner being kept separate from the proper planning process with indications of the Officers of the Borough and HCC working on behalf of the Borough as joint landowner on the submission to the site allocation process (3.85 of the above report).	The erroneous presentation of the Manydown land and the clear effect and influence on Borough policy and treatment of the land needs to be understood. This misrepresentation casts severe doubts on the integrity of the plan and the process in which the Manydown land was put forward for development. The EIP should be asked to investigate this as part of the process and to reject any policy or decision arising from any incorrect guidance given to Officers or Members.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. The judicial review meant that Manydown site should be considered in the site assessment work as an available site. The Pre-submission Local Plan was agreed at full Council for public consultation.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1169	No	No	74% of new development is proposed on Greenfield land. The proposal does not fully recognise the windfall sites that can be expected throughout the 15 year period. The initial phase of the plan recognises there will be windfall sites in the period but the later phase does not and so is much more reliant upon Greenfield sites. This is unsound reasoning and contrary to the planning guidance favouring re-use of Brownfield land as a priority over Greenfield. Brownfield sites do not run out. Over time more and more changes take place and more and more land and buildings come forward to offer Brownfield development opportunities. It is more likely that Brownfield sites will be available at the present rate and so there will be no need to increase the annual number of homes provided on Greenfield sites. In addition, the AMR demonstrates that the majority of development is currently on previously developed land. This underlines the over-reliance on greenfield sites in the plan.	The Urban/Brownfield opportunities figure of 2247 in Table 2 Para 4.11 should be increased with a corresponding reduction in the remaining Greenfield requirement. The above figures for a rate of between 40% (target) and 60% (present sustained level) should be used. This then brings down the Greenfield numbers from 7557 to between 4002 and 6002. A minimum target for Brownfield land be set in the plan and monitored with suitable policies brought in to deliver this. A re-evaluation of the sites should then be carried out based on the lower demand. The figure of 4002 be found in sight through the selection process. Further sites for 2000 reserve Greenfield homes be earmarked to cover any shortfall. Such by nature must be small sites without long term commitment that can be put forward or removed subject to the monitoring process over the term of the plan.	The components of supply outlined in Table 2 are considered suitable and robust and are supported by the Local Plan evidence base including the SHLAA which considers the viability of the delivery of individual sites. The opportunity sites figure reflects the SHLAA, and these have been discounted by 10% to account for non-delivery. Windfall sites are expected to come forward across the plan period and Table 2 reflects this (50 units pa). The Plan currently positively promotes brownfield development but supply should be based upon identified sites and a robust strategy and therefore it would not be suitable to include arbitrary targets etc. Further information is contained within the Housing Topic Paper and up to date SHMA.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1194	No	No	The Basingstoke MDA north of Basingstoke in the 2001-2011 plan was designed and met the requirement imposed in that plan to be a "long term development to meet the future needs of the borough". The plan before us gives no consideration to this concept and so overlooks this. The concept of an MDA was to cater for Greenfield housing need on a long-term planned basis beyond the plan period. The requirement of the MDA which BDBC was obliged to fulfil was for an MDA at Basingstoke to meet that plan's, and future need. This aim was to continue future releases of land in subsequent periods (as is now proposed in the plan for the Manydown MDA). However this plan merely contains the residue of the sites carried over from the 2001-2011 plan and does not consider or evaluate a further extension of that site as had been proposed in the present plan. This would appear to be a glaring omission in the site selection process.	The proposed Plan should be characterised as an on-going process flowing from the existing and past plans. The lessons from the past EIP should be learned and a more robust plan submitted. In the last two local plans, a vast amount of development has been decided by the Inspector at the EIP rather than through the boroughs plan process. The site selection process should include the on-going expansion of the MDA from the 2001-2011 plan as proposed in that plan.	The so-called North Basingstoke MDA was allocated to take development over the last plan period and much of the land has now been built out. The remaining sites form part of the Pre-submission Local Plan's land supply, as suitable. All promoted sites, including those to the north of the town were considered though detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal and the sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. A review of a Local plan is an appropriate time to reassess the current strategy and review it as necessary in light of the available evidence base.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Patrick Murphy	N/A	N/A	442112	118	Yes	No	SS3.3 & 3.8 are in Bramley. They are both unsound, & without any new roads planned, unsustainable. Sites related to policies SS3.3,3.8,3.7,3.9 & 5 together will constitute an MDA & contribute to significant increased traffic on the A33. Any incidents on A33 will severely impact on very narrow Cufaude Lane. Chineham station SS3.10 is not even being considered by network rail. Increased traffic will move north via C32 especially Bramley railway station, compounding congestion & parking problems. Bramley only needs 72 dwellings to meet its needs. B businesses in the Parks are very concerned about residential development being planned so close to them which might preclude new employment. There has been no infrastructure gain as the area has expanded. A site in this area cannot be viewed in isolation; taking these & other suggested adjacent sites makes a total of 2060 houses. The plan is too vague about infrastructure enhancements & thus impact the ability to deliver it.	The local plan strategy of making large settlements even larger is unsustainable without considerable prior infrastructure investment. NE Basingstoke is essentially being "infilled". BDBC's anticipated/encouraged immigration must be met by a custom built development, which will provide infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown, SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affect on the existing population. It is said that one site cannot be built at the same rate as the development of smaller, more dispersed locations & that significant infrastructure would be needed to be put in place first. Evidence suggests, and CNS supports, that to develop the NE of the Borough at the proposed rate will need significant changes to and delivery of additional infrastructure. If SS3.8 can deliver in the period 2014-19 then Manydown, SS3.10, could do the same rather than starting later.	The two sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the sites are covered under the policy criterion. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. As part of the site specific policies such new infrastructure will be a requirement of the new developments. Sites have not been viewed in isolation. The site issues raised were considered through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process and it is considered that they can be adequately mitigated through the application of the criteria contained within the site policy. Also, the relationship with the adjoining commercial premises was considered in detail during the recently considered outline planning application for Razzo's Farm. The noise issues were addressed via a noise report, and the council's EHO supported the report findings, that whilst there are noise impacts, these can be adequately mitigated. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Banner and Bewley Homes	Banner and Bewley Homes	Barton Willmore	458958	767	Yes	Yes	Policy SS3 provides a schedule of the greenfield sites proposed to be allocated for development in order to meet the requirement set out in SS1 bullet d) to deliver 7,010 dwellings on greenfield sites over the plan period. Alongside the list of sites, the policy includes an approximate number of dwellings to be provided on each of the sites and the phase in which each site will come forward in the plan period. Policy SS3 includes development of 'Land South of Blosswood Lane' for 150 dwellings to contribute towards housing delivery in the period 2014-/15 to 2018/19. The policy is supported by site-specific policies SS3.6. We support policy SS3 in this respect.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Graham Smith	Test Valley Borough Council	N/A	625620	482	Not Specified	Yes	The Council has no objection to the proposed Overton allocation (SS3.5) and supports the recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the River Test SSSI. Future proposals for Whitchurch and Overton need to take into account and mitigate against possible future impact on the B3400 London Road.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The IDP sets out further detail.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Ms Naomi Collier	N/A	N/A	630267	45	Not Specified	No	Object to the inclusion of SHLAA site (BAS 069). Concern over the removal of the green space, currently used for recreational purposes. Concerned about the potential traffic that will be generated if the site were developed for housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site is included in the SHLAA as a site within the existing SPB which could come forward for development in the future. This site does not form an allocation within the new Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	303	Yes	No	Bramley considers policy SS3 to have major flaws, making it unsound. The housing numbers in 4.11. Table 2 is based on data gathered in 2010 and 2011 with the sites selected from the SHLAA of 2010. The sites brought forward for site selection in June 2013 had proposed yields matching the agreed number with little headroom (possibly only that generated by those areas included in policy SS5) therefore for there is very little choice. All the proposed sites had to be selected directly or via NDP allocations to make the agreed total of 13,464 dwellings, with 7,010 to come from green field site allocations. With effectively no spare sites, the "selection" process was flawed and unsound as there was no actual selection as all green field sites had to be included to make the required total. With no reserve sites the situation will become critical if any one of these green field sites is found to be non-viable. This could lead to "planning by appeal". The only flexible site is Manydown.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The table has been updated to a base date of 2013 and is based on an updated SHLAA published in February 2013. All category one sites were assessed through the sites assessment process the yield from which would be in excess of the housing required over the Plan period, as set out in the SHLAA. The Plan contains an over supply of sites to enable flexibility and to account for non-delivery. The yield at Manydown has been increased following the consultation. Further information is set out in the updated SHMA and Housing Topic Paper.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	218	No	No	It is a legal obligation of the Borough Council to put forward sites scoring the least value to adhere to the NPPF (below 100/101). The Council has not followed its legal obligation to sequential tests as the sites are presented 'en masse'	The sites should be listed (and developed) in the order of least value. There is no sound case for not adhering to the policy of sequential tests	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives and represent, on balance, the most sustainable sites for development. The Environment Agency has not objected to the Plan's spatial strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	219	Yes	No	Not sound as many of the sub-policies state that they will make provision for xx dwellings which provide measures to mitigate the impact on local road network without detailing this mitigation or insisting that the mitigation is carried out in advance of the development. A sound set of policies would detail the mitigation required, state the funding stream to meet it and set out a timetable for the delivery of that mitigation in advance of the development. Many of the mitigations for transport are limited to the 'flaring' at or approaching junctions, but this does not increase road throughput - merely increases the capacity of the junction to carry queuing traffic. this is not a mitigation.	Mitigation measures should be detailed including costing's and funding stream. Where funding is not proven development must not take place. Previous infrastructure deficits remaining shows that a lack of this properly planned and funded infrastructure provision in advance of development is the only way to avoid further gridlock.	Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. The IDP sets out further details on costings, funding streams etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	419	No	No	The proposed housing numbers are perilously close to inadequacy. This is because of the economic growth assiduously pursued by past and present borough administrators. Such attempts have been fairly successful and there is every reason to believe that this trend will continue. Furthermore, the size of the waiting list for social housing is unacceptably high. Should the Inspector determine that the proposed housing numbers are inadequate, there is only negligible slack in the plan. Additionally, if the Inspector deletes one or more larger site a shortfall will exist. There is also the possibility that some allocated sites may not proceed to development for many years, thus reducing the housing land available. Cumulatively the sites around the north east of Basingstoke are akin to an MDA. However, as proposed they would be developed piecemeal, with this lack of integration resulting in excessive stress on local infrastructure. A more cohesive approach is required in that area.	The above shortcoming can only be addressed by the inclusion of the total Manydown area (SS3.10) for development.	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is set out in the Housing Topic Paper. An over supply of sites is included to allow for non-delivery and ensure flexibility. The Plan also includes a policy trigger to review the Plan if monitoring shows that the strategy is not being delivered. The strategy and sites are considered to be robust, supported by the evidence base. The infrastructure requirements of sites to the east are set out in more detail in the IDP. The need for joint delivery/masterplanning of relevant sites is outlined in the specific site policies. The phasing of Manydown has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tatlow King Planning	641907	1001	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	831	Yes	No	Support the proposed 748 dwellings per annum target. However, this target is not achievable in the early years of the local plan, given the 3 most substantial housing developments (4,980 dwellings and approximately 37% of the total housing number) being delivered towards the end of the plan period (2020-2029) as set out in Policy SS3. Furthermore, it is likely that the houses required in policy SS5 will again come on board at the earliest around 2018-19. Unlikely that the 748 dwelling figure will be exceeded until the 2020s and the latter end of the lifecycle of the local plan. Council should be doing more to encourage housing development to come forward earlier in the plan period to ensure the 748 dwellings per annum target will be met or exceeded across the entire lifetime of the plan. The current strategy will certainly make it more difficult for the Council to demonstrate a continual 5 year supply of housing, a requirement of the NPPF, over the earlier stages of the plan.	The Local Plan needs to make much stronger emphasis for allowing housing development to take place on brownfield sites in sustainable locations across the borough, particularly over the early plan period. The Council should consider bringing forward at least one of the larger developments planned for Basingstoke to ensure housing numbers are compliant with the annual target across the plan period. Bringing forward a development such as the Manydown site would also potentially have the benefit of bringing forward a western bypass for Basingstoke (also see representations on paragraph 2.8), which would benefit not just the new developments, but Basingstoke as a whole.	The Plan takes a positive approach to brownfield development with policies that support such development where suitable. The rephasing or a number of the allocated sites has occurred as a result of the consultation including Manydown which has been brought forward to 2017/18.	See changes made to the phasing of sites within Policy SS3.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	67	No	No	Chineham Parish Council considers this Policy to have flaws, making it unsound. The housing numbers defined in 4.11. Table 2 are based on data gathered in 2010 and 2011 with the sites selected from the SHLAA of 2010. The sites brought forward for Site Selection in June 2013 had proposed yields matching the agreed numbers with no "headroom" and thus no choice. All the proposed sites had to be selected to make the agreed total of 13,464 dwellings, with 7,010 to come from greenfield site allocations. With no spare sites, the "selection" process was flawed and unsound as there was no actual selection as all greenfield sites had to be included to make the required total. With no Reserve Sites the situation will become critical if any one of these greenfield sites is found to be not viable. This could have serious consequences, including "planning by appeal". This deficiency could be avoided by increasing the yield from SS3.10, Manydown.	This deficiency could be avoided by increasing the yield from SS3.10, Manydown.	The table has been updated to a base date of 2013 and is based on an updated SHLAA published in February 2013. All category one sites were assessed through the sites assessment process the yield from which would be in excess of the housing required over the Plan period, as set out in the SHLAA. The Plan contains an over supply of sites to enable flexibility and to account for non-delivery. The yield at Manydown has been increased following the consultation. Further information is set out in the updated SHMA and Housing Topic Paper.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Cllr Keith Watts	BDBC	N/A	784578	206	Yes	Yes	I am not qualified to say if the Plan is legally compliant. I believe that it is sound but I have the following reservations. This draft has no provision for the development of employment in Whitchurch It makes no explicit commitment to the relief of traffic congestion in Whitchurch Policy SS3 p) should be removed to enable integration of new housing with the existing settlement Policy EM2 should provide for a strategic gap between Whitchurch and Freefolk	A site should be allocated for the development of employment in Whitchurch an explicit commitment should be made in the Plan to the relief of traffic congestion in Whitchurch Policy SS3.10 p) should be removed to enable integration of new housing with the existing settlement Policy EM2 should provide for a strategic gap between Whitchurch and Freefolk	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Whitchurch Town Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan. Local Plan Transport Assessment (2013) has identified the improvements and interventions that will be needed on the strategic network to deliver the Local Plan and support the strategic sites. The Council have worked and will continue to work with the Highways Agency (HA), Hampshire County Council and neighbouring local authorities on highways mitigation measures, funding streams and delivery mechanisms. Any proposal would need to comply with Policy CN8 and detailed issues would be considered through the planning application process which would include the production of a TA.Policy SS3.10 has been updated following consultation - please see SS3.9 schedule for more details. A strategic gap between Whitchurch and Freefolk is not required as it will not act as a 'strategic' gap. Although Whitchurch and Freefolk are relatively close together, no land allocations within the Local Plan will reduce the distance between settlements further.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	319	Yes	No	Redlands cannot - and should not - be developed without BAS121 being fully built. I understand that this will not be possible in the Plan Period. As a result, SOL002 should be withdrawn - or, at the very least, marked as a 'reserve' site, in case of need and in case BAS121 does get developed (even if unlikely).	Amend SS3.7 introduction: "This 9 hectare 'reserve' site..." Amend SS3.7 part (a): "...150 dwellings, if required to fulfil the Borough's housing requirement under the Local Plan. It will not be released for development unless other sites are not delivered - and will not be developed in isolation."	Following the public consultation further work has been undertaken on these sites in liaison with the landowners. Policy SS3.7 states that the site will not be developed in isolation and must be delivered in conjunction with the East of Basingstoke site. See criterion g) of Policy SS3.7. All of BAS 121 (delivering 450 units only) will be built out within the Plan period	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mrs Cynthia Hall	N/A	N/A	784770	291	Yes	No	There would appear to be insufficient consideration regarding the placement of the new housing. There are sufficient areas submitted that will not interrupt with the quality of life presently enjoyed within the village without it being piecemeal. The area behind Kevin close is an area that is used considerably by wildfow and swans in the winter due to very poor drainage. The field becomes a swamp in the winter and is used continually by resident children as a nominated play area during the spring and summer I do not believe there is sufficient resource in the village to accommodate the numbers indicated.	Greater consideration needs to be made re the resources that the village has to offer and based upon problems identified in other parts of the country where property has been built on 'flood plains' care need to be exercised re concreting/tarmacing in areas where there is already a major issue with land drainage - Any covering of the soil with concrete/tarmac will create major problems with existing properties.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 50 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Kingsclere to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see pares 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The location of these units will be considered through the neighbourhood planning process when the local community can decide on the most suitable location.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mrs Jessica Tattersall	N/A	N/A	784782	490	No	No	Considering the need to preserve green sites where possible, scattering development around the Chineham, Bramley and Sherfield area is not as good as development in one area for example Manydown (SS3.10).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The strategy is considered to be the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and includes a variety of sites within different locations to ensure deliverability and flexibility. The housing requirement cannot be met on one single site. The site assessment work, SHLAA and sustainability appraisal have informed the selection of sites.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	403	Yes	No	Concern that reliance on so few major sites to deliver a high proportion of the housing requirement will create challenges for the ability to deliver within the plan period. Given the long planning and implementation there is particular concern that Manydown may fail to deliver its total within the plan period.	None identified but the deliverability of housing provision within the Plan period must be achievable, as required by the NPPF.	The Plan's strategy and allocated sites are considered to be deliverable within the Plan period, as by the evidence base. An over supply of sites is included to allow for non-delivery and ensure flexibility.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	502	Yes	No	Site SS3.9 has been selected in direct contravention of the Sequential Test based on flood risk as defined in the glossary p143, and which is National Policy as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. SS3.9 is listed as the high risk area (band8) in the list of selected sites whereas there are other sites which are reasonably available namely BAS 144 Hounsme Fields (1000 houses), BAS 099 Scrapps Farm (80 houses), BAs 141 Land at Worting Road (280 houses), and numerous sites at Tadley. Site SS3.9 is unsound.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base and the site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues. Following the public consultation further work has been undertaken on sites. Development will not take place within the floodplain or in high risk areas. Additionally, the Environment Agency have been consulted and they are satisfied that development will not take place in the flood plain for site SS3.9 and therefore the relevant tests have been complied with.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1084	Yes	No	Flooding - Policy EM7 (p91) states that a sequential approach to development will follow national guidance, i.e. sites with a lower risk will be developed first. The plan contravenes the Flood risk policy, as defined in the glossary p143, since it has put the East of Basingstoke site (SS3.9) ahead of other sites with a lower flood risk. SS3.9 is listed as the highest flood risk (band 8) in the list of selected sites whereas other sites (Hounsme Fields SHLAA BAS 133 and sites on Manydown, BAS099 and BAS141) have a lower flood risk. Many low risk sites at Tadley have not been selected.	Ensure that the flooding Sequential Test is applied correctly across the Borough. Hounsme Fields and Tadley sites must be developed ahead of East of Basingstoke.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base. The site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues. The Environment Agency has not objected to the Plan's spatial strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1088	Yes	No	Hounsme Fields (SHLAA BAS133), adjacent to Kenne! Farm (SS3.2), should be included as an alternative to sites Redlands and East of Basingstoke. This was included in previous versions of the SHLAA. The flooding Sequential Test alone places this before SS3.9. The number of houses on BAS 133 directly matches those on SS3.7 and SS3.9. Failure to apply the flooding Sequential Test is not consistent with NPPF. This is unsound. We support the CountryWatch comments on this.	Using the flooding sequential test Hounsme Fields should replace SS3.9 and SS3.7.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off and drainage are considered within the evidence base. The site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues. The Environment Agency has not objected to the Plan's spatial strategy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Miss Sarah Elliott	Homes and Communities Agency	N/A	786159	578	Yes	Yes	The HCA previously made a representation on-line regarding concern over the previously proposed level of housing supply (590dpa). We deemed this to be insufficient to met local housing need. Together with the new increased proposed supply of 748dpa. we welcome the bringing forward of Greenfield Site Allocations, in particular the Manydown site in Basingstoke. This level of housing growth, whilst lower than recent years, is comparable to the long-term trend (for instance in 2006/07 housing completions were at 728).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments, support and offer for future partnership working noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	651	Not Specified	Yes	We have no concerns with the site selection process and those sites selected for allocation. An updated sequential test was undertaken further to the previous flood risk ranking and sequential test and determined through the SHLAA. This has been clearly demonstrated in the summary of the evidence base Appendix 1	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Tom Brenan	N/A	N/A	786371	697	Not Specified	No	I have concern about the Greenfield Site Allocations policy and loss of farmland for food production. NPPF para.112 requires account to be had to the benefits of the most versatile agricultural land. Para.99 states that new developments should avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts from climate change. While the draft Plan seeks to support appropriate rural businesses and, additionally, the definition of 'Green Infrastructure' at Para 5.36 refers to allotments, orchards and community gardens, there is no specific provision for smaller, local horticultural enterprises that could play a part in securing food into the future. I am concerned about the requirement to "Limit the direct and indirect impacts on local species and habitats" and measures only "seek to ensure" that there is a positive improvement in conservation status. The impacts implied in the Policy and others are 'adverse'. There is inconsistency within the Policy with regard to the impacts on biodiversity.	If the Council consider that building on agricultural land is the only available option, I would encourage them to consider incorporating a requirement to provide opportunities for small-scale commercial horticultural enterprises on such land. This would be in conformity with NPPF paragraph 17 which promotes mixed use developments recognising the many benefits from open land including food production. The draft Plan rightly recognises the importance of biodiversity and I would urge the Council to require that any development minimises the adverse impact on local species and habitats and additionally requires developments ensure that there is an overall improvement in biodiversity at the development site. I would also suggest that the draft Policies SS3.7(e) and SS3.9(m) should make provision for the use of any forms of renewable energy on such developments rather than restricting it to those linked with a combined heat and power incinerator.	The presence of best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification), should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations (e.g. biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources). Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land (grades 3b, 4 and 5) in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. It is for local planning authorities to decide whether best and most versatile agricultural land can be developed, having carefully weighed the options in the light of other evidence. Taking the above into account the site assessment concludes that whilst development on some sites would have a negative impact on the best and most versatile agricultural land this has to be balanced against other issues including the need to need objectively assessed housing needs. Support for rural businesses and enterprises is set out in Policy EP4. The plan should be read as a whole and Policies EM4 and EM5 cover green infrastructure further. The Council's open space standards will ensure that appropriate open space is provided on new housing allocations, including allotment provision. The use of renewable energy is supported on all developments. The use of CHP on SS3.7 and SS3.9 is site specific where evidence shows such a facility can be delivered. See the schedule on EM4 for updates in relation to the biodiversity policy which supports the overall improvement in biodiversity. Specific criteria in the site policies ensure that biodiversity related issues are addressed.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Dr John Williams	N/A	N/A	786377	699	Not Specified	No	For some time the water quality of the discharges from the River Loddon are failing to meet the required standard and yet the siting of houses in the area along the A33 and around the incinerator will make the pollution worse or increase the risk of flooding in this area. Surely this is a mistake and has not been thought through. This is a unsuitable site for development.	intentionally left blank	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Issues of flood risk, surface water run-off, drainage, water quality and pollution are considered within the evidence base and the site policies along with other policies contained in the plan in combination address such issues.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	800	Not Specified	No	Support: for the Swing Swang Lane allocation - 100 units Map 1b. Object: to the omission of Black Dam as a sustainable greenfield location. This makes the Policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the NPPF.	This objection would be overcome by deletion of Policy EM2 and the allocation of housing land in this area as evidenced by earlier representations.	All sites have been assessed through the detailed site assessment work and sustainability appraisal. Black Dam (Bas 101) was deemed as not suitable for a strategic allocation for a number of reasons as outlined in the evidence base.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	823	Yes	No	We fully endorse the inclusion of SS3.3 in the list, and support the current phasing of SS3.3 - 2014/15 - 2018/19. However, it is considered that the PSLP should not be explicit in identifying the numbers of dwellings proposed for each site, notably that they should not be seen as a maximum. Consequently, we support the current wording with its reference to "approximately", which is suitably 'flexible' for the purpose of 'soundness'. However the current timeframe for the adoption of the Local Plan will not enable the delivery of Razor's Farm and other such sites by 2014/15. Therefore, BDBC need to allow sites such as SS3.3 to come forward before the adoption of the Local Plan. The requirement for development briefs/masterplans to be adopted prior to the submission of planning applications hinders the ability of identified sites to come forward in the short-term, and will cause further unnecessary delays in the delivery of the required housing. Requirement flawed and unjustified.	On the basis of the above it is suggested that the requirement for masterplan or development briefs to be prepared and adopted for all greenfield sites should be deleted from Policy SS3. Instead, such requirements should be included in the supporting site specific policies SS3.1 - SS3.11, where necessary .	The phasing contained in the presubmission Local Plan does not prevent planning applications for development on any of the sites prior to adoption of the plan. The involvement of the community in the completion of masterplanning is considered suitable and in line with national guidance. The policy is worded to allow flexibility in that it is the Council's preference for this approach but it is not restrictive.	Change wording to read "Development on the sites is expected to come forward through the preparation of a masterplan or development brief, <u>where appropriate</u> , prepared in partnership with the landowner and with consultation involving the local community, to be approved by the council prior to the submission of a planning application. Where two or more sites are adjacent to each other, masterplanning should be undertaken jointly".	N/A	Remains outstanding	
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	868	No	No	This policy applies a phasing approach to the delivery of these sites citing the requirement to maintain a five year supply as justification for this methodology. Gladman assert that this policy is not compliant with the Framework. Para 47 of the NPPF sets out the need to boost the supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in para14 of the NPPF. There is nothing in the NPPF that prevents a local authority from having a land supply above 5 years. This approach would boost significantly the supply of housing and adhere to Greg Clark MP ministerial forward in the Framework that states "Development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay..."	intentionally left blank	The policies ensure that there is a rolling 5 year land supply, in line with the NPPF. However, there is nothing in the Plan specifically preventing the land supply from going above 5 years.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Pellipar Investments Ltd	Pellipar Investments Ltd	N/A	787110	964	Yes	No	Policy is unsound as the findings are not consistent with paragraph 158 of the NPPF which requires the policy to be based on adequate evidence. The Hounsme Fields site should be allocated. The Council's Landscape Capacity Study (2010), the SHLAA and the Site Assessment (2013) have underestimated the development capacity of the Hounsme Fields site and the benefits to be derived from a south-west cluster of allocated sites. The omission of Hounsme Fields is not justified as its exclusion does not represent the most appropriate strategy for south-west Basingstoke, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. See representations and appendices for further detailed justification.	Based on an assessment of landscape capacity and impact issues affecting Hounsme Fields, Kennel Farm and Basingstoke Golf Course, request that Hounsme Fields is allocated in Policy SS3, in order to provide a sound development strategy for south-west Basingstoke. Hounsme Fields performs at least as well in terms of landscape capacity as Kennel Farm, and in terms of impact on the wider landscape setting performs better than it. The allocation of both sites would contribute to a sound development strategy for south-west Basingstoke. It would remove some of the disbenefits arising from development of either of the sites separately. It would also facilitate the provision of joint mitigation measures and assist delivery of new services and infrastructure to serve both sites. Request that the Council's Site Assessment (2013) is reviewed and amended to reflect this additional evidence submitted. See representation and appendices for further detailed justification.	All sites have been assessed through the detailed site assessment work and sustainability appraisal. Hounsme Fields was deemed as not suitable for a strategic allocation for a number of reasons as outlined in the evidence base (including updates to the site assessment).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	786	Yes	No	Support the allocation. Masterplan/Development Brief - do not support the policy text which requires the preparation of a masterplan or development brief. Phasing - no technical justification for the phasing of the golf club site at the end of the plan period from 2024/25 - 2028/29. The phasing appears to be based upon assumptions about the availability of the site, which are entirely without foundation. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People - Part (b) of Policy SS3.11 requires the site to make provision for a mix of dwellings. We support the principle of this but have concerns about the requirement to make provision for permanent pitch/plot provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People. The local plan is not considered to be sound in this respect as it does not fully consider the objectively assessed needs for the traveller community for the entire plan period.	The text to Policy SS3 should be amended to remove reference to consultation with the local community and the requirement for the Council to approve the masterplan prior to submission of the application, as this is not subject to any control under the Town & Country Planning Act. An alternative text for the policy is:- "Development on the sites is expected to come forward through the preparation of a masterplan or development plan brief. Where two or more sites are adjacent to each other, Masterplanning should be undertaken jointly". Phasing for the golf club site should be amended. Delete part (b), replace with:- "Make provision for a mix of dwelling sizes and types to meet local needs". We consider that the Council should allocate a piece of land within the ownership of the Borough or County Council for immediate release to ensure that the current and short term needs of the traveller community can be met.	The involvement of the community in the completion of masterplanning is considered suitable and in line with national guidance. The policy is worded to allow flexibility in that it is the Council's preference for this approach but it is not restrictive. The phasing of the golf club has been reviewed and amended. The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them.	Change wording to read "Development on the sites is expected to come forward through the preparation of a masterplan or development brief, <u>where appropriate</u> , prepared in partnership with the landowner and with consultation involving the local community, to be approved by the council prior to the submission of a planning application. Where two or more sites are adjacent to each other, Masterplanning should be undertaken jointly".	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A		Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1049	No	No	There is evidence that acknowledges that land within and adjoining the Worting conservation area would assist in providing a choice of housing and it would be beneficial that this area is delivered at the outset. We suggest that our client's land could provide for approximately 140 dwellings, including the provision of a material amount of publicly accessible open space and the reinforcement of the landscaping buffer. We consider the sites are clearly deliverable and suitable. We therefore support the Council's proposals to allocate the Many down site for future greenfield development. However, we consider that the site capacity can be increased yet further as discussed in the SHLAA responses we have provided.	Manydown, Basingstoke allocated for approx. 3,500 homes and phased to come forward over the period 2015/16-2028/29.	The phasing of Manydown has been brought forward to 2017/18 and the yield increased to 3,400 as a result of the consultation process. The allocation includes the site in question and the suitability of this area for development will be considered further through the masterplanning process.	See revisions to SS3.10	No change	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1188	Yes	No	The proposed distribution of housing is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, and is therefore not justified. The amount of development planned at Manydown during the plan period should be increased and that planned in the Loddon valley and at Basingstoke Golf course reduced (or omitted) given that 1. the scale of growth proposed in the Loddon Valley exceeds the environmental and infrastructure capacity of the area 2. there are substantial doubts about the suitability and deliverability of the Basingstoke golf course allocation 4. there is demonstrable capacity to accommodate more than 3080 dwellings at Manydown (incl. at Worting).	intentionally left blank	The distribution of housing relates to several considerations including land availability and site capacity. The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. The phasing of Manydown has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	See changes to SS3.10	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Mark Schmul	Stratfield Saye Estate	Hives Planning Ltd	787607	1132	Yes	No	In general, the approach for development in the Borough, set out in the Local plan is supported. However, there are key areas where, at present, the strategy is considered 'unsound' in the terms of NPPF Para 182. In general Bramley is suitable for helping to deliver the housing and other needs of the rural areas. Policies SS3 should identify land at Strawberry Fields, Bramley as suitable for delivering 200 dwellings, which should be shown on a policies map.	In order to be made sound, Policy SS3 should identify land at Strawberry Fields, Bramley, as suitable for delivering 200 dwellings in accordance with the reasons set out in the attachment. The allocation should be shown on a Bramley Policy Map.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable. There is the opportunity for developers to work with Bramley NP steering group to allocate housing as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. This could be for part, the full amount or in excess of 200 dwellings depending on the steering groups' objectives for Bramley for the NP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Judith Ashton Ass.	787729	1273	No	No	We question why, given the fact Oakley is a sustainable RSC, has the largest population outside Basingstoke (despite very modest growth over the past years), and the highest number of households in need of all the rural settlements (425), it does not have its own specific housing allocation in policy SS3 (like Overton and Whitchurch). It is submitted that it deserves a specific allocation of 150 dwellings in policy SS3, like Overton and Whitchurch, as well as a neighbourhood plan allocation of 200 in policy SS5. The other benefit of allocating small sites such as that proposed at Park Farm Oakley for 150 units, is that small sites can be brought forward quicker, and hence help address the councils 5 year housing land supply situation. The final paragraph of policy SS5 is unclear, and is not positive or proactive. See full rep for the full details of the argument, and read in conjunction with rep ID 1206.	Not only should policy SS3, if it is to be positively prepared and to address the housing requirements of Oakley, include a strategic allocation for 150 dwellings at Park Farm Oakley, but Policy SS5 should, if it is to be positively prepared and effective look to increase scale of development to be identified in Oakley through neighbourhood planning process to 200 units. In respect of the last paragraph of SS5, we believe the timescale proposed for the adoption of neighbourhood plans in the parishes identified in policy SS5 should be brought forward to 2015 at least to give momentum to the delivery of the neighbourhood plans.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base, and 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan) given local housing needs, the characteristics of the village and also constraints. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable. There is the opportunity for developers to work with Oakley NP steering group to allocate housing as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. This could be for part, the full amount or in excess of 150 dwellings depending on the steering groups' objectives for Oakley for the NP. The Plan contains sufficient sites to meet the objectively assessed housing need and deliver a rolling 5 year land supply. The current trigger regarding neighbourhood plans is considered to be appropriate given the adoption date of the Local Plan and the timescales involved in going through the statutory neighbourhood planning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1231	Yes	No	The County Council support's the references within the policies set out within the Local Plan for the need to ensure good pedestrian and cycle links within allocated sites that connect to the wider existing network of rights of way and other forms of non-motorised access and references regarding the maintenance and improvement of existing rights of way across and alongside sites and connections with 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors'. However the County Council is concerned that while policies all recognise existing rights of way/green network, there needs to be recognition of the desirability of new links to provide effective connections between the proposed developments and the wider network of rights of way and countryside access	Hampshire County Council therefore requests the Borough Council to make it clear within the Local Plan what is included within the terms "the existing green grid" or 'green corridors' by including the following text where relevant: "the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace"	This issue falls under Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure, which is defined in the glossary of the Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1256	Yes	No	We have a generic concern relating to loss of green infrastructure. Most if not all allocations are greenfield sites which include or adjoin public rights of way. Whilst some of the policies make reference to maintain (and even improve) these rights of way, it is highly likely that their functional value will be diminished as their surroundings change from rural to urban. Indeed a number run through fields over which the public (and/or their dogs) may roam. The developments are thus likely to reduce access to natural greenspace. As it stands, public rights of way seem to be dealt with in differing ways in allocation policies Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. It is unlikely to be viable to fully avoid such impacts, so we suggest that it is made clear that any degradation of the public right of way network is compensated. The biodiversity requirements of the allocation policies (SS3.1 to SS3.11) are not expressed in consistent language	This wording allows a net loss to biodiversity, and the use of compensation as first resort. There are number of ways that the plan could be modified to ensure that the avoid-mitigate-compensate hierarchy is suitably applied. In order for this policy to be sound we advise this is amended to read " h) Mitigate Limit the direct and indirect impacts on local species and habitats, including the part of the site designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the nearby Basing Fen SINC, through on-site and off-site compensation measures and seek to compensate for any residual impacts to ensure that there is a positive improvement in the conservation status of these species within the designations net gain to biodiversity ". Other policies would need to modified in a similar manner.	The plan should be read as a whole. These matters raised are sufficiently covered by policies EM4 (Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation) and EM5 (Green Infrastructure). The avoid-mitigate-compensate hierarchy is included within policy EM4. See the response to other representations – in particular to comment ID: 575 (Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust) and comment ID: 1275 (Natural England). Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Submission Local Plan policy EM5. Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection.	No change	N/A	N/A	Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Submission Local Plan policy EM5. Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection. Also amendments to criterion in policies SS3.1-SS3.11 of the Submission Local Plan have been made to address the consistency point.
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1291	Yes	No	The Basingstoke Golf Course should be omitted from the proposed SPB because inclusion of the site does not satisfy the requirement of NPPF 182 that "the plan should be the most appropriate strategy"- the Golf Course is too far from the main centres of employment - Lodge Farm is much nearer - the Golf Course would require highways expenditure of £19.57m whereas Lodge Farm would not require any expenditure on the highways beyond that already required for other sites along the A33 east of Basingstoke - the Golf Course is too far from the Chineham STW and would require very expensive, major infrastructure and on-going pumping. Lodge Farm is next to the STW. - Lodge Farm could be provided with a combined heat & power scheme using waste heat from the nearby incinerator. - Lodge Farm is lower grade agricultural land. - the Golf Club members have not yet decided whether to make the land "available". See attachment for further details.	Map 1c should be amended to exclude the Golf Course and retain the existing SPB to the south east of the A30 Winchester Road. Replacing the Golf Course with BAS102 Lodge Farm would enable the council to demonstrate that it was adopting the "most appropriate strategy" as required by NPPF 182. The LPA should also resist all representations to include BAS133 Hounsme Fields in the Local Plan allocation. Inclusion of that site would also fail to meet the requirement to adopt the "most appropriate" strategy as (for the reasons set out above) it is less suitable than all the sites currently included in the Pre-Submission Local Plan.	The Golf Course has been selected for allocation in the Local Plan following detailed site assessment work and sustainability appraisal of site options. These include but are not limited to, conclusions from assessments of infrastructure capacity including transport impacts and mitigation, landscape and biodiversity studies. Following this work this site was deemed as a site which forms part of the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Footnote inserted making reference to Appendix 5, as follows: "Appendix 5 sets out the detailed requirements to be satisfied when preparing Masterplans and Development Briefs."	Response to representation	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in light of latest evidence (SHLAA)	new evidence	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update site capacities in light of updated evidence	new evidence	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert "Upper" before 'Cufuade' for consistency	consistency	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Anne Rushbrooke	N/A	N/A	644452	10	Not Specified	No	I do not feel the strategy has been objectively assessed in relation to objectivity, infrastructure requirements, in the Local Plan in general, based on all of the sites being 'green field' and a huge amount of disruption will be caused to residents to businesses next to the sites. In relation to site SS3.1 there are already traffic issues. Additionally, there is cycle traffic along Basing Road, and people ride their horses across the field and on the road. Site SS3.1 is completely unsuitable for such a development. I do not feel site SS3.1 meets any of these above criteria.	The number of houses to be developed (748), as set out in the Local Plan, is too high. How was this figure calculated? If based on the last five-10 years, when the Basingstoke and the UK as a whole has undergone a huge amount of immigration, just who are the Council building for? This number should be halved and 'brown field' sites used first. There is plenty of unused office and commercial space already. These sites should be redeveloped for housing if unused for years - such as those by the Chineham Tesco.	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives, based upon a detailed evidence base including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. Infrastructure improvements associated with these sites are covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. The Plan's housing requirement is considered to be sound and further information is set out within a Housing Topic Paper. The majority of the housing number is to address the borough populations natural growth which is projected to increase. International migration makes up a very small proportion. The scope to accommodate additional residential development on brownfield sites has been considered by the council through the SHLAA and ELR and opportunities have been reflected within the overall strategy, whilst ensuring that the growth of the borough's economy continues. Brownfield sites could not accommodate the additional housing development needed to meet the council's objectively assessed need, and therefore the allocation of greenfield sites is required.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	152	Yes	Yes	The site at Swing Swang Lane abuts the Old Basing Conservation Area at its eastern end. English Heritage therefore welcomes and supports requirements b) and c) of Policy SS3.1, although we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve' as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to ' <u>conserve</u> '	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn and Agreed with change.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	220	Yes	No	Unsound as it directly contradicts SS4 which states that no further planning applications will be granted where this would exacerbate deterioration of the relevant catchment. This therefore contradicts policy EM1.g	Delete the site unless it can be positively shown that there will be no run off into the local groundwater and all effluent is dealt with on site by means of reed beds or other natural means. The risk of run off into the upper reaches of the River Loddon is unacceptable	Policy EM6 is relevant and states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. Clause k) of Policy SS3.1 refers to ensuring that the necessary mitigation measures are put in place to reduce the risk of groundwater flooding. This is further dealt with under Policy EM7 (Managing Flood risk).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	603	Yes	No	NPPF9,109,114,113 not satisfied in Policy EM4. Does not "set criteria based policies against which...will be judged" for protecting/ enhancing habitats, landscapes and soils, ecosystem services, net gains in biodiversity. Not consistent with NPPF Sect 11 Para 109 because, for mitigation. On site mitigation may not work or be high risk but policy does not positively include a requirement for landowners to take pre-development steps to minimise biodiversity loss. Pre-emptive steps should be "positive" policy to allow species to be translocated where feasible/proven. SINC has Wall Bedstraw a plant no longer common (BSBI map) not "listed" but needs to be increased. Also gloworm, not listed but need to be increased. Site is not being managed. LPA should require a pre-devmnt mgmt plan, seed collection & translocation to one or more pre-prepared receptor sites where the species can be sustained viably. Some 300 gloworms recorded on site and the same approach considerations should apply.	Amend h. to read "through on-site and off-site compensation measures that precede as well as being part of development" New. Include "provide links to the existing green network". Existing and broken links cannot be guaranteed in the future unless recognition they are required or reinstated.	Criteria h is considered to be suitable. The plan should be read as a whole. Policy EM4 provides the criteria based policy used to assess proposals with regards to biodiversity, geodiversity, and nature conservation. Links between the green network is also covered by Policy EM4, criteria e).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	604	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	These points are adequately covered by the policy in combination with other policies in the plan. Criteria e) and f) refer to improving the connection of the site with the existing cycle and pedestrian routes and the Public Right of Way. In addition, criteria g) of the policy refers to providing connections to the existing green network. The plan should also be read as a whole and therefore Policies EM5 and CN8 are also relevant.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	798	Not Specified	No	Support/Object: As in other representations (SS1 and SS3), same development criteria could apply to Black Dam as considered in the objection to SS3 above allowing an allocation on land to the south of this Policy area. This makes the Policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the NPPF.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted for the allocation of housing at Swing Swang Lane. See further comments under Policy SS3.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved. Please also see comment on SS3.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Andrew Trotter	HCC	N/A	205851	1145	Yes	Yes	The County Council as a landowner supports the allocation of land at Swing Swang Lane and the policy clauses considered necessary to guide its delivery. The site has the ability to deliver approximately 100 and supporting infrastructure during the first five years of the Plan period. A supporting submission report, prepared by HCC, summarises technical evidence and demonstrates the soundness of the allocation.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved.Support Noted.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewerage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. i.e. "Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.."	Agree with the suggested change.	Insert additional bullet point to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) nad surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn and Agreed with change.
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Stafford Napier	N/A	N/A	413817	52	Yes	No	(See separate Word Document for explanation of each reason listed below) 1. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para's 24 and 24- Distance from town and employment. 2. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 30 in respect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 3. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 17 in respect of public transport and walking and cycling provision. 4. Insufficient road capacity contrary to Policy CN8. 5. Uncertain sewerage infrastructure availability. 6. Prejudicial to surrounding ancient woodland and adjacent SINC's	Remove the policy from the Plan OR substantially reduce the density of housing to allow for increased woodland buffers and screening of the development in such a sensitive location AND amend Para c) to read "Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape, ensuring that the density, heights and layout of buildings on the higher ground minimise any visual impacts on this prominent location, especially views from the Wessex AONB and respecting the Roman Road as a landscape feature and existing hedgerows and providing a buffer of 50 metres to protect ancient woodlands".	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Jeffrey Northam	N/A	N/A	628923	117	No	No	Policies SS3.2 and SS3.11 : a.The increased CO2 emissions from additional traffic adding top global warming b.Development would be beyond the ridgeline and have steep gradients for cyclists and walkers c. Inadequate road capacity d. The requirement for major sewerage network upgrades e. Damage to valuable ancient woodlands	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Geoff Burnes	N/A	N/A	784733	277	Yes	No	The small areas of woodland, including ancient woodland, that separate the proposed Kennel Farm site from Old Down Common are a vital resource for local wildlife conservation. Permitting development of Kennel Farm will introduce levels of human disturbance entirely incompatible with the woodland and common as a thriving wildlife resource, and reduce the Common to the character of an urban park. Even an undeveloped margin of 50m, much greater than the proposed 20-30m, would not provide sufficient separation to avoid such disturbance. Given the amount of effort from the Council and local volunteers to develop the Common and its adjacent woodland as a thriving wildlife haven, this development would appear counter to previous policies, undermining these efforts and damaging precious local habitats.	Ideally, reject this application on the grounds of its environmental impact.	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	283	Yes	No	1. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para's 24 and 34 - Distance from town and employment. 2. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 30 in respect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 3. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 17 in respect of public transport and walking and cycling provision. 4. Insufficient road capacity contrary to Policy CN8. 5. Uncertain sewerage infrastructure availability. 6. Prejudicial to surrounding ancient woodland and adjacent SINCS	Remove the policy from the Plan OR substantially reduce the density of housing to allow for increased woodland buffers and screening of the development in such a sensitive location AND amend Para c) to read "Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape, ensuring that the density, heights and layout of buildings on the higher ground minimise any visual impacts on this prominent location, especially views in and out of the Wessex AONB and respecting the Roman Road as a landscape feature and existing hedgerows and woodlands".	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mrs Elizabeth Burnes	N/A	N/A	784757	296	No	No	The NPPF demands that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife sites or landscape areas will be judged. Given the NPPF's requirement for moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature, it is difficult to see what criteria were applied in putting forward the Kennel Farm site. The NPPF again requires that Local Plans plan for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Volunteers, supported by the Council, have worked hard to foster biodiversity in Old Down and its adjacent woodlands including ancient woodlands. Unless the aim is to change the character of Old Down into that of an urban park, with the attendant drastic habitat degradation, the criteria that have been applied are unclear. Such a development would only further exacerbate recent catastrophic falls in fauna populations.	Fundamentally, this development should be refused because of its undoubted detrimental environmental impact. Any policy that converts Old Down and its adjacent woodland into a 'park-like' corridor between housing developments is a fundamentally-flawed approach.	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Peter Wilson	N/A	N/A	786114	556	Not Specified	No	The site is an unsustainable location for development for the following reasons. 1.Isolation - from Kempshott, including Gabriel Park, and existing school and other facilities there by the existing woodland park and by the need to leave land adjoining the tree belt on the site's northern boundary undeveloped. Isolated from development at Beggarwood Lane. 2.Lack of on-site facilities and distance from existing facilities. The proposed development is too small to support on-site facilities and the nearest are in Kempshot and Hatch Warren which are too far to make walking a practical option. 3.Unacceptable impact on the Local Road network. Most journeys to and from the site are likely to be by the private car. In particular, either on its own or in conjunction with SS3.10 and SS3.11 sites, it would have an unacceptable impact on Kempshot Lane and Fiveways junction. 4.Possible prejudice to a western bypass 5.Indefensible boundary 6.Landscape impact 7.Natural habitats impact	Proposed site SS3.2 should be deleted from the plan. If, notwithstanding this objection, the site is retained in the plan, the policy should be amended by replacing criterion (d) with the following: "Provide measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the Kempshott roundabout, the A30 and effective measures to prevent the passage of through traffic on unsuitable roads in Kempshott".	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861. Criterion d) and e) adequately cover the points on transport mitigation measures.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr John Rothera	Kempshott District Residents Association	N/A	122977	590	Yes	No	Policy SS3.2 is unsound for the reasons: 1. The site is unsuitable - contrary to NPPF paragraphs 24 and 34 - distance from town centre and employment locations. 2. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 30 in respect of reducing greenhouse emissions - unsustainable 3. Inadequate road capacity, contrary to Local Plan Policy CN8 4. Significant adverse impact on existing facilities located in neighbouring residential areas, e.g. on schools 5. The residents of the new housing would be severely isolated from other residential areas 6. The development would be harmful to adjacent ancient woodlands and SINCS 7. The development would have a severe detrimental impact on the landscape character and quality of the area 8. Loss of good quality agricultural land.	For the reasons set out above, the Kempshott and District Resident's Association recommends that Policy SS3.2 be deleted from the Local Plan; but in the event that Policy SS3.2 is retained in the Plan, that a minimum of 50metres wide wildlife buffers be required to be provided within the housing site along the whole length of the ancient woodlands.	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	600	Yes	No	NPPF9,109,113,114,117 not satisfied in Policy EM4 i including not "setting criteria based policies against which dev. proposals ...will be judged" for protecting and enhancing landscapes, biodiversity, ecosystem services. Para i NPPF114,117 No positive strategy/criteria for networks/priority habitats to give "net gains in biodiversity" e.g. habitats must support diversity, be scaled to absorb impacts, be viable, sustainable, permeable, & function as network of diverse habitats & associated undisturbed species, healthy soils, i.e. uncompressed, uneroded, untrampled plants, shrubs, tree roots. Habitat space inadequate for traffic & pet disturbance and so will degrade, fragment, die out as birds, mammals, invertebrates lose food, places to breed, hide, hibernate. Trees felled at most biodiverse because houses close. Must include "provide links to the existing green network". Existing and broken links cannot be guaranteed in the future unless recognition they are required or reinstated.	Need objective/measurable criteria by which landscapes, habitats soils, ecosystem services, net gains in biodiversity, permeability, viability and sustainability for habitat related flora and fauna are necessary to be "protected and enhanced". Woodlands/corridors must satisfy habitat needs for associated habitat species. Ancient wood plant species are fragile and need to be protected/enhanced as human/pet traffic will damage plants/invertebrates etc. if inadequate habitats. Woods are defined to be space where tree cover is 20% or more. Para i Limit direct and indirect adverse impacts on key species and habitats, including the nearby Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation by mitigating and compensating any impacts and by delivering viable and sustainable habitats for wildlife to ensure species regeneration and permeability (movement) for flora and fauna and a net gain in biodiversity related to those habitats; Add. Must include "providing links to the existing green network".	The plan should be read as a whole. Policy EM4 provides the criteria based policy which to assess proposals for biodiversity, geodiversity, and nature conservation. Links between the green network is also covered by Policy EM4, criteria e).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Wates Development (c/o Savills)	Wates Development Ltd	Savills	133038	1198	Yes	No	Savills and Wates Developments Ltd fully support the identification of Kennel Farm within the Pre-submission Plan as a baseline housing allocation and one required to come forward early in the plan period between 2014 and 2019. An objection is however raised in respect of the Policy wording and the reduction of the housing capacity from 'approximately 350 dwellings' as contained within the previous SHLAA to 'approximately 250 dwellings' as set out in SS3.2. It is not considered that the amendment is justified nor based on a robust evidence base, and therefore is not considered sound. The calculation of the density has involved moving away from the recognised methodology for calculating net residential density and excluded areas of on site accessible open space from the net developable area, and instead sought to calculate density on a 'housing alone' area, thus artificially reducing the net developable area and reducing the site capacity to 250 dwelling. (please see full response)	In order to be considered sound, the wording of Policy SS3.2 should be amended to delete reference to 'approximately 250 dwellings' and replace with 'approximately 350 dwellings', as contained within the former Pre-submission Core Strategy draft (January 2012).	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861. Agree to change the number of dwellings in the policy to be in alignment with the recent appeal decision.	Amend the number of dwellings from 250 to <u>up to 310</u> .	Response to representation and in line with the recent appeal decision.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	618	Yes	No	HCC as Highways Authority supports the thrust of this policy, but believes a strengthening of clause D is needed to be more effective.	Amend D as follows: 'Provide measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A30 corridor and specifically improvements at Kempshott Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment).	Agree to amend.	D) <u>Provide measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A30 corridor and specifically improvements at Kempshott Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment)</u>	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mrs Christine Northam	N/A	N/A	786629	811	No	No	Distance from town and employment areas The CO2 emissions from additional cars will add to global warming. The developments would be beyond the ridgeline and have steep gradients for both cyclists and walkers There is inadequate road congestion A requirement for a major sewerage and upgrade to the network Loss of amenity value of Golf course	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mrs Catherine Dodd	N/A	N/A	613030	882	Yes	No	The site is a considerable distance from the town centre and the business areas of Basingstoke. The reliance on the private car would therefore be huge and the current road structure would be inadequate to cope with enormous increases in traffic. SS3.2 stands out in the middle of an undeveloped area with open areas either side of it. A housing development here would be a major change in the direction of developed areas and would take development beyond the natural landform boundary of the borough and into the open countryside. The site is also adjacent to an ancient woodland SINC. The site is also isolated by the A30 from other housing and amenities and schools. I feel that the development of this site would be totally inappropriate and constitute suburban sprawl, which would destroy valuable countryside and must be avoided.	The site should be removed from the plan. If it must be retained then road infrastructure, schools and sewage works etc. must be funded and in place before development.	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1168	No	No	Object to the proposed allocation. The decision has been taken prematurely. The site is poorly located to the existing built up area of Basingstoke. LPA not undertaken an objective assessment of housing need across the borough and sub-region and not considered whether the site is an appropriate location for new housing allocation in the context of a potentially more suitable locations, including those elsewhere in the sub-region. Is not based on the most appropriate strategy. The Local Plan is not legally compliant given the absence of an appropriate level of cooperation with neighbouring authorities.	Requests the allocation is deleted. Requests a decision should be take at a sub-regional level (as part of duty to cooperate) to locate the uplift in housing requirements to a more sustainable location elsewhere.	The site has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1232	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority supports the thrust of this policy. However the County Council believes that a strengthening of the policy wording in Clause D would make this policy more effective and therefore sound.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority request that Clause D of this policy is amended as follows: D) Provide measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A30 corridor and specifically improvements at Kempshott Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment)	Agree to amend.	New wording as follows : D) <u>Provide measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A30 corridor and specifically improvements at Kempshott Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment)</u>	Response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. i.e. "Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.".	Agree with the suggested change.	Amend bullet point to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.2 - Kennel Farm	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Janet Aris	N/A	N/A	389416	68	No	No	Concerns about the traffic/highways implications associated with the Razors Farm site - policy SS3.3.	"The council must ensure that all necessary infrastructure on all proposed sites is put in place before developers are allowed to go ahead" .	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy. This is supplemented by the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Anonymous	N/A	N/A		82	Yes	No	The Razors Farm site should not be seen as an extension of Basingstoke, as it is actually contained within Bramley Parish Boundary. Infrastructure, whether it be structural, services or facilities are already stretched to capacity within Bramley and Chineham. Sites related to policies SS3.3, SS3.8, SS3.7, SS3.9 and policy SS5 at Bramley will all contribute to significant increased traffic on the A33, whilst development at SS3.7 and 3.9 will not allow for the A33 to be made into a dual carriageway. Development of these sites will result in traffic movement north towards Bramley Village for services and in particular in order to access the railway station The result of the additional development to the north will be that traffic will move north into Bramley Parish and have an adverse impact on the C32 adding further congestion and exacerbating parking issues in the village. There is no evidence to suggest that sites of this size are needed. Bramley only requires 72 more dwellings.	The viability of policies SS3.3 and 3.8 is unsound and without significant road infrastructure changes made prior to development the sites are unsustainable. Policy SS10 is used as a justification for the development of the 3.3 and 3.8 sites, however, there is no definite plan in place to deliver this policy.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. In addition, the allocation contributes to meeting the boroughs overall housing need. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the policy criterion. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy and this is supplemented by the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	87	Yes	No	This site is wholly unsuited to additional housing as it will be accessed via a commercial estate and is constrained by the railway line. The location would be better suited to an expansion of the business park, drawing additional employment to the local economy. The local Parish Council has indicated that this site may be a possible location for the proposed Chineham railway station - this would be more valuable to the local community and business park. Having seen plans for this development, it is clear that no real, justifiable and sustainable provision has been made for 1) the road network, 2) the local schools (especially with the near-completion of Taylor's Farm, for which the developers made a contribution to funding a school which soon disappeared) 3) the local medical centre 4) sewerage and provision of similar services.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site issues raised were considered through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process and it is considered that they can be adequately mitigated through the application of the criteria contained within the site policy. Also, the relationship with the adjoining commercial premises was considered in detail during the recently considered outline planning application for Razor's Farm. The noise issues were addressed via a noise report, and the council's EHO supported the report findings, that whilst there are noise impacts, these can be adequately mitigated. The need for additional school provision would be catered for by the adjacent Cufaude Farm site, where the provision for a new school is safeguarded by the policy requirements specifically set out in respect of that allocation. The provision of the Chineham Railway Station is addressed by policy SS10, and would not be prejudiced by this site allocation. Additional development in this location will increase the demand for and viability of such services.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	95	Yes	No	This site is wholly unsuited to additional housing as it will be accessed via a commercial estate and is constrained by the railway line. The location would be better suited to an expansion of the business park, drawing additional employment to the local economy. The local Parish Council has indicated that this site may be a possible location for the proposed Chineham railway station - this would be more valuable to the local community and business park. Having seen plans for this development, it is clear that no real, justifiable and sustainable provision has been made for 1) the road network, 2) the local schools (especially with the near-completion of Taylor's Farm, for which the developers made a contribution to funding a school which soon disappeared) 3) the local medical centre 4) sewerage and provision of similar services.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site issues raised were considered through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process and it is considered that they can be adequately mitigated through the application of the criteria contained within the site policy. Also, the relationship with the adjoining commercial premises was considered in detail during the recently considered outline planning application for Razor's Farm. The noise issues were addressed via a noise report, and the council's EHO supported the report findings, that whilst there are noise impacts, these can be adequately mitigated. The need for additional school provision would be catered for by the adjacent Cufaude Farm site, where the provision for a new school is safeguarded by the policy requirements specifically set out in respect of that allocation. The provision of the Chineham Railway Station is addressed by policy SS10, and would not be prejudiced by this site allocation. Additional development in this location will increase the demand for and viability of such services.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	104	Yes	No	There is a need to progress the Chineham railway station, which was expected to be completed on many occasions including when Sherfield Park was developed. Additional houses without completing this facility will give rise to unacceptable traffic and congestion on the roads. Public transport (buses) have been ineffective at serving Sherfield Park, which is littered with parked cars on the roads, and this will be the same. The railway station must be funded - but it is clear that there is no firm intention to move forward on this within the plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The provision of the Chineham Railway Station is addressed through policy SS10, and work is continuing with HCC , Network Rail, and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development (paragraph 4.77). In addition, the council has produced a Transport Assessment which analyses the traffic implications associated with the plan, and proposes mitigation measures. This is also supplemented by the council's IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	132	Yes	No	The Razors Farm site should not be seen as an extension of Basingstoke, as it is actually contained within Bramley Parish Boundary. Infrastructure, whether it be structural, services or facilities are already stretched to capacity within Bramley and Chineham. Sites related to policies SS3.3, SS3.8, SS3.7, SS3.9 and policy SS5 at Bramley will all contribute to significant increased traffic on the A33, whilst development at SS3.7 and 3.9 will not allow for the A33 to be made into a dual carriageway. Development of these sites will result in traffic movement north towards Bramley Village for services and in particular in order to access the railway station The result of the additional development to the north will be that traffic will move north into Bramley Parish and have an adverse impact on the C32 adding further congestion and exacerbating parking issues in the village. There is no evidence to suggest that sites of this size are needed. Bramley only requires 72 more dwellings.	The Local Plan strategy of making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure investment. The borough's expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown, SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affects on the existing population. Regard for the impact on the existing population should be the main consideration. The evidence that a series of smaller sites is necessary in order to provide the housing in a more efficient and timely manner, is not logical or persuasive.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. In addition, the allocation contributes to meeting the borough's overall housing need. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the policy criterion. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy and this is supplemented by the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Mac Andrade	N/A	N/A	784524	139	Yes	No	My interpretation is that the plan is not sound because: Positively prepared - the plan states that Bramley will have to accommodate circa 200 houses but Bramley already is accommodating 810 houses in Razor Farm. Thus, fairness nor positive sincerity does not represent itself. Effective - The council owns a considerable amount of land in Manydown, which it could sell and use the funds to upgrade the transport and business attractiveness of the area Effective - The local plan does not address the amount of empty commercial buildings which could be transformed into residential property (e.g. Wella Road)	As above	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. In addition, the allocation contributes to meeting the borough's overall housing need. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability. The scope to accommodate additional residential development on brownfield sites has been considered by the council through the SHLAA and ELR and opportunities have been reflected within the overall strategy, whilst ensuring that the growth of the borough's economy continues. Brownfield sites could not accommodate the additional housing development needed to meet the council's objectively assessed need, and therefore the allocation of greenfield sites is required.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	154	Yes	Yes	The site at Razors Farm includes four Grade II listed buildings and there are other heritage assets on the site or nearby. English Heritage therefore welcomes and supports requirements c) and e) of Policy SS3.3., although we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve' as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of these heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	intentionally left blank	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to 'conserve'	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Lisa Robins	N/A	N/A	784670	243	Yes	No	Since the introduction of large developments at Sherfield Park, and the lack of promised infrastructure and amenities to support that ever increasing development, additional housing at Razors Farm will simply compound this issue as it is hard to believe the infrastructure and amenities will be provided/improved. The effects on traffic in the surrounding areas will be incredibly detrimental and potentially dangerous given the roads in use. Justification of this site cannot be made.	Remove Razors Farm as a proposed site for development	Additional infrastructure would be provided in the area as part of the Cufaude Farm development, which would include a community centre and new school. In addition, policy SS10 promotes the development of the Chineham railway station. Infrastructure and transport is assessed through the IDP and Transport Assessments. Both documents set out mitigation measures.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Nicholas Bywater	N/A	N/A	784685	265	Yes	No	The site for Policy SS3.3 lies at the northern edge of the Chineham Business Park and its development for residential use would prevent any future expansion of this popular commercial area. Whilst the redevelopment of existing commercial sites, as well undeveloped sites, are likely to satisfy occupational demand over the Plan period, the Chineham Business Park is the last commercial area in Basingstoke whose boundary can still be extended. Its proposed enclosure by residential development creates an unwelcome 'collar' that may restrict economic growth beyond the plan period. If policy SS3.3 is to remain, the supporting infrastructure improvements must be planned and provided before this site (and that of SS3.8) can be brought forward for any development. The Draft Plan does not adequately clarify how this would be achieved and both Policies SS3.3 and SS3.8 are therefore unsound.	Policy SS3.3 should be re-considered properly in the context of more appropriate longer term commercial uses, including use of part of the site for the proposed Chineham railway station. Otherwise, more clearly defined infrastructure improvements are required before this policy can be effectively implemented in its current form.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. The need to retain the site for a future employment use has been considered in light of the borough's Employment Land Review which concludes that the site is not required. Accordingly, it is considered that residential use of the site is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace. The council's Transport Assessment sets out mitigation measures in relation to transport infrastructure, as reflected within the criteria of the policy. The Cufaude Farm site would also deliver infrastructure improvements in the form of a new school and community centre, as reflected in the policy and IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Stephen Levin	N/A	N/A	784995	335	Not Specified	No	The plan fails the soundness test because it is not based on robust and credible evidence. More over, it ignores credible evidence that shows the plan's failure. Criteria f within SS3.3 calls for improved road links from Cufaude Lane to the A33 through Sherfield Park. The Transport Assessment addressed only the increased traffic flow generated by the Raxor's Farm and Cufaude Farm development and ignored any traffic flow from the Business Park. This flow was deemed small enough that a simple flaring at the A33 roundabout would mitigate any problems. The plan thus ignores common sense and the witnessed January 2013 obstructions which showed that Business Park traffic could be three times what the plan assumes. Gaiger Avenue would be come a nightmare.	An alternative is required for the access road so it can avoid the Gaiger Avenue/Rockbourne Road roundabout.	The evidence base includes a Transport Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which is considered to be a suitable evidence base in relation to highways matters. The Transport Assessment included traffic flows from employment areas as part of its baseline position. The council's Transport Assessment sets out mitigation measures in relation to transport infrastructure, as reflected within the criteria of the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	R Cheke	N/A	N/A	86092	340	Yes	No	Insufficient consideration has been given to how the plan will exacerbate existing traffic problems. The new development at SS3.3 will be isolated from the centre of Basingstoke and consequently will result in the need for additional vehicle movements. Further development in this area will put intolerable pressure on the existing road network. There is already huge pressure on the A33 and all the proposed development along both sides of the A33 in the Redlands/Chineham area would preclude future road widening. An increase in housing in the area will put pressure on the fragile ecology of the area, especially on aquatic systems such as the River Loddon and its tributaries and exacerbate the likelihood of flooding along Cufaude Lane. There is no adequate primary school available in the area, and the new development will put additional pressure on existing school transport facilities.	The Manydown area, which was purchased specifically to cater for future housing needs in Basingstoke should be used to much greater capacity. It could take 9000 homes, thus obviating the need for development in Bramley.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the policy criteria. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy and this is supplemented by the IDP. Biodiversity issues are appropriately covered by criteria h) which will limit the impact of any future development. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	343	Yes	No	Proposals for development of SS3.3, SS3.4, SS3.7, SS3.8 and SS3.9 in effect form a major development area East of Basingstoke. Development of these sites will overload A33, sewerage system, schools, surgeries and local community facilities. Public transport will be insufficient to meet demand. A33 will not have sufficient capacity even with improvements and future duelling will be prevented by these developments.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.3. As an alternative increase the developable area and number of dwellings for the Manydown site (policy SS3.10).	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with these sites are covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Miss Karen Bental	N/A	N/A	785033	344	Yes	No	The plan does not seek to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements re: housing, transport or the environment, and to be sound it needs to incorporate a 10yr demographic plan for each. The plan is also not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives e.g. Manydown. The plan is not deliverable in terms of the existing infrastructure and must show indications of a 10yr demographic plan. The plan is also no flexible as it must show a 10yr demographic forecast. The plan is no consistent with government guidance allow for local development plan submissions.	The plan needs to incorporate a 10yr demographic forecast, and more consideration needs to be given the development of the Manydown area.	The Plan's housing requirement is considered to be sound and further information is set out within a Housing Topic Paper. The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with these sites are covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Jackie Riley	N/A	N/A	86129	353	Yes	No	The LDF has been changed so many times without local people having a chance to be involved. It seems that if areas such as Cufaude and Razors Farm and Redlands were all developed this would be unmanageable in terms of infrastructure, as the area has already been saturated by new development in this regard. A33 cannot cope with more traffic. The plan is not balanced or workable or sound and it is disappointing that an obvious solution has been deliberately left out for so long and has only been included with much less houses planned than would be possible.	There is an opportunity to follow policy and balance development around Basingstoke by planning an eco-village on Manydown. This would remove the need for the housing at SS3.3, SS3.7 and SS3.8 and could have all the infrastructure properly planned at the outset. Manydown has space to take several thousand more houses which would mean reserve sites would not be required. Greater regard is necessary in respect of traffic congestion.	The Plan's housing requirement is considered to be sound and further information is set out within a Housing Topic Paper. The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with these sites are covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Chris Flooks	N/A	N/A	637722	359	Yes	No	The new residents of SS3.3 and 3.8 will have a significant impact on Bramley. Bramley has been overdeveloped in recent decades, exacerbated by insufficient infrastructure improvements. Choosing to located further development in Bramley on the premise that it has a railway station is unrealistic, as the parking at the station is totally inadequate, and the railway line is getting much busier, and will become more so as a result of electrification of the line. The C32 is used as a detour from the congested A33 to the A340 and cannot cope at present, as situation which will be exacerbated by the effects of the Redlands, Razors, Cufaude and Sherfield Park developments. The school has recently been extended but is also already nearing maximum capacity again. The doctors surgery is also struggling to cope with the demands being placed on it. There is no provision for walking safely between Bramley and the adjacent villages nor are there safe cycle routes. No high speed broadband.	The approach involving making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure. The allocation of 200 dwellings would contribute to the wider infrastructure problems, and would create an unsustainable situation. The borough expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without a lasting detrimental impact on existing residents. There is no reason why Manydown cannot be developed at an appropriate pace in order to keep up with the demands for new housing. Proposals are needed within the plan to address the specific infrastructure issues flowing from the plan.	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with these sites are covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP, based upon the Local Plan evidence base which includes a Transport Assessment. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Ms Louise Hayling	N/A	N/A	784338	382	Yes	No	This development is within Bramley parish boundary but it is considered in the plan that developments will be directed towards Basingstoke. No consideration is given to the additional traffic in the area that the development will cause, it is isolated from the centre of Basingstoke so car travel will be necessary. Not effective. It has already been noticed that there has been an increase in traffic due to the Taylors Farm development and therefore further development in this area will put intolerable pressure on the existing road network. The A33 is under strain already, and all the proposed development along both sides will limit the scope for road widening. Environmentally the proposal will be a disaster, as the rural pathways and views into the countryside will be lost forever and the beautiful green land will be swallowed up forever.	Manydown was purchased specifically to cater for the future housing needs for Basingstoke and should be used to much greater capacity. It is ridiculous to defer the deliverability of two thirds of these homes to beyond the plan period and ludicrous to purport that it cannot deliver until the latter stage of the plan because of infrastructure requirements. Manydown was originally proposed to accommodate at least 9000 homes which has been fought against for a number of years and this deferral will lead to the carving up of many other areas where infrastructure and environmental issues and concerns have not been sufficiently addressed. Rural areas like Bramley risk being swallowed up into one major conurbation with other sprawling in-fill developments. The council should get on with the Manydown development to the full extent it was intended, for the good of the whole borough and leave the villages alone.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. The council has produced a Transport Assessment, which analyses the traffic implications and proposes mitigation measures. This is supplemented by the IDP. The landscape impact of the proposal has also been subject to detailed assessment in the form of the Landscape Capacity Study/site assessment, whilst the wider environmental considerations have also been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. The relevant policy criteria will ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	413	Yes	No	Razors Farm Object to (b) as this site is not on the edge of town and actually is in the countryside. This site borders or is linked to the business park and railway line and is not suitable for housing. This area should be reserved for future development of the business park. (j) Traffic from this development will put unacceptable strain on Chineham and add to the traffic on the A33. There would need to be alternative access to and from this site but none appears to be planned. (p) Sewage system does not cope now. What is the effluent quality programme? Site is isolated.	Road infrastructure not in place. Put unacceptable strain on Chineham and Bramley. Alternative sites available at Hounsme Fields or Manydown.	The site adjoins the Basingstoke town settlement policy boundary, and therefore is regarded as being on the edge of the town for planning purposes. The noise impacts are addressed in criteria m) of the policy. The need to retain the site for a future employment use has been considered in light of the borough's Employment Land Review which concludes that the site is not required. Accordingly, it is considered that residential use of the site is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace. The council has produced a Transport Assessment, which analyses the traffic implications and proposes mitigation measures. This is supplemented by the IDP. The specific access arrangements will be addressed at the planning application stage. The reference to the effluent quality improvement programme is derived from paragraph 8.3.2 of the Water Cycle Study Phase 2 report 2009. To support any development on this site a drainage strategy must be produced to understand the impact of development and any upgrades that may be required to the sewer network and/or the effluent system. An effluent quality programme is a plan of how effluent from the development will be discharged to ensure acceptable water quality standards.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	445	No	No	The proposed development of Razor's Farm for residential purposes is both unsound and bizarre. Given the availability of more suitable locations (SS3.10), to place homes adjacent to a commercial area (in this case containing some heavy industry) is irrational both in terms of the impact on existing industry and also future residents. The adjacent business parks are the largest commercial zone in the borough, with only a single formal highway access and egress route which is already seriously stressed and undermining the viability of the business parks. Development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the local road network, both the A33 and the smaller routes which would be used as an alternative. The absence of both a primary school and provision of medical services would mean undue pressure being placed on facilities in Chineham, which area already overstretched. The development would be too isolated and will not be accessible in practical terms by public transport.	The above shortcoming can only be addressed by deletion of this site from the proposed Greenfield Site Allocations (SS3).	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing in light of the evidence base, including the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site is covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy and this is supplemented by the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Sandra Tapping	N/A	N/A	541740	447	Yes	No	There is a natural edge to north of Chineham at Crockford Lane, and the woodland forms an important 'green barrier'. Allowing Razor's Farm to coalesce with Chineham and Taylor's Farm would put a huge immediate burden on local infrastructure, especially as the local plan infrastructure requirement should a 285 million pound funding gap. There are already major congestion problems on the A33 east of Basingstoke. Further development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on the A33 and lead at times to gridlock. This would have disastrous consequences for the whole of the Basingstoke economy. There would also be shortfalls in the sewerage, school and NHS provisions which are already overstretched with Taylor's Farm being developed without adequate infrastructure, and there are nearly 2 years of approved building for more houses at Taylor's Farm. I urge the Inspector to question the short term overloading of infrastructure in the Chineham area.	Manydown should be the first site to be developed and not a second phase, especially as it is public land bought for housing. Manydown would also bring forward the best sustainable opportunity for new infrastructure as a result of the scale of development being suggested, and is in single ownership which is beneficial from a deliverability perspective.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing in light of the evidence base, including the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process. In terms of highway impact, as part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion i) in the policy and this is supplemented by the IDP. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site is covered under the relevant policy criteria and the accompanying IDP. The issue of the impact on education facilities has already been assessed by Hampshire County Council, and there is an acknowledged need for a 2 hectare primary school. The requirement for the provision is set out in clause b), of the Cufaude Farm site allocation policy (SS3.8), and that site allocation also includes the requirement for the provision of social and physical infrastructure, including the provision of a community centre.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Anthony Tapping	N/A	N/A	638608	451	Yes	No	I object to Razor's Farm and Cufaude Farm being in the local plan because the development of this part of Basingstoke is unsustainable in the context of: traffic congestion on the A33; loss of suitable site for the proposed Chineham railway station; lack of infrastructure; lack of medical or educational facilities or shops; loss of countryside; flooding and increase in pollution with potentially inadequate sewerage and drainage systems. Planning Policy states that settlement should accommodate development without encroachment into open countryside. The shape of Basingstoke is already 'skewed' towards a NE/SW axis. Any development of Razor's Farm would be an adverse encroachment into the countryside and severe loss of local amenity, rural beauty and therapeutic green areas between settlements. The River Loddon is already polluted and breaks the law. The local sewerage system is already overloaded and is unlikely to be able to cope with future demand.	Manydown should be the first site to be developed and not a second phase. The short term option of overloading infrastructure by piecemeal development on greenfield sites in the Chineham area must be questioned. Manydown would bring forward the best sustainable opportunity for new infrastructure as a result of the scale of development being suggested, and is in single land ownership which is beneficial from a deliverability perspective.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing in light of the evidence base, including the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. The issue of the impact on education facilities has already been assessed by Hampshire County Council, and there is an acknowledged need for a 2 hectare primary school. The requirement for the provision of a primary school is set out in clause b), of the Cufaude Farm site allocation policy, and that site allocation also includes the requirement for the provision of social and physical infrastructure, including the provision of a community centre. The landscape impacts associated with the allocation have also been considered in detail in the Landscape Capacity Study commissioned by the council. The council's Water Cycle Study 2009 states that the WCS has shown that planned growth of between 14800 and 18900 dwellings can be accommodated without causing significant additional pressure on Water Framework Directive physio-chemical status.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Clir Chris Tomblin	N/A	N/A	637009	462	Yes	No	The site will encroach into the countryside, and there will be a loss of the rural landscape, useable farmland, use and enjoyment of footpaths, wildlife habitats and impacts upon the free movement of wildlife from area to area. There will be a conflict between the residential use of this site and the adjacent commercial premises. The site is not accessible by public transport. SS10 is used as a partial justification, however, this development is not likely to take place. The traffic implications of the proposal will undermine the viability of the business park. The impact of extra traffic will also affect local communities as the delays of the overloaded A33 corridor encourage routes through the existing communities of Chineham, Bramley and soon Taylors Farm. The proposal for the Crockford road roundabout mitigation schemes are fanciful, requiring 4 land wide carriageways and traffic lighting. The development will increase the existing flooding problem.	The policy of adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements places too much demand on the existing infrastructure and hence the existing communities. We may make new developments attractive places to live in but at what cost to existing inhabitants. A more cohesive approach is required in respect of the sites to the north of Basingstoke, especially in terms ensuring appropriate infrastructure provision. The current approach will not achieve the Vision. The only logical solution must be to maximise the use of the land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. The whole site can take over 8000 houses but the choice to only part develop this site in this local plan has not been sufficiently justified. This site is a clean sheet and so can be well planned - providing for the needs of a new community and not compromising those that already exist. The borough owns the land - purchased for this very reason with tax-payer money - and can then fund the required infrastructure.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing in light of the evidence base, including the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process. The biodiversity issues have been assessed as part of the council's Biodiversity Assessment. Noise issues and the relationship with the neighbouring commercial area are addressed by clauses m) and n) within policy SS3.3. The council has produced a Transport Assessment, which analyses the traffic implications and proposes mitigation measures. This is supplemented by the IDP. The site is not located in a Flood Zone 2 or 3, and clause o) within the policy addresses flood risk.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Jessica Tattersall	N/A	N/A	784782	494	No	No	Development on the site will put the already heavily strained local services/infrastructure under intolerable strain. History shows that promised infrastructure for new developments in the area frequently do not materialise, and if they do almost invariably are lagging behind completion of the development. Traffic jams on the A33 are becoming more regular. The footpath to the far end of the Taylor's Farm development has not been connected to Chineham, meaning that there is a dangerous walk along the narrow and busy Cufaude Lane, which leaves residents to drive for a 'safer' route. It is currently very difficult to get a doctors appointment. Manydown is far more suited to being developed to its full capacity with the funds raised being used to provide the area with the needed infrastructure.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes mitigation measures. In addition, infrastructure provision in the area will be enhanced through the development of the Cufaude Lane site, as that allocation includes the requirement for a school, and community centre. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability. The housing sites which have been proposed seek to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	499	Yes	No	Razors Farms sets out a new community unrelated to both Taylors Farm, or Chineham Business park, it is effectively cut off by the railway line. The development would add an additional burden to the biodiversity value of the Loddon valley and on the River Loddon where current objectives of the WFD cannot be met. Development on the site would increase traffic on the A33, congestion already occurs here. Appendix A of the IDP does not identify funding for the necessary junction improvements.	Sherfield-on-Loddon Parish Council believe that Razor's Farm should be taken out of the Local Plan submission and that further development should be concentrated on the Manydown land.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The policy requires that the development of the site is planned comprehensively with that of Cufaude Farm, and the issue of any potential isolation of the site is addressed by means of criteria f) within the policy. The site has also been assessed as part of the council's Biodiversity Assessment. The council's Water Cycle Study 2009 states that the WCS has shown that planned growth of between 14800 and 18900 dwellings can be accommodated without causing significant additional pressure on Water Framework Directive physio-chemical status. Thames Water also raised no objection to the recent planning application for the development of the site. The council has produced a Transport Assessment, which analyses the traffic implications and proposes mitigation measures. This is supplemented by the IDP.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	608	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'The existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particular in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	620	Yes	No	Clause F is not sufficiently clear on how the development will link to Sherfield Park, and is not specific about whether the link is going to be addressed via highways links or focussed on developing links for non-motorised users. The policy contains no reference to a site specific Transport Assessment, and the policy should only make reference to improvements which have been identified in the site specific Transport Assessment.	Amend clause F as follows: 'Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the...' Amend clause I as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A33 Corridor and specifically improvements at Crockford Lane Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment).'	Officers agree that criteria f) requires clarification and additional wording added. Criteria i) has also been amended to reflect that improvements will be required to the wider A33 corridor, specifically the Crockford Lane Roundabout.	Criteria f) to read: Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the adjoining business park..... Criteria i) to read 'i) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A33 Corridor and specifically improvements at Crockford Lane roundabout.	Response to representation and improve clarification	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Liz Whittaker	N/A	N/A	786332	664	Not Specified	No	Chineham parish is separated from the town by the ring road, the railway line, two major business areas and the pattern of development in relation to adjacent parishes. Chineham is the local centre for services used by the residents of Old Basing, Lychpit and Sherfield on Loddon. Decisions on housing provision must be made taking this into account. Therefore, Razors Farm should not be seen as an extension of Basingstoke, as it is actually contained within Bramley parish boundary. Infrastructure, services and facilities are already stretched to capacity within Bramley and Chineham. The A33 will not be able to cope with the additional traffic from the housing allocations in the area. How is the problem of water quality going to be adequately addressed? Razor's Farm borders on and is accessed from Hampshire International Business Park and is not suitable for housing, being hemmed in by industrial sites and the railway line. The additional housing will reduce employment levels.	Manydown, SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental effects on the existing population. The site should be allocated for greater numbers of housing, it is obvious it can accommodate far more than the current plan allows for. This could cope with a large urban extension to Basingstoke with schools, shopping, leisure and medical facilities without overloading facilities in Chineham and other areas, such as Lychpit and Bramley. The plan does not explain why this site will not be used until 2019, this site should be brought forward sooner and developed fully, before any other site are even looked at. Regard for the impact on the existing population should be the main consideration. The evidence that a series of smaller sites is necessary to provide housing is not logical or persuasive.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. The issue of water quality is addressed by means of clause p) in the existing policy text. The noise issues and relationship with neighbouring commercial sites are addressed by clauses m) and n) in the policy text. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1233	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority does not consider the wording of Clause F of the policy is sufficiently clear on how the proposed development will link to Sherfield Park. The policy is not specific about whether this linkage is going to be addressed via highway links or focussed on developing links for non-motorised users.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority request that Clause F and Clause I of this policy are amended as follows: F) Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the adjoining business park, the site reserved for the possible Chineham Railway Station, Cufaude Farm and Sherfield Park, whilst ensuring that the maintenance of a high level of residential amenity is not prejudiced by the activity and visual intrusiveness of the business park. I) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A33 Corridor and specifically improvements at Crockford Lane Roundabout (as identified in the site specific Transport Assessment).	Officers agree that criteria f) requires clarification. Criteria i) has also been amended to reflect that improvements will be required to the wider A33 corridor, specifically the Crockford Lane Roundabout.	Criteria f) to read: Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the adjoining business park..... Criteria i) to read 'i) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the A33 Corridor and specifically improvements at Crockford Lane roundabout.	Response to representation and improve clarification	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities	N/A	786489	761	Not Specified	No	A statement is made at part SS3.3 p) about foul water not draining to Sherfield on Loddon Sewage Treatment Works unless an effluent quality programme has been implemented. Thames Water consider that this text should be amended.	The section should be amended to read along the lines of: "The developer will be required to provide a drainage strategy to understand the impact of development and any upgrades that may be required to serve it".	Agree to make change.	Change p) to read " Ensure that the impact of development and any upgrades that may be required to the sewer network and/or effluent system are understood, through the production of a drainage strategy".	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mrs Gail Tomblin	N/A	N/A	638019	775	Yes	No	There will be loss of the rural landscape, useable farmland, footpaths, wildlife habitats. Mitigation is not defined. The site is isolated from Taylor's farm and Chineham. The function of businesses within the business park that produce noise have their industrial sites placed away from existing settlements. Public transport is an issue and this site will further promote reliance on the car. Chineham railway station SS10 is used to part- justify this development, although it is unlikely this will be developed. The existing business park has major traffic flow issues. If the proposed road link between Taylor's farm and Chineham were not opened then the Razor's Farm site SS3.3 would cause an overbearing impact on Cufaude Lane and Hammore road traffic flow. Not clear how mitigation schemes are funded and when they would be delivered. Water run-off from this site regularly floods Cufaude Lane, this could be exacerbated by new development.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The site has been subject to detailed site assessment in the form of the Landscape Capacity Study and the Sustainability Appraisal. The site is in close proximity to Taylor's Farm, and when combined with the Cufaude Farm allocation, and measures to improve the connectivity of the site, will not be unduly isolated. Issues related to noise and the relationship with the neighbouring commercial sites are addressed by means of clauses m) and n) in the policy text. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. Any potential flooding issues are addressed by means of clause o) in the policy text.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	807	No	No	We fully endorse the inclusion of the strategic development at Razor's Farm. 420 units should not be considered a maximum, and the actual amount provided should be allowed to be informed by a series of technical and environmental considerations. Bullet d) requires a strong landscape buffer "from the outer", however, as such a buffer will take time to development, this requirement is not practical/reasonable. bullet f) should not include the assumption that the site will be isolated. The wording of bullet g) requires further clarification. bullet h) needs to be more flexible. bullet i) also needs to be made more flexible. bullet l) is generally supported, though there should be no requirement to go beyond the building regulations. bullet q) the requirement for development of a joint masterplan for the two sites is not 'justified' and does not represent a 'flexible' approach, key tests of 'soundness'. Furthermore, it will slow the delivery of Razors Farm.	Technical work has been carried out which demonstrates that the site can accommodate up to 425 dwellings, at required densities, along with the associated infrastructure and other requirements. We therefore support the inclusion of "approximately" in order to provide "flexibility" a key test of soundness in the NPPF. bullet d) to be amended as per Para 3.8 of full submission. bullet f) to be amended as per Para 3.12. bullet g) to be amended as per Para 3.17 bullet h) to be amended as per Para 3.21 bullet i) to be amended as per Para 3.25 bullet q) should be deleted.	The policy already uses the term 'approximately 420 dwellings', which enables the level of flexibility suggested. In terms of the buffer, an assessment of this issue in respect of the recently considered planning application suggests that the requirements of clause d) can be achieved. With regard to the point in relation to clause f) it is reasonable to assert that the site would be 'potentially isolated' if measures to improve the connectivity of the site are not put in place. It is considered that clause g) is sufficiently clear in requiring that the development of this site does not frustrate the goals of policy SS10 (Chineham Railway Station). Clause h) is informed by specific analysis of the site as set out in the Biodiversity Assessment, and therefore is considered justified and effective. Similarly, clause i) is informed by the council's Transport Assessment, and therefore is considered to be justified and effective. In relation to clause l), it is considered that it would be overly negative to specify that measures cannot go beyond the building regulations requirements (as per paragraph 154 NPPF), and the current wording is considered to be suitably flexible. In relation to clause q) it is considered that a joint masterplan would be the most effective way of delivering the two sites given their location, infrastructure requirements etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Michael Poore	N/A	N/A	441355	835	No	No	The proposal is unsound because no mention is made of access to Cufaude Lane which is unable to handle the existing traffic. The road is too narrow and the edges are continually breaking. The resultant holes make passing even more difficult. The road is also subject to serious flooding making it unusable. The word mitigate is meaningless - the council allows the developers to do anything they want without any consideration of the residents wishes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is considered that the current wording will allow for suitable mitigations works to be put in place if these are deemed necessary to make the proposed development acceptable. The full range of specific works are more appropriately addressed at the planning application stage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Cllr Elaine Still	BDBC	N/A	214658	852	Yes	No	The site is cut-off by the railway and is adjacent to a very busy business park. Building houses so close to an industrial area who's function is producing noise and traffic 24 hours a day will prove to be a huge problem for the residents. There is already a major problem on the business park with traffic flow issues with long queues. Already local companies are considering to relocate because of traffic congestion and with what is potentially a large development coming forward I fear these companies will move out.	In my view adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements will only add to placing too much demand on existing infrastructure which in turn will be a burden on existing communities. The sites to the North East of Basingstoke SS3.3 Razors Farm, SS3.8 Cufade Farm SS3.9 east of Basingstoke SS3.7Redlands constitutes a major development area. The best solution has to be to maximise the use of land at Manydown SS3.10. This site can take over 8000 houses and I feel the decision to only part develop this site in this local plan is unjustified. The Manydown site is a blank canvass so in turn can be well planned out to accommodate the required infrastructure for the new communities. After all the Borough Council owns the land and it was bought for the purpose of building houses with tax payers money.	The relationship with the adjoining commercial premises is addressed in criteria f). The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. In addition, the issues raised are addressed by means of criteria i), m) and n) in the existing policy text. In addition, focusing all development on Manydown would not be practical, nor would it address the council's immediate/short term housing need. The housing sites which have been proposed seek to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	858	Yes	Not Specified	The proposed development around Chineham and the proposed railway station covered by Razors Farm is currently awaiting a final decision by committee. The current planning application does not provide for parking, drop-off point, disabled access, bus or taxi facilities. This type of passenger facility is a basic requirement for any urban transport hub interchange to encourage its full and safe use and would also provide a better business case for implementation. The proposed railway station is intended to serve not only the existing nearby residents of Chineham, Chineham Business Parks but the additional 800+ homes proposed to be provided at the Razors and Cufaude Farm developments, but without the provision of these facilities currently planned. This lack of guaranteed provision of the railway station undermines the policy.	A joint masterplan is needed in respect of Razors and Cafaude Farm.	Whilst the comments are noted, it is considered that they call for a level of detail which is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. Turning to the issue of Chineham Railway Station, it is not considered to be reasonable to make the development of the site dependent upon the provision of that facility, as other suitable mitigation measures can be put in place in order to prevent any potential isolation of the site. That being said, it is clearly important that the development of this site does not frustrate the delivery of Chineham Railway Station, hence the inclusion of clause g). Finally, with regard to the need for a joint masterplan, also encompassing the Cufaude Farm allocation, this matter is specifically addressed in policies SS3.3 and SS3.8.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	865	No	No	Opposed to housing development on this site. As it borders on and is accessed from Hampshire International Business Park it is not considered suitable for housing. It was Chineham Parish Council's understanding that the southern part of this site was to be considered as a reserved area for future expansion of the business park. Should housing development take place then the potential for further local employment would be lost. Site is viable only on the assumption that SS3.8 will be brought forward. There are demonstrably deliverable suggestions for alleviating the pressure on transport and local amenities as a result of sites in policies SS3.9, SS3.7, SS3.3 and SS3.8. This level of concentrated development equates to a Major Development Area. Proposals are being considered to abandon the road link between Taylor's Farm and Chineham. The loss of this agreed link, for which construction has already started, would have profound implications for the development of SS3.3 and SS3.8.	To remove Razor's Farm from the Local Plan as it is not considered suitable for residential development and make an additional allocation on SS3.10 Manydown. Site may be a possible location for the proposed railway station and that such use would enable conserving and enhancing the woodland between Chineham and Taylor's Farm where the railway station and parking is at present proposed.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Its location adjacent to the business park is addressed in criteria f). The need to retain the site for a future employment use has been considered in light of the borough's Employment Land Review which concludes that the site is not required. Accordingly, it is considered that residential use of the site is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace. The requirement for Razor's Farm and Cufaude Farm to be brought forward in a co-ordinated manner is already included within the policy text for both site allocations. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	791341	883	Yes	No	Infrastructure is already stretched to capacity. The site encroaches further into Bramley reducing the open green space and removing a working farm from the area. The sites are only accessible via commercial and industrial parks (south) and a narrow widening rural road (north). Access from Sherfield Park will add to traffic issues on Cufaude Lane. TA acknowledges impact on Great Binfield and Crockford Lane roundabouts. All allocation sites in the area (total of 2060 houses) will contribute to traffic problems. Without significant road infrastructure changes prior to development the sites are unsustainable and thus the policies are not sound. There will be pressure to Bramley railway station and there are no firm plans for Chineham Railway Station. There is no evidence that sites of this size are needed to meet the Parish needs. Bramley only needs 72 dwellings. Development will impact on employment opportunities.	The borough's expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affect on the existing population. Evidence suggests, and policy CNS supports, that to develop the northeast area of the borough at the proposed rate will need significant changes to and delivery of additional infrastructure. This is SS3.8 can deliver in the period 2014-19 then Manydown could do the same rather than starting in 2019/20.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the policy criteria. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. In terms of Chineham Railway Station, it is not considered to be reasonable to make the development of the site dependent upon the provision of that facility, as other suitable mitigation measures can be put in place in order to prevent any potential isolation of the site. It is clearly important that the development of this site does not frustrate the delivery of Chineham Railway Station, hence the inclusion of clause g).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Kyriacos Marianos	N/A	N/A	784574	971	Yes	No	The infrastructure required has not been considered carefully and is not precise. Vague statements on the plan are not sufficient to proceed.	The detailed infrastructure needs have to be set out precisely and precede the development. Financially, insufficient funding is in place for this vital requirement.	Whilst the comments are noted, it is considered that they call for a level of detail which is beyond the remit of the Local Plan. Furthermore, the council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. This is supplemented by the council's IDP. The combination of these documents and the policy requirements contained in the Local Plan are considered to suitably address the infrastructure issues associated with the development in question.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1166	Yes	No	1. Allocation fails the Vision, which states "we enrich the different characters of and links between towns, villages and the countryside...and the River Loddon area" 2. Pressures from new residents will result in an additional burden on the biodiversity value of the Loddon Valley. 3. Additional impact on the River Loddon whereby it cannot be demonstrated that the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) can be met, in a river which is currently failing to meet the good ecological status as required by the WFD. 4. SS3.3 would increase the traffic on the A33, which is already overloaded, beyond its capacity. 5. Appendix A of Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicates that no funding has been identified to ensure policy SS3.3 criteria i) is delivered. Questions the trip rates in Table 8.26 of the Transport Assessment for SS3.9/7. Country Watch supports the objections to SS3.3 raised by Chineham Parish Council. Please also see the Chineham Parish Council representations.	Country Watch supports the objections to SS3.3 raised by Chineham Parish Council. Please also see the Chineham Parish Council representations.	The site has been subject to detailed site assessment in the form of the Landscape Capacity Study and the Sustainability Appraisal. The biodiversity issues have been assessed as part of the council's Biodiversity Assessment. The council's Water Cycle Study 2009 states that the WCS has shown that planned growth of between 14800 and 18900 dwellings can be accommodated without causing significant additional pressure on Water Framework Directive physio-chemical status. Thames Water also raised no objection to the recent planning application for the development of the site. The council has commissioned a Transport Assessment which assesses the impact on the A33 and sets out various mitigation measures. The TA is also supplemented by the council's IDP. In addition, clause i) in the policy text specifically addressed highways issues.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1259	Yes	No	SS3.3 There are a number of areas of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation on this allocation. Whilst the policy requires these to be buffered, the development is likely to permanently preclude the linking of these sites into a wider ecological network, contrary to NPPF Para 109. This impact does not seem to have been recognised, and hence the plan is unsound. The policy also requires these SINCs to be buffered, but no buffer width is specified. This may dramatically affect the quanta of housing possible in this allocation. In order to ensure the quanta is deliverable we advise that the size of the buffers required to achieve the relevant ecological objective is determined at this stage, and specified in the policy.	This could be addressed by adding " reconnect the woodland habitats within the site to Long Swains Row and the woodland belt to the south of the allocation in an ecologically sufficient manner." We advise that the council ensures that this can be delivered at the same time as the other specifications within the policy (e.g. housing quanta), and other specifications modified as necessary given to ensure that this modification can be delivered.	The site has been assessed as part of the council's Biodiversity Assessment. Whilst the comments are noted, it is considered that they call for a level of detail which is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, as this is supposed to be an essentially high level document. The biodiversity issues, and their impact upon site planning and the housing yield have been considered in detail during the course of the recently considered planning application, and that is regarded as the more appropriate forum for such issues to be addressed. The suggested text is not required as development proposals will need to accord with policy EM4 of the Local Plan which requires there to be no harm to the integrity of linkages between SINCS. As indicated in policy EM5 of the Local Plan, the council will support proposals which seek to improve the links in the green infrastructure network. The Landscape and Biodiversity SPD in box 4 provides guidance on buffer widths, it states "A minimum buffer of 20 metres should be provided between the edge of the woodland and the development (including gardens), unless it can be demonstrated, in a particular case, that the above issues can be satisfactorily addressed if a lesser distance is applied." This standard applies to designated and non-designated woodland. The SPD buffer width is greater than the "precedent" type buffer of 15m referred to in the 'Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees covering England issued by Natural England and the Forestry Commission (April 2014)'. A specific buffer distance will not be added to the policy as the SPD includes guidance on this matter.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	change to q) to refer to "Upper"	consistency	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.3 - Razor's Farm	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Julian Crawley	N/A	N/A	783708	112	No	No	This development will allow building on high elevation open land - which will adversely impact on surrounding views and local residents in both Popley and Marnel Park, and Sherborne St John. BDBC should identify the specific measures that will actually provide effective and substantial visual screening. BDBC Officers should advise which curtailment measures (referred to in previous written advice to BDBC Members) they will implement to limit the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area.	Previous development at Marnel Park has failed to provide any effective screening - hence the need to ensure the minimum requirements, in detail, in advance. The SSJPC submission to the recent Planning Appeal at Marnel Park showed that trees to a height of 60ft are required to form an effective screen.	Criteria c) of the policy outlines the need to provide substantial screening and this is sufficiently detailed for a Local Plan as matters of detail are discussed through the planning application process. In relation to this, in September 2013 the Secretary of State granted permission for an outline application for 450 dwellings on the whole of the site and a full application for 200 dwellings on part of the site. Specific screening measures are outlined in the application conditions.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	155	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports requirement f) of Policy SS3.4, although we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve' as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to 'conserve'	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	226	Yes	Yes	The 450 dwellings North of Popley fields is not a good idea. Popley has already had nearly 2000 extra dwellings included in the last local plan, this is an opportunistic inclusion, which should have been factored into the North Basingstoke Action plan previously. Consequently, when the homes were sold the buyers were promised no new extra dwellings, this promise is now being cynically broken by the same developer. The roads in the immediate vicinity were not designed to take extra traffic, and Popley Way is now having to cope with nearly twice the number of residents it was originally designed to cope for, with long queues in and out of the estate at peak periods. The "transport infrastructure upgrades" will need to include upgrading Popley Way to a dual carriageway. Also, the new school promised as a sweetener is not necessary as there are two existing primary schools and a secondary school within half a mile. Chineham Park school was closed and should be re-opened instead.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	In September 2013, the Secretary of State granted permission for an outline application for 450 dwellings on site and a full application for 200 dwellings. Transport mitigation are included in the conditions for the application.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	347	Yes	No	Proposals for development of SS3.3, SS3.4, SS3.7, SS3.8 and SS3.9 in effect form a major development area East of Basingstoke. Development of these sites will overload A33, sewerage system, schools, surgeries and local community facilities. Public transport will be insufficient to meet demand. A33 will not have sufficient capacity even with improvements and future duelling will be prevented by these developments.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.4. As an alternative increase the developable area and number of dwellings for the Manydown site (policy SS3.10).	In September 2013, the Secretary of State granted permission for an outline application for 450 dwellings on site and a full application for 200 dwellings. The cumulative highway impact of the developments proposed to the east of Basingstoke have been considered through the Transport Assessment and this also provides details on potential mitigation measures.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	609	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	These points are adequately covered by the policy in combination with other policies in the plan. Criteria e) and f) refer to improving the connection of the site with the existing cycle and pedestrian routes and the Public Right of Way. In addition, criteria g) of the policy refers to providing connections to the existing green network. The plan should also be read as a whole and therefore Policies EM5 and CN8 are also relevant.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	624	Yes	No	HCC does not consider the Transport Assessment is currently sufficient to specify the requirement for individual junctions. Only where further discussions have taken place with the Highways Authority and the need justified would HCC consider it appropriate to name specific junctions.	Amend clause G as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the primary and local road network including the A340 and A33 corridors' . (Delete the remainder of this point).	Accepted and updates made	Update criteria g as follows: <u>include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the primary and local road network including the A340 and A33 corridors</u>	Response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Giuseppe Zanre	David Wilson Homes	N/A	85673	846	Yes	Yes	As developer for the North Popley Fields, Basingstoke site, allocated under policy SS3.4, we write to confirm our support to the justification and wording of this policy. On 11th September 2013 the Secretary of State allowed the appeals for development on the site for up to 450 dwellings, a community centre, a 1 form entry primary school and associated access, open space and landscaping. The Secretary of State concluded that: "...a serious and significant shortfall in housing land supply, and significant shortfall in housing land supply, would clearly outweigh the temporary, albeit lengthy, construction impact that the local community would have to endure and the slight impact on landscape character and visual intrusion in the wider locality that would, in time, be mitigated by reinforced landscaping." In allowing the appeals on the site the S of S has effectively confirmed that the wording and inclusion of this Policy in the Local Plan is justifiably sound.	No changes to make.	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	Support
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1234	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority does not consider that the transport assessment work carried out for this strategic site is currently sufficient to specify the requirement for an individual junction(s) to be provided as a direct result of this proposed development. Only where further discussions have taken place between the Highways Authority and the Borough Council and the need for schemes been justified and agreed would HCC as Highways Authority consider it to be appropriate to name specific junctions in policy text.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause G of this policy is amended as follows: G) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the primary and local road network including the A340 and A33 corridors	Accepted and policy updated	Update criteria g as follows: <u>Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the primary and local road network including the A340 and A33 corridors</u>	Response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1261	Yes	No	We note that in policy SS3.4, there is a requirement to " Include measures to secure strategic biodiversity enhancements"; ", a requirement absent from other allocation policies. It is unclear what is meant by this, and why only this allocation is required to provide this. Unless there is a good reason for it we advise that this vagueness and inconsistency means that the policy is undeliverable and unjustified.	This Clause k) was included to protect the Great Crested Newts on site which are a European Protected Species. The enhancements include a large mitigation scheme, including areas of land specifically to enable the newts to migrate through the site, which has been adopted. Adequate migration for the species is a key consideration for any development in this area but can be covered under Policy EM4 of the Local Plan.	Accepted and policy to be updated.	Remove clause k) from the Policy as this is suitably covered under Policy EM4.	Reponse to representation.	N/A	Agreed with change.
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.4 - North of Popley Fields, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed, i.e. "Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."	Agree with the suggested change.	Insert additional critierion to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Graham Watts	N/A	N/A	781241	31	No	No	Main concerns are that Overton cannot cope with 270 additional houses, due to the impact this would have from an infrastructure perspective. Moreover, no infrastructure is proposed as part of this plan, and therefore the proposals will overload the existing "rural" infrastructure.	Concentrating purely on Manydown would at least make the plan legally compliance and sound. In addition, building on the countryside is not sustainable, or acceptable, and therefore only brownfield sites should be considered.	The Plan's approach to Overton is the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements are included under the policy criterion for Overton Hill. Also, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) sets out the infrastructure that is likely to be required to enable development set out in the Local Plan to be achieved. The IDP is informed by evidence supplied by infrastructure providers including the health and education sectors and utilities providers. It is not considered that development on this site within a five year timescale will have an unacceptable impact upon the village. Development is proposed at Manydown (policy SS3.10), however it would not be practical to focus all new housing development in this location due to a number of issues including deliverability. The scope to accommodate additional residential development on brownfield sites has been considered by the council through the SHLAA and ELR, and opportunities have been reflected within the overall strategy. However, brownfield sites could not accommodate the additional housing development needed to meet the council's objectively assessed need, and therefore the allocation of greenfield sites is required.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mrs U Kercher	N/A	N/A	206137	72	Yes	No	The Local Plan proposes an excessive number of new dwellings for the village of Overton.	Smaller pockets of development, to be decided upon by the residents of the village would be more appropriate. It is important that the local residents have the most crucial say on the approach to new housing in Overton, as opposed to the local planning authority. In additional, a more co-operative relationship between the local residents and the local planning authority would be more helpful.	The Plan's approach to Overton is the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. The Local Plan allocates the Overton Hill site for the provision of approximately 120 dwellings. The Council needs to demonstrate a supply of housing sites to deliver a 'sound plan'. However, the Council is providing the local community with the opportunity to influence where the remaining 150 homes are located within the Parish over the local plan period through the mechanism of neighbourhood planning.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	157	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports requirements b) and d) of Policy SS3.4, although we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve', as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to 'conserve'	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	ClIr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	183	Yes	No	This allocation is very soon after the development of the existing 99 houses on the site. The allocation should be delayed to a later period of the plan to allow the village community to re-cohere with the new residents here and on the recent development of Foxdown. Without this cohesion residents will not feel they belong, nor readily get involved with the community, this rapid growth will fail to meet the objectives of the LP.	Development of this site should deliver homes in the period 2019/20 to 2023/24 and not 2014/15 to 2018/19.	The Council needs to ensure that it has a five year housing land supply at the start of the Local Plan period, and therefore a number of allocation sites within the borough have been phased for development in the first five years of the plan period. These sites have been phased based on deliverability information. The Council must identify and allocate sites that are deliverable at various points of the plan period to ensure that the housing supply is maintained.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Keith Moor	N/A	N/A	784666	232	No	No	It is for BDBC to take legal advice on soundness, don't ask lay people. The consultation's contrived nature/questions are not inclusive of all sections of the community and, as such, thoroughly undemocratic. It fails to represent the true sentiment of the locality, even in a well informed community like Overton. Sustainability has been misinterpreted throughout: 1) While reams are devoted to road transport, the plan fails to address the need for enhanced rail services, e.g. extending Overton's platform. It presumes people drive to the station. Clearly the authors have no idea how full the trains already are at rush hour. Do plan for obligations on rail companies: they're just as much part of the infrastructure as utilities. How are CO2 emissions to fall? 2) Lip service is paid to sustainable dwellings: only the minimum environmental standards are indicated. It is disappointing that the Overton sites are presumed to have low or medium for impact on archaeological interest.	Take the opportunity to engage with a range of community groups which reflect a range of demographic profiles. That would make it inclusive. The plan for Overton should compel the rail organisations to extend the platform at Overton and provide longer trains, in the same way that a water/gas/electricity company is engaged in providing supply of their service. Without it, the plan remains unsustainably car-centric. BDBC must upgrade the environmental spec to the highest standards, not the minimum. Overton has already shown that eco-homes can be planned and built. If homes must be built, then the plan should require that they meet the highest environmental standards. In-fill which was not foreseen at the time of the plan should be accommodated within the housing quota. It is unreasonable to expect the Plan to predict what villagers may intend in the next decade or so.	Decisions on rail network investment are the responsibility of Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies. However, Train Operating Companies, including South West Trains produce Route Utilisation Strategies (RUS) for routes on their network, including the South West Mainline that serves Overton. The RUS identifies improvements that could be made to the network to increase capacity. With regards to the sustainability standards required for new dwellings, the appropriate national standards (i.e. the building regulations which are aligned to the Code for Sustainable Homes) will be applied when an application is submitted. The Local Plan must take account of viability issues when implementing any environmental standards and National government has made clear that deviation from national standards should be resisted.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	258	Yes	No	Overton Parish Council accepts that some small scale housing developments which meet the needs of 'local people and key workers' will have to be built. Developments should be small and built over time to ensure the absorption of new residents into the social fabric of the village. This development comes too early in the plan period and this has been exacerbated by the submission of an outline planning application for this site. The Overton Village Design Statement that was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in February 2002 states that suitable time intervals should be allocated between the completion of one development and the start of another to allow landscaping to mature and for the integration of new parishioners into the community.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Council needs to ensure that it has a five year housing land supply at the start of the Local Plan period, and therefore a number of allocation sites within the borough have been phased for development in the first five years of the plan period. These sites have been phased based on deliverability information. The Council must identify and allocate sites that are deliverable at various points of the plan period to ensure that the housing supply is maintained. It is not considered that development on this site within a five year timescale will have an unacceptable impact upon the village. Turning to small scale development, an allowance has been made in the Local Plan housing supply (see Table 2, p26) for windfall developments across the borough. Further clarification on what windfall development counts towards the Neighbourhood Planning requirement has been added to Policy SSS. With regards to the SPG, a number of national policy changes have occurred since this document was produced, most recently the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework with which the emerging Local Plan and planning decisions must be in general conformity.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mrs Susan Carter	Overton Society	N/A	418919	465	Not Specified	No	We feel that the exhibition did not provide sufficient detail, nor to obtain clarification on specific points. It was difficult to locate the relevant information in the on-line documents. There is mention of both settlement and parish boundaries. It was not clear which one relates to development. There is no site within the settlement boundary that can take the additional housing stated that Overton is expected to receive. With specific relation to Overton, it is set out in the Village Design Statement (secondary planning guidance) that there should be a period of time between large developments to allow the community to settle. Accepting housing of the magnitude proposed MUST be phased gradually.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's approach to Overton is the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and provides a balance between identifying a site for development in the shorter term and enabling the local community to identify future development locations. It is agreed that additional greenfield allocations are needed to meet future housing needs, outside of the Overton SPB. Through the process of neighbourhood planning the Parish can decide where the additional dwellings to Overton should be allocated and these can be located outside the established SPB for Overton. The SPB will be reviewed in a future DPD following the adoption of the Local Plan. Since the adoption of the SPG in 2002, a number of substantial national planning policy changes have occurred, most recently the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework with which the emerging Local Plan and planning decisions must be in general conformity.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	562	Yes	No	This policy to develop adjacent to the River Test SSSI will result in adverse harm to the River Test SSSI. Although criteria e) of the policy requires the provision of a buffer zone, this will not be sufficient to offset the impacts that will arise from a development immediately adjacent to the river. The Basingstoke and Deane Green Infrastructure Strategy includes an action to look at creating a footpath along the river. Having a development of this scale adjacent to the river will create access issues.	The site/ policy should be removed from the Local Plan.	It is considered that the policy criteria provides sufficient protection for the SSSI and the Environment Agency has not objected to the allocation.	No change	n/a	N/A	Comment that the site should be removed from the Local Plan remains outstanding. Following discussions with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust the following minor change was made to paragraph 4.23 of the Submission Local Plan: "It is situated in an attractive part of the landscape which the River Test (<u>designated as a SSSI</u>) flows through." The Wildlife Trust confirmed they welcome this amendment.
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	612	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particularly in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	683	Not Specified	No	3.5 f Why/How would improvements to the Station Road junction with B3400 mitigate the impact of the development when it is not linked to it in anyway?	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The improvements to the Station Road junction to the B3400 would enable improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity from the existing and proposed Overton Hill development.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Ms Kathryn Price	N/A	N/A	786755	840	Not Specified	Not Specified	Concerned about the access to the school in Overton, should the school be made larger to accommodate further children from the proposed additional housing. There is only one single track road that leads to the school. Therefore access is key. Unless the parking is resolved access is likely to become far worse. The school is trying to encourage people not to drive to school but some households need two incomes and therefore will be likely to drive to school as they will have to then drive to work. A double yellow line is not practical. I do not disagree that there should be additional housing built but the access to the school must be highlighted as an existing issue.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the education infrastructure that the education authority considers necessary to support the development set out in the Local Plan. This particular issue is recognised and reflected in policy criteria g) which will ensure that measure are included to improve accessibility to the school. Highway safety issues will be investigated by the highways authority prior to any mitigation measures being proposed.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Miss Clare Gibbons	Southern Water	N/A	787164	1004	Not Specified	No	SS3.5 fails to recognise the requirement for off-site sewerage infrastructure to serve the proposed residential development at Overton Hill. Southern Water has undertaken an assessment and there is currently insufficient capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate the redevelopment set out in the emerging Local Plan. Therefore, as our previous representations stated, additional off-site infrastructure would be required. There is therefore a risk that the necessary infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the development, unless delivery is supported by the Local Planning Authority in planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. Furthermore, it is important to give early warning to prospective developers regarding the need to connect off-site, as it will add to the cost of the development. Overall, the lack of policy recognition for the delivery of off-site sewerage infrastructure could adversely affect the deliverability of the Local Plan.	We propose a minor amendment to policy SS3.5 in order to meet the requirements of paragraphs 157 and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework and achievement of sustainable development. To Policy SS3.5 (Overton Hill) add a bullet point: " provide a connection to the sewerage system of the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water.	Noted. Agree to incorporate new bullet point to address sewerage infrastructure.	Insert new bullet " Provide a connection to the sewerage system of the nearest point of adequate capacity".	Response to rep.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1213	Yes	Yes	Our client's vision accords with the criteria of draft Policy SS3.5 (Overton Hill), which is considered to be sound and will secure a high quality form of development. Our client is committed to working constructively with the local community and the Borough Council to deliver a high quality residential development which will meet local housing needs including the provision of affordable housing. This commitment has been demonstrated through the level of engagement with the local community and the Council prior to the submission of the outline planning application currently pending consideration under the Council's ref. 13/00197/OUT. We support the allocation of the Overton Hill site and the Council's site assessment process which is robust and justified. In our opinion the allocation of Overton Hill, in the context of the evidence base and the Council's approach to housing distribution is sound. Additional information attached	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	n/a	n/a	N/A	Support

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1262	Yes	No	Allocation SS3.5 is less than 1km from the AONB. There is no reference to the AONB in the policy. There does not appear to be any clear evidence that this allocation will not result in a negative impact on the AONB, and hence the policy is not consistent with NPPF Para 117. Whilst we imagine that the allocation would not be fundamentally unacceptable, any residual landscape impacts on the AONB should be compensated for.	Adding " After mitigation, compensate through offsite measures any residual landscape impacts on the AONB. " would make this clear. The same issue and policy solution applies to policies SS3.6 and SS3.10.	Policy EM1 - Landscape states that the 'designation of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty reflects the national importance of that landscape and its setting. Development proposals in the AONB or its setting will also be determined in accordance with national planning policy and criteria set out in the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan'. Any proposal at Overton Hill would have to satisfy this policy requirement as the Plan should be read as a whole. It is not considered that a specific reference to the AONB is required in this case. The council's Landscape Capacity Study (2010) highlights that the site has a high landscape capacity and that development could be accommodated, subject to respecting the character and settlement pattern, together with the wider landscape.	No change	n/a	N/A	Overcome following further discussions with Natural England. No changes were necessary.
Policy SS3.5 - Overton Hill	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr G Trotter	N/A	N/A	631357	69	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	intentionally left blank	Support noted	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	158	Yes	Yes	The site South of Boswood Lane is adjacent to the Grade II listed Manor Farm and associated granary at Whitchurch. English Heritage therefore welcomes and supports requirement d) of Policy SS3.6, although we would prefer conserve to preserve as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	intentionally left blank	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to 'conserve'	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr John Buckley	N/A	N/A	784538	269	Yes	Yes	I believe the overall plan to be 'Sound' but much of the detail regarding Infrastructure and Transport requires further consideration. Regarding the Whitchurch Boswood Lane site, to talk of linking cycling routes to existing is a nonsense as there are none existing. Safe segregated facilities need to be provided from the site to shops, schools, health centres and businesses. Parliament's unanimously agreed recommendations of the UK government's Get Britain Cycling Report should be incorporated. There needs to be a firm policy on reducing non-essential motor traffic and increasing sustainable transport, as the present town centre road system will not cope. Ignoring this will increase dangers and pressure on the local community. Other infrastructure needs such as increased healthcare, education and transport MUST be provided in parallel with development, not afterwards. Without the above the Plan, although 'Sound' in principle, is severely lacking.	intentionally left blank	Local Plan CN8 sets out the Transport policy which all new development will need to comply with and makes specific reference to providing safe and suitable access for all users (which includes pedestrians and cyclists) and provides an on site movement layout compatible with all users. In terms of off site provision, the council will continue to work with the highway authority to make improvements to off site cycle infrastructure, although any such investments must take account of local circumstances and constraints (such as narrow roads and pavements) as a result of the historic settlement pattern and street layout. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the infrastructure that will be required to support the development set out in the Local Plan. This information was obtained following engagement with statutory infrastructure providers.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mrs Michelle Ashley	N/A	N/A	784775	290	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	intentionally left blank	Support noted	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	495	Yes	No	Object to the allocation as it is within the North Wessex Downs AONB. Have not seen any explanation by the Council that this site has been chosen using the tests of NPPF paragraph 116, which refers to major development in AONBs. Not all of Whitchurch is within the AONB. Therefore, options do exist to avoid an AONB location.	The Council must demonstrate that all alternative sites around Whitchurch have been considered, and in the light of paragraph 116 of the NPPF, this site remains the only option. If this cannot be demonstrated then there is a contradiction with Local Plan paragraph 2.8 objective N).	The council completed a site assessment and sustainability appraisal which considered all available potential development sites around Whitchurch and the draft allocation was, on balance, the most suitable location for development. Whilst the site lies within the AONB, given the nature of the site and particularly the influence of the A34, it now has a very different character to the AONB. Criteria c) of the policy will ensure that any development responds positively to the designation. Also, Policy EM1 - Landscape, states that development proposals in the AONB or its setting will be determined in accordance with national planning policy and criteria set out in the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan'.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	597	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	intentionally left blank	Support noted	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	613	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particularly in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	628	Yes	No	HCC is aware of the capacity constraints with Whitchurch centre and as detailed transport assessment work has not been completed, it is not possible to rule out whether some general improvements are required or not. A more general reference is therefore needed to junctions within the centre.	Amend clause E as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the junctions within the village centre and to Boswood Lane and Bell Street.	Officers agree with the principle of the suggested change although have revised the text slightly.	Criteria e) updated as follows: Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to <u>the junctions within the Town Centre and to</u> Boswood Lane and Bell Street;	Response to representation.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1235	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority is already aware of capacity constraints with the junctions within Whitchurch village centre. Detailed transport assessment work has not been carried out for the site allocation within Whitchurch and so it is not possible to rule out whether some improvements will be required at this stage or not. Therefore Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority considers that a more general reference to junctions within the village centre would be appropriate to make the transport clause of this policy sound.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause E of this policy is amended as follows: E) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the junctions within the village centre and to Boswood Lane and Bell Street	Officers agree with the principle of the suggested change although have revised the text slightly.	Criteria e) updated as follows: Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to <u>the junctions within the Town Centre and to</u> Boswood Lane and Bell Street;	Response to representation.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Banner and Bewley Homes	Banner and Bewley Homes	Barton Willmore	458958	762	Yes	Yes	We support the inclusion of Land South of Boswood Lane within policy SS3.6. We consider the evidence base to support the allocation is robust and sound. The council has had regard to the AONB designation, but has appropriately recognised that the AONB character of this area has altered as a consequence of the construction of the A34 Bypass to the west. As a result, this part of Whitchurch no longer functions or has the scenic qualities of an AONB designation. However, it should be noted that due to the site's archaeological potential towards Boswood Lane, the current planning application seeks to maintain and respect the archaeology in situ. This is achieved by locating the open space over the area of potential archaeology. This is at odds with part k of the emerging policy which seeks to locate the green space 'centrally'.	We recommend that part k) of the policy is amended to reflect this site specific issue and not be so prescriptive as to dictate where the open space should be located.	It is agreed that a more general phrase would be suitable in light of the constraints which have been highlighted through additional masterplanning work.	Criteria k updated to remove the following wording 'located centrally to meet the needs of all phases of the site'.	Response to representation.	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr and Mrs Anthony McCarthy	N/A	N/A	463283	857	No	No	The site has previously been deemed as not being appropriate for development by an Inspector. The development and BDBC have previously failed to tell the consultee about the proposed development of this site. The site is unacceptable on the grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy and lack of landscaping. Also on the grounds of height, bulk, position of buildings, number of buildings and scale of development, which will totally transform the environment in a detrimental manner. We also object on the grounds of the inevitability of additional external noise, the limitation of our own internal and external private space and the diminution of our own health and well-being. A major justification for new building at Whitchurch has been/is to provide homes for local people. However, no measures are in place to ensure that the homes would be reserved for local people. Presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in AONBs. There will be an unacceptable landscape impact.	None specifically stated, though by implication, this site should not be allocated for development.	The site issues raised were considered through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process where it was concluded that the site is the most suitable location around Whitchurch to accommodate future development. Impacts can be adequately mitigated through the application of the criteria contained within the site policy. National Planning Policy has changed substantially since the last Local Plan Examination which also only considered needs up to 2011. The new Plan allocates sites to meet housing needs up to 2029.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Miss Clare Gibbons	Southern Water	N/A	787164	1009	Not Specified	No	SS3.6 fails to recognise the requirement for off-site sewerage infrastructure to serve the proposed development south of Boswood Lane. Southern Water has undertaken an assessment and there is currently insufficient capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate the redevelopment set out in the emerging Local Plan. Therefore, as our previous representations stated, additional off-site infrastructure would be required. Connection off-site is the mechanism by which developers can provide the infrastructure required to service their sites. Overall, the lack of policy recognition for the delivery of off-site sewerage infrastructure could adversely affect the deliverability of the Local Plan and sustainable development.	We propose a minor amendment to policy SS3.6 in order to meet the requirements of paragraphs 157 and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework and achievement of sustainable development. To Policy SS3.6 (South of Boswood Lane) add a bullet point: " provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity as advised by Southern Water.	Noted. Agree to incorporate new bullet point to address sewerage infrastructure.	Replace criterion I) with "Provide a connection to the sewerage system of the nearest point of adequate capacity".	Response to rep.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1263	Yes	No	Allocation SS3.6 is less than 1km from the AONB. There is no reference to the AONB in the policy. There does not appear to be any clear evidence that this allocation will not result in a negative impact on the AONB, and hence the policy is not consistent with NPPF Para 117. Whilst we imagine that the allocation would not be fundamentally unacceptable, any residual landscape impacts on the AONB should be compensated for.	Adding " After mitigation, compensate through offsite measures any residual landscape impacts on the AONB. " would make this clear. The same issue and policy solution applies to policies SS3.6 and SS3.10.	The location of the site within the AONB is acknowledged within criteria c) of the policy which ensures that any future development responds positively to the special landscape characteristics of the area. Policies EM1, Landscape and EM4: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation also apply which set out the requirements to mitigates impacts etc. The Landscape Capacity Study (2010) concluded that the site has a medium landscape capacity and that development could be accommodated, provided it respect the character of the town and the setting of the AONB. Appendix 4 of the SHLAA (version 8, Feb 2014) states that "...it is acknowledged that the area has a different character to the AONB given the influence of the A34. At the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry the borough council did not raise an objection on landscape terms, provided that a comprehensive approach was taken to the provision of substantial planting because of noise from the A34."	No change	n/a	N/A	Overcome following further discussions with Natural England. No changes were necessary.
Policy SS3.6 - South of Boswood Lane	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	88	Yes	No	Development of this site would severely impact the already congested A33 and spoil the natural beauty of the Loddon Valley. The A33 must be upgrade to a dual carriageway before it reaches breaking point.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Landscape and biodiversity assets were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the landscape, wildlife and habitats (criteria b and d).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	96	Yes	No	Development of this site would severely impact the already congested A33 and spoil the natural beauty of the Loddon Valley. The A33 must be upgraded to a dual carriageway before it reaches breaking point.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Landscape and biodiversity assets were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the landscape, wildlife and habitats (criteria b and d).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	221	No	No	Not sound as it places housing near to an incinerator and sewage treatment works which is in direct contradiction to Para 3.2	The statement that 'ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met within homes and amenity areas through the avoidance of noise sensitive areas and through the preparation of comprehensive noise and odour studies which inform layout decisions on this and the adjoining East of Basingstoke site' does not protect future residents from the existence of the 2 facilities. It cannot be met	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. TThe council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. A 'Noise Impact Assessment for land east of Basingstoke (July 2010)' produced on behalf of the landowner (HCC) accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. Conclusions in paragraph 6.4 of the report state that "Once further information is available (ie, detailed plans of the site layout and traffic flow rates), a further assessment should be undertaken to establish required detailed mitigation measures." This assessment will need to take into account the National Planning Practice Guidance on noise. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011)' produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters.The noise and odour assessments will be used to inform the joint masterplanning of SS3.7 and SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	306	Yes	No	Policies SS3.7 - Redlands and SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke both impact Bramley residents travelling to Basingstoke for employment, leisure and higher order services with the increased traffic volumes on the A33 being the primary cause for concern alongside loss of open green space. There are no specific infrastructure improvements planned to solve the consequential problems and the statements of mitigation have no substance. These developments along with the existing Sherfield Park site will turn the A33 into a residential corridor to Basingstoke rather than support the essential gap required by residents to maintain any residue of the rural aspect in this north east part of the borough.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Coalescence of settlements was recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and has been given due consideration through the site selection process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	333	Yes	No	The development of Redlands would extend the building line out of Basingstoke and onto and over a ridge. Development will lead to the loss of a green buffer and therefore nothing physical to prevent further development in an easterly direction. Doubts whether the new homes can be sufficiently protected from fall out from the incinerator (given the prevailing wind direction). Development will put more pressure on the A33 roundabout.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.7.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution and landscape matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the landscape (criteria b). The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	348	Yes	No	Proposals for development of SS3.3, SS3.4, SS3.7, SS3.8 and SS3.9 in effect form a major development area East of Basingstoke. Development of these sites will overload A33, sewerage system, schools, surgeries and local community facilities. Public transport will be insufficient to meet demand. A33 will not have sufficient capacity even with improvements and future duelling will be prevented by these developments.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.7. As an alternative increase the developable area and number of dwellings for the Manydown site (policy SS3.10).	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Jackie Riley	N/A	N/A	86129	356	Yes	No	The LDF has been changed so many times without local people having a chance to be involved. It seems that if areas such as Cufaude and Razors Farm and Redlands were all developed this would be unmanageable in terms of infrastructure, as the area has already been saturated by new development in this regard. A33 cannot cope with more traffic. The plan is not balanced or workable or sound and it is disappointing that an obvious solution has been deliberately left out for so long and has only been included with much less houses planned than would be possible. The development of the Redlands site contravenes the strategic gaps policy and involves building on land which is liable flood and the development would have a detrimental environmental impact on the River Loddon. The site is also inappropriate from a biodiversity perspective and is inappropriate owing to the close proximity to the incinerator.	There is an opportunity to follow policy and balance development around Basingstoke by planning an eco-village on Manydown. This would remove the need for the housing at SS3.3, SS3.7 and SS3.8 and could have all the infrastructure properly planned at the outset. Manydown has space to take several thousand more houses which would mean reserve sites would not be required. Greater regard is necessary in respect of traffic congestion.	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as coalescence of settlements, biodiversity and pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria d) and f) on landscape and biodiversity matters. As indicated in the site assessment for SOL002 the site is not on land liable to flood: "The site is situated wholly within Flood Zone 1, outside a Critical Drainage Area and is not Upstream of a Critical Drainage Area. There is no record of groundwater or localised flooding within the site. The site is not at risk of future surface water flooding in a 1 in 200 year event." Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	363	Not Specified	No	SS3.7 Redlands This policy is not sound when judged against the 'tests of soundness' Redlands 'Policy SS3.7' lies immediately to the north of SS3.9 East of Basingstoke. Newnham Parish Council believes that SS3.9 should be removed and as such SS3.7 would be in isolation. Many of the Parish Council's comments on SS3.9 relate to SS3.7 and for the same reasons SS3.7 should be deleted. SS3.7g states "This should not be developed in isolation" Policy SS3.7 is unsound as it will be ineffective, and will not protect the biodiversity value of the Loddon Valley. The Policy is also ineffective as it contradicts statements in the Local Plan Vision. The Council will not be complying with their duties under the NERC Act or NPPF to protect and enhance biodiversity therefore the policy is also not consistent with national policy.	Delete SS3.7 See our response to SS3.9	SS3.7 and SS3.9 have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Biodiversity matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the biodiversity (criteria d). The Local Plan needs to be read as a whole - including paragraph 6.23 and policy EM4. Policy EM4 (Biodiversity) requires all development proposals to "Include proportionate measures to contribute, where possible, to a net gain in biodiversity...". The development of SS3.7 and SS3.9 will not lead to SS3.7 being isolated. In respect of the East of Basingstoke site, see the council's response to comments on policy SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	414	Yes	No	Redlands (b) As Redlands is a hill it will be impossible for any building on it not to be intrusive and highly visible. (c) this development will add to the traffic on the overloaded single carriageway A33. Development here prevents the road being duelled at this point in the future. Making a bigger roundabout or putting in traffic lights at Sherfield Park will not mitigate the effect of the extra traffic on the A33. Sherfield Park's thousand recently built houses has already overstrained the road at peak times. (f) The presence of the incinerator and sewage works makes this site an unpleasant and unhealthy choice. The houses built on the hill will be high enough to 'benefit' directly from smoke from the incinerator chimney. (g)We agree this site should not be developed in isolation. Was this site chosen just to give the East of Basingstoke site another exit on to the A33? The site is closely linked to SS3.9 and many of the objections to SS3.9 can be shared with SS3.7	Delete this site There are sites with fewer problems available at Manydown and Hounscome Fields.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape and noise and odour pollution matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts (criteria b and f). An odour assessment needs to be carried out to inform mitigation measures and masterplanning. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Any future layout could take account of the need to dual the A33 in the future, as suitable. The development of SS3.7 and SS3.9 will not lead to SS3.7 being isolated. In respect of the East of Basingstoke site, see the council's response to comments on policy SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Cllr Chris Tomblin	BDBC	N/A	637009	464	Yes	No	A previous comment by an Inspector regarding this site was "that it would not relate well to the existing development form and would have poor connections with facilities and Chineham given the busy A33." The site is only viable if developed in conjunction with SS3.9. This site takes the development of the town over an existing natural ridge line, similarly to Razor's Farm SS3.3 will not be able to be effectively landscaped or screened. A33 traffic capacity is already at maximum level. A33 corridor has a significantly poor air quality assessment. Placing residents in areas of high pollution does not fit the Basingstoke Adopted Vision. The incinerator will have a detrimental impact on the health of the residents, as the maximum concentration of pollutants will fall upon any dwellings located on this site. The sewage works will also have a detrimental impact on the housing in terms of unpleasant odours.	The policy of adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements places too much demand on the existing infrastructure and hence the existing communities. We may make new developments attractive places to live in but at what cost to existing inhabitants. A more cohesive approach is required in respect of the sites to the north of Basingstoke, especially in terms ensuring appropriate infrastructure provision. The current approach will not achieve the Vision. The only logical solution must be to maximise the use of the land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. The whole site can take over 8000 houses but the choice to only part develop this site in this local plan has not been sufficiently justified. This site is a clean sheet and so can be well planned - providing for the needs of a new community and not compromising those that already exist. The borough owns the land - purchased for this very reason with tax-payer money - and can then fund the required infrastructure.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape and pollution matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts (criteria b and f). An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. Development proposals will also need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) of the Local Plan. The development of SS3.7 and SS3.9 will not lead to SS3.7 being isolated. In respect of the East of Basingstoke site, see the council's response to comments on policy SS3.9. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	500	Yes	No	The Council accepts that if SS3.7 was a stand alone site in the countryside without SS3.9 it could not be justified as an allocation. The Council requires sites SS3.7 and SS3.9 to be master planned in combination.	Object to SS3.7 and requests deletion of Policy SS3.7. Sherfield-on-Loddon PC acknowledges that in the plan period greenfield sites will need to be developed in order to meet house building targets but believes that both SS3.9 and SS3/7 are insecurely located and should be deleted as unsound. SOL PC believes that an alternative and better choice would be BAS133 (Hounscome Fields).	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding and partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Messrs Jordan & Ross	N/A	N/A	786112	557	Yes	Yes	Support the allocation in policy SS3.7 (as defined in Policy Map 1b). The site is available and deliverable within the plan period. The principles of a comprehensive approach to the develop the site at Redlands along with the site East of Basingstoke have been agreed with Hampshire County Council and the owner of the land to the north (at Sherfield Hill Farm) providing access on to Sherfield Park roundabout on the A33. The masterplan would consider a co-ordinated development which hopefully will include the ability of a new bus link to the A33 and new pedestrian and cycle links to Chineham District Centre. The site already has strong and defensible green buffers to most of the northern and eastern boundaries. It is also proposed this will be further strengthened with more planting - to be identified in a potential planning application.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Andrew Bowater	N/A	N/A	786121	558	Yes	Yes	Support the allocation. Criteria c) of the policy requires access needs to be provided from the Redlands site to the Sherfield Park roundabout on the A33. The land required for access to the Sherfield Park roundabout is available as confirmed by the landowner. The ability to have access on to the Sherfield Park roundabout on the A33, enables an estate road to be provided linking through the site at Redlands and east of Basingstoke and back onto the A33 at Whitmarsh Lane. The two development sites can then be delivered in a co-ordinated manner with access on to the A33 in two locations.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	629	Yes	No	HCC believe that Clause C needs re-wording to be more effective. There is no reference to the potential isolation of the site from existing communities. This specific issue should be addressed in the policy, so that any development can be designed to provide a layout which addresses isolation through direct links to the existing development and the provision of internal walk / cycle routes.	Amend Clause C as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A33 corridor to ensure safe and convenient access for all road users. This should include provision for a site access from an improved Gaiger Avenue / A33 junction, or a suitable alternative, along with appropriate access to the adjacent sites SS3.9. Add new policy Clause H as follows: 'Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct links to existing development, including provision of internal walking and cycling routes linked to external routes and facilitate the integration of these links with site SS3.9	Officers agree that criteria C requires clarification. However, officers do not consider the addition of a new policy clause (h) relating to accessibility of the site is necessary given that that Policy CN8 provides detailed requirements that would need to be satisfied, including: integrating into existing movement networks; providing safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users; and providing an on-site movement layout compatible for all potential users.	Criteria C updated as follows: 'include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A33 corridor to ensure safe and convenient access for all road users. This should include provision for a site access from an improved Gaiger Avenue/A33 junction, or a suitable alternative, along with appropriate access to the adjacent site SS3.9'.	Response to representation and to add clarity.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Andrew Bowater	N/A	N/A	786121	838	Not Specified	Not Specified	Has been in talks with the owner of Redlands with regards to access across part of my property to enable access from Redlands to the Sherfield Park roundabout. An in principle deal has been agreed that if planning permission is granted for the development of Redlands in conjunction with the East of Basingstoke then the owners can purchase the necessary land to provide this access. The ability to have access on to the Sherfield Park roundabout on the A33, enables to Estate Road to be provided linking through the site at Redlands and East of Basingstoke and back to the A33 at Whitmarsh Lane. The two development sites can then be delivered in a co-ordinated manner with access on to the A33 in two locations.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Cllr Elaine Still	BDBC	N/A	214658	848	d	No	this site would have poor connections with facilities and Chineham on what is already an over congested A33 with traffic capacity at maximum. This site is only viable if developed in conjunction with SS3.9. This site will not be able to be effectively landscaped or screened. A33 traffic capacity at maximum	In my view adding piece meal sites to existing settlements will only add to placing to much demand on existing infrastructure which in turn will be a burden on existing communities. The sites to the north east of Basingstoke SS3.3 Razors Farm,SS3.8 Cufade farm, SS3.9 East of Basingstoke and SS3.7 Redlands constitutes a major development area. The best solution has to be to maximise the use of land at Manydown SS3.10. This site can take over 8000 houses and i feel the decision to only part develop this site in this local plan is unjust. The Manydown site is a blank canvass so in turn can be well planned out to accommodate the infrastructure requirements for the new communities. After all the Borough Council owns the land and it was bought for the purpose of building houses with tax payers money.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Landscape matters were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the landscape (criteria b). Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year, it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	872	Yes	No	Together with SS3.9 these allocations would form an unacceptable and intrusive ribbon development along the A33. The only reason for this site to be included would seem to be the need to access the A33 at the Taylor's Farm roundabout. SS3.7 and SS3.9 together would add traffic from 1050 dwellings to an already overloaded single carriageway. It is noted that proposals are being considered to abandon the road link between Taylor's Farm and Chineham, adding more congestion to the A33. The loss of this agreed link, for which construction has already been started, would have profound implications for the development of SS3.7 and SS3.9. Development of this site will restrict options for any future upgrade to the A33 to a dual carriageway.	To remove the Redlands site from the Local Plan as it is unsuitable for development and make an additional allocation on the Manydown site (SS3.10).	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding and partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Nigel Bell	N/A	N/A	316285	916	Yes	No	Tranquillity is all too easily lost. Were SS3.9 and SS3.7 to be allowed to proceed they would result in just a little more noise, a little more pollution, this cumulatively contributes to the erosion and loss of tranquillity. These aspects primarily affect people's lives especially when enjoying the Valley's tranquillity. However, it is the domestic animals, the dogs and cats, associated with development, that will damage the tranquillity of the Valley for wildlife.	Delete SS3.9 and SS3.7 from the Plan. If land is required to replace these sites for housing, it would be appropriate to further investigate land broadly west of Basingstoke, without in any way infringing the integrity of Oakley. The land immediately to the West of Basingstoke is undoubtedly part of the landscape, but it is not unique, it lacks a river valley, it lacks variety in its soil, it lacks ready access, and while it is a small part of the chalk downland it should be stressed that Basingstoke possesses many hundreds of acres of such countryside, from the Hanington area west to the land approaching Andover. Any greenfield development there will not (or should not) affect the Test Valley - also one of Basingstoke's gems.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1100	Yes	No	SS3.7g states - "This should not be developed in isolation". Additionally the Council's Cabinet recommended at its meeting on 28th February 2013. "SOL002 - This is a small development, but has a disproportionate impact on the landscape by taking development over a ridge line, and is not critical for the delivery of the proposed mix of sites in the Decision Notice." Although this was withdrawn the fact remains. Policy SS3.7 is unsound as it will be ineffective, and will not protect the biodiversity value of the Loddon Valley. The Policy is also ineffective as it contradicts statements in the Local Plan Vision. The Council will not be complying with their duties under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act or NPPF to protect and enhance biodiversity therefore the policy is also not consistent with national policy. Many of our comments on SS3.9 East of Basingstoke are also relevant to SS3.7 Redlands. For the same reasons SS3.7 should be deleted.	Delete SS3.7	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as landscape and biodiversity were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.7 contains specific criteria d) and f) on landscape and biodiversity matters. The Local Plan needs to be read as a whole - including paragraph 6.23 and policy EM4. Policy EM4 (Biodiversity) requires all development proposals to "include proportionate measures to contribute, where possible, to a net gain in biodiversity...".	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding and partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1156	Yes	No	The Council accepts that if SS3.7 was a stand alone site in the countryside without SS3.9 it could not be justified as an allocation. The Council requires the two sites SS3.7 and SS3.9 to be master planned in combination, and as Country Watch representations for both sites considerably overlap please consider points 1 to 8 incl, 12 & 13 SS3.9 East of Basingstoke in so far that they relate to SS3.7. Country Watch to SS3.7 and requests deletion of Policy SS3.7 and the site from Policy Map 1b.	Delete Policy SS3.7 and the site from Map1b.	The development of SS3.7 and SS3.9 will not lead to SS3.7 being isolated. In respect of the East of Basingstoke site, see the council's response to comments on policy SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding and partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1236	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority is of the opinion that a rewording of Clause C of the policy as well as the addition of a new Clause (H) will make it more effective and therefore sound. There is no reference in the existing policy to the potential isolation of the site from existing communities and the County Council would like to see this specific issue added into the policy wording so any development can be designed to provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct links to existing development and the provision of internal walking and cycling routes.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause C of this policy is amended and an additional Clause H is added to make this policy sound as follows: C) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A33 corridor to ensure safe and convenient access for all road users. This should include provision for a site access from an improved Gaiger Avenue/A33 junction, or a suitable alternative, along with appropriate access to the adjacent site SS3.9. Suggested new policy Clause H) Provide a layout which addresses the potential isolation of the site from existing communities through direct links to existing development, include provision of internal walking and cycling routes linked to external routes and facilitate the integration of these links with site SS3.9.	Officers agree that criteria C requires clarification. However, officers do not consider the addition of a new policy clause relating to accessibility of the site is necessary given that that Policy CN8 provides detailed requirements that would need to be satisfied, including: integrating into existing movement networks; providing safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users; providing an on-site movement layout compatible for all potential users.	Criteria C updated as follows: 'include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including <u>improvements to the A33 corridor</u> to ensure safe and convenient access for all road users. <u>This should include provision for a site access from an improved Gaiger Avenue/A33 junction, or a suitable alternative, along with appropriate access to the adjacent site SS3.9.</u>	Response to representation and to add clarity.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria f) as follows: "In light of the nearby incinerator and ~~sewerage~~ <u>sewage</u> treatment works ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met within homes and amenity areas through the avoidance of noise sensitive areas and ~~through~~ the preparation of comprehensive noise and odour studies <u>(in consultation with the utility provider)</u> ...".	To ensure consistency with wording in criteria n) of policy SS3.9 and the response to comment ID: 755. Also to amend typographical error.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. i.e. Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure..".	Agree with the suggested change.	Amend bullet point g) to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/Agreed with change
Policy SS3.7 - Redlands	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	89	Yes	No	This site is purely in the countryside with access only through Razor's Farm. A second access to Cufade Lane would be necessary, but this lane is not suited to the additional traffic that such a development would create. Past experience has shown that it is unlikely that the planned investment in infrastructure will materialise.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network, in particular in respect of Cufaude Lane (policy clause f). HCC has also submitted a comprehensive Transport Study setting out how to address the highways aspects associated with the development of the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	97	No	No	This site is purely in the countryside with access only through Razor's Farm. A second access to Cufade Lane would be necessary, but this lane is not suited to the additional traffic that such a development would create. Past experience has shown that it is unlikely that the planned investment in infrastructure will materialise.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network, in particular in respect of Cufaude Lane (policy clause f). HCC has also submitted a comprehensive Transport Study setting out how to address the highways aspects associated with the development of the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	105	Yes	No	No public transport plan will be sufficient without the Chineham railway station which needs to be in place BEFORE these houses are built. The station is constantly referred to as "potential", i.e. there is no plan to deliver it. Yet it is an essential part of the infrastructure, to cut down on road traffic which will be intolerable given the nature of the road connections around this area currently.	Commit to building Chineham railway station alongside Razors Farm and before Cufaude Farm is developed.	The Council supports the provision of the Chineham Railway Station and the Plan sets the framework for this delivery through policy SS10. Work is continuing with HCC, Network Rail, and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development (paragraph 4.77). It is not accepted however, that the station needs to be provided prior to the housing on this site being built. The Chineham station is not infrastructure that is fundamental to facilitate development. The IDP defines the Chineham station as desirable infrastructure. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy contains criteria (f and g) to mitigate highway impact and also improve accessibility by non-transport modes.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	131	Yes	No	Policies SS3.3 and 3.8 should not be seen as an extension of Basingstoke, as they are actually contained within Bramley Parish Boundary. Razors Farm must be delivered first. Infrastructure, whether it be structural, services or facilities are already stretched to capacity within Bramley and Chineham. Sites related to policies SS3.3, SS3.8, SS3.7, SS3.9 and policy SS5 at Bramley will all contribute to significant increased traffic on the A33. Development of these sites will result in traffic movement north towards Bramley Village for services and in particular in order to access the railway station The result of the additional development to the north will be that traffic will move north into Bramley Parish and have an adverse impact on the C32 adding further congestion and exacerbating parking issues in the village. There is no evidence to suggest that sites of this size are needed. Bramley only requires 72 more dwellings. The site with be in conflict with neighbouring uses.	The Local Plan strategy of making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure investment. The borough's expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown, SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affects on the existing population. Regard for the impact on the existing population should be the main consideration. The evidence that a series of smaller sites is necessary in order to provide the housing in a more efficient and timely manner, is not logical or persuasive.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Appendix A of the IDP details the Infrastructure Schedule which sets out the proposed infrastructure to be provided in order to deliver planned growth, by whom and when. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. Paragraph 4.13 of the Local Plan explains the council's approach to housing distribution.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Mrs Julia Johnston	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	876	No	No	Opposes development on this site. This site is in the countryside outside the urban area and with no road access except through the Razor's Farm site. Any development on this scale would require more than one access road. This development must mean an upgrade to Cufaude Lane, opening a through route to Bramley. This would mean radical changes to the north/south traffic flows and open up the already congested services in Chineham to users from the Bramley area. It is unlikely that with the investment in infrastructure needed for this proposal that development would be limited to the proposed site. Development of SS3.8 would be the start of expansion to the north with no natural boundary before Bramley itself notwithstanding that offered by policy EM2 (Strategic Gaps). The sites suggested, SS3.9, SS3.7, SS3.3 and SS3.8 make a total of 1880 houses, with no demonstrably deliverable suggestions for alleviating the pressure on transport and local amenities.	To remove the Cufaude Farm site from the Local Plan as it is not suitable for development and make an additional allocation on SS3.10 Manydown. Site should be called Upper Cufaude Farm; Cufaude Farm being to the north at SU 649574.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). HCC has produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel within the site is provided through the adjacent Razor's Farm site as opposed to being served by Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel of the site would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how technical solutions could be delivered in order to facilitate this. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. Agree to change title of policy SS3.8 to "Upper Cufaude Farm".	Amend title of policy to "Upper Cufaude Farm". Amend other parts of the Local Plan accordingly e.g. contents page and policy SS3.	In response to representation.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	159	Yes	Yes	The site at Cufaude Farm abuts the complex of G II buildings at Upper Cufaude Farm. English Heritage therefore welcomes and supports requirement c) of Policy SS3.8, although we would prefer 'conserve' to 'preserve' as this terminology better reflects that of the National Planning Policy Framework and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. This comment is without prejudice to any comments we may wish on any future planning application for the development of this site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support is noted. Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice.	Change 'preserve' to ' <u>conserve</u> '	Response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Osczyk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	222	Yes	No	Any development cannot Preserve and enhance the architectural and historic significance of heritage assets in the area including Razor's Farm, Upper Cufaude Farm, Cufaude Farm and the Vyne, and their rural settings. It is a contradiction	Delete the site	The proposed site boundary seeks to maximise the retention of the setting of the listed buildings, whilst the site planning and design will also need to respect the heritage assets (policy requirement c). Matters such as heritage assets were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. In addition, the NPPF requires that any harm to heritage assets is balanced against the public benefits flowing from the proposed development (in this case the meeting of the need to provide more housing). English Heritage consider the policy to be sound.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Lisa Robins	N/A	N/A	784670	244	Yes	No	Since the introduction of large developments at Sherfield Park, and the lack of promised infrastructure and amenities to support that ever increasing development, additional housing at Cufaude Farm will simply compound this issue as it is hard to believe the infrastructure and amenities will be provided/improved. The effects on traffic in the surrounding areas will be incredibly detrimental and potentially dangerous given the roads in use. Justification of this site cannot be made.	Remove proposed development at Cufaude Farm from the plans	Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network. HCC has also submitted a comprehensive Transport Study setting out how to address the highways aspects associated with the development of the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Stephen Levin	N/A	N/A	784995	336	Not Specified	No	The plan fails the soundness test because it is not based on robust and credible evidence. More over, it ignores credible evidence that shows the plan's failure. Criteria f within SS3.8 calls for improved road links from Cufaude Lane to the A33 through Sherfield Park. The Transport Assessment addressed only the increased traffic flow generated by the Razor's Farm and Cufaude Farm development and ignored any traffic flow from the Business Park. This flow was deemed small enough that a simple flaring at the A33 roundabout would mitigate any problems. The plan thus ignores common sense and the witnessed January 2013 obstructions which showed that Business Park traffic could be three times what the plan assumes. Gaiger Avenue would be come a nightmare.	An alternative is required for the access road so it can avoid the Gaiger Avenue/Rockbourne Road roundabout.	The evidence base includes a Transport Assessment supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Transport Assessment included traffic flows from employment areas as part of its baseline position. The Assessment sets out mitigation measures in relation to transport infrastructure, as reflected within the criteria of the policy. In addition, HCC have submitted a detailed Transport Study with their response to the pre-submission consultation, which analyses the more detailed highways implications associated with the development of the site. Therefore, it is considered that the allocation is properly supported by a suitable and robust evidence base. The full range of highways related issues will also need to be clarified through masterplanning and also through the planning application process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	R Cheke	N/A	N/A	86092	341	Yes	No	Insufficient consideration has been given to how the plan will exacerbate traffic problems. The new development at SS3.8 will be isolated from the centre of Basingstoke and consequently will result in the need for additional vehicle movements. Further development in this area will put intolerable pressure on the existing road network. There is already huge pressure on the A33 and the proposed development along both sides of the A33 in the Redlands/Chineham area would preclude future road widening. Cufaude Lane has sharp corners, is narrow, has single lane/passing places along it, and is already a 'rat-run'. An increase in housing in the area will put pressure on the fragile ecology of the area, especially on aquatic systems such as the River Loddon and its tributaries and exacerbate the likelihood of flooding along Cufaude Lane. There is no adequate primary school available in the area, and the new development will put additional pressure on existing school transport facilities.	The Manydown area, which was purchased specifically to cater for future housing needs in Basingstoke should be used to much greater capacity. It could take 9000 homes, thus obviating the need for development in Bramley.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Matters such as biodiversity and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Miss Karen Bentall	N/A	N/A	785033	346	Yes	No	The plan does not seek to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements re:housing, transport or environment, and to be sound must incorporate a 10yr demographic plan for each and realistic infrastructure proposals for access and egress compliant with Health and Safety, Highways and Byways. The plan is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives e.g. Manydown. The plan is not deliverable in terms of the existing infrastructure on a single lane roadway and must show indications of a 10yr demographic plan. The plan is not flexible as it must show traffic plans and a 10yr demographic forecast (as above) The plan is not consistent with government guidance allowing for local development plan submissions.	The plan needs to incorporate a 10yr demographic forecast, and further consideration is required in respect of Manydown.	The Plan's housing requirement is considered to be sound and further information is set out within a Housing Topic Paper. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	350	Yes	No	Proposals for development of SS3.3, SS3.4, SS3.7, SS3.8 and SS3.9 in effect form a major development area East of Basingstoke. Development of these sites will overload A33, sewerage system, schools, surgeries and local community facilities. Public transport will be insufficient to meet demand. A33 will not have sufficient capacity even with improvements and future duelling will be prevented by these developments.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.8. As an alternative increase the developable area and number of dwellings for the Manydown site (policy SS3.10).	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Matters such as sewerage infrastructure were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Jackie Riley	N/A	N/A	86129	357	Yes	No	The LDF has been changed so many times without local people having a chance to be involved. It seems that if areas such as Cufaude and Razors Farm and Redlands were all developed this would be unmanageable in terms of infrastructure, as the area has already been saturated by new development in this regard. A33 cannot cope with more traffic. The plan is not balanced or workable or sound and it is disappointing that an obvious solution has been deliberately left out for so long and has only been included with much less houses planned than would be possible.	There is an opportunity to follow policy and balance development around Basingstoke by planning an eco-village on Manydown. This would remove the need for the housing at SS3.3, SS3.7 and SS3.8 and could have all the infrastructure properly planned at the outset. Manydown has space to take several thousand more houses which would mean reserve sites would not be required. Greater regard is necessary in respect of traffic congestion.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Chris Flooks	N/A	N/A	637722	361	Yes	No	The new residents of SS3.3 and 3.8 will have a significant impact on Bramley. Bramley has been overdeveloped in recent decades, exacerbated by insufficient infrastructure improvements. Choosing to located further development in Bramley on the premise that it has a railway station is unrealistic, as the parking at the station is totally inadequate, and the railway line is getting much busier, and will become more so as a result of electrification of the line. The C32 is used as a detour from the congested A33 to the A340 and cannot cope at present, as situation which will be exacerbated by the effects of the Redlands, Razors, Cufaude and Sherfield Park developments. The school has recently been extended but is also already nearing maximum capacity again. The doctors surgery is also struggling to cope with the demands being placed on it. There is no provision for walking safely between Bramley and the adjacent villages nor are there safe cycle routes. No high speed broadband.	The approach involving making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure. The allocation of 200 dwellings would contribute to the wider infrastructure problems, and would create an unsustainable situation. The borough expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without a lasting detrimental impact on existing residents. There is no reason why Manydown cannot be developed at an appropriate pace in order to keep up with the demands for new housing. Proposals are needed within the plan to address the specific infrastructure issues flowing from the plan.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. In addition, policy SS3.8 sets out the specific requirement for a two form entry primary school. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. High speed broadband is addressed in policy CN5 and supporting text at paragraph 5.39 and the IDP. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Henrietta Pullan	N/A	N/A	636570	367	Yes	No	The development of SS3.8 will place intolerable pressure on Cufaude Lane and will cause long jams and be detrimental to highway safety. The lane will already have to cope with Sherfield Park development traffic and is unsuitable for adding further traffic. Some cars will use this as a route to Tadley from developments at SS3.3 and SS3.8. Cufaude Farm is pristine agricultural land with great biodiversity and rural, enjoyable footpaths. Housing will not enhance the character of the area and is detrimental to the environment. Listed buildings in the area will be engulfed and will lose their special character as a result.	The housing allocation at Manydown should be increased to the usual amount per hectare and start earlier. The idea that Manydown cannot begin until a 'masterplan' is in place is unfair as the areas north and east of Basingstoke make up a large combined area which will have no such benefit and can be started straight away. Manydown should be allocated for 4000 houses as stated by the 'builders' and the houses proposed at SS3.3 and 3.8 should be removed from the plan, as this will alleviate a potential traffic nightmare in relation to the A33 at Chineham.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as biodiversity and impact upon heritage assets were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The proposed site area also seeks to maintain a reasonable separation distance in relation to the listed buildings. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, in particular Cufaude Lane, and mitigation measures that are required. HCC have also submitted a comprehensive Transport Study setting out how to address the highways aspects associated with the development of the site. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Ms Louise Hayling	N/A	N/A	784338	384	Yes	No	The Cufaude Farm development cannot proceed without the Razors Farm development and as such reasons for the opposition to both sides are inextricably linked. No consideration is given to the additional traffic in the area that the development will cause. Not effective: it has already been noticed that there has been an increase in traffic due to the Taylors Farm development and therefore further development in this area will put intolerable pressure on the existing road network. The A33 is under strain already, and all the proposed development along both sides will limit the scope for road widening. Cufaude Lane is a narrow lane with sharp bends and single lane/passing places. Environmentally the proposal will be a disaster, as the rural pathways and views into the countryside will be lost forever and the beautiful green land will be swallowed up forever. There is no evidence that SS3.3 and 3.8 are justified for Bramley. Bramley only needs 72 dwellings to meet its housing need.	Manydown was purchased specifically to cater for the future housing needs for Basingstoke and should be used to much greater capacity. It is ridiculous to defer the deliverability of two thirds of these homes to beyond the plan period and ludicrous to purport that it cannot deliver until the latter stage of the plan because of infrastructure requirements. Manydown was originally proposed to accommodate at least 9000 homes which has been fought against for a number of years and this deferral will lead to the carving up of many other areas where infrastructure and environmental issues and concerns have not been sufficiently addressed. Rural areas like Bramley risk being swallowed up into one major conurbation with other sprawling in-fill developments. The council should get on with the Manydown development to the full extent it was intended, for the good of the whole borough and leave the villages alone.	Policy SS3.8 states that this site will only be released for development after, or in conjunction with, the development of the Razor's Farm site. In addition, criteria j) in the policy provides for a comprehensive development with the Razors Farm allocation (Policy SS3.3) through the development of a joint masterplan for the two sites. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. In addition, HCC have also produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel within the site is provided through the adjacent Razor's Farm site as opposed to being served by Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel of the site would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how technical solutions could be delivered in order to facilitate this. The council's Transport Assessment also assessed the impact on the A33 and proposes mitigation measures. The site has also been assessed by means of the Landscape Capacity Study and Sustainability Appraisal. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	389	Yes	No	Whilst the County Council as landowner supports the principle of the development of the Cufaude Farm site, there is concern that the proposed allocation boundary is not justified by evidence and risks under-delivery of housing and supporting infrastructure (not effective). The SHLAA related to the entirety of HCC's ownership 32.5 ha. In February 2013 the draft allocation was for 390 dwellings, primary school and public open space. However, since then the allocation boundary has been reduced by around 30% to 22.6 ha, with a strategic gap introduced between Bramley and Basingstoke, although the land use requirements in terms of development capacity have remained the same. Without modification this would result in the under-delivery of the housing target for the site, and/or prejudice provision of the primary school site. The designation of the strategic gap does not relate to landscape sensitivity or visual impact and has no clear rationale.	It is recommended that there are adjustments to the allocation boundary and strategic gap boundary under policy EM2 based on known constraints, an assessed land budget and high level masterplanning work undertaken to date (please see attached map). The proposed modification will achieve a development that both achieves the identified development capacity and enable a development appropriate to the context and internally consistent with other clauses within policy SS3.8.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, strategic gaps have not been defined to protect the countryside or landscape, they prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements. The boundaries are justified, following physical features.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	432	No	No	The proposed development at Cufaude Farm, projected so far into the countryside with restricted access is unsound. The adjacent MoD Bramley military base is an unsuitable neighbour for residential development. Given the availability of more suitable locations (SS3.10), to seek to place homes in a location better reserved - if at all - for future commercial development would be a more thoughtful approach. The nearby business parks constitute the largest commercial zone in the borough with only a single formal access and egress route which is already seriously stressed and undermining the viability of the business parks. If developed, the residents from this site would either have to mingle with the large volumes of commercial traffic over an extended route, or will choose to rat-run through the nearby Chineham and Taylors Farm areas. Some would even choose to use the Bramley road, which is very rural. There is also a lack of medical services and the site would depend on car traffic.	This site should be deleted from the list of SS3 Greenfield Site Allocations.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. In their submission, HCC state that a Noise and Vibration Assessment has been carried out on the site, and concluded that using engineering or development layout techniques a satisfactory living environment could be achieved for future residents. The matter is also covered by criteria h) of the policy. HCC have also produced a Transport Study which sets out how technical solutions could be delivered in order to enable development. The council's Transport Assessment also considered the impact on the A33 and proposes mitigation measures. The need to retain the site for a future employment use has been considered in light of the borough's Employment Land Review which concludes that the site is not required. Accordingly, it is considered that residential use of the site is more appropriate in the light of the relative needs within the borough for residential and commercial floorspace.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Sandra Tapping	N/A	N/A	541740	450	Yes	No	There is a natural edge to north of Chineham at Crockford Lane, and the woodland forms an important 'green barrier'. Allowing Razor's Farm to coalesce with Chineham and Taylor's Farm would put a huge immediate burden on local infrastructure, especially as the local plan infrastructure requirement should a 285 million pound funding gap. There are already major congestion problems on the A33 east of Basingstoke. Further development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on the A33 and lead at times to gridlock. This would have disastrous consequences for the whole of the Basingstoke economy. There would also be shortfalls in the sewerage, school and NHS provisions which are already overstretched with Taylor's Farm being developed without adequate infrastructure, and there are nearly 2 years of approved building for more houses at Taylor's Farm. I urge the Inspector to question the short term overloading of infrastructure in the Chineham area.	Manydown should be the first site to be developed and not a second phase, especially as it is public land bought for housing. Manydown would also bring forward the best sustainable opportunity for new infrastructure as a result of the scale of development being suggested, and is in single ownership which is beneficial from a deliverability perspective.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. In particular it assesses the impact on the A33. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. The issue of the impact on education facilities has already been assessed by Hampshire County Council, and there is an acknowledged need for land to accommodate a primary school. As indicated in the IDP contributions (through CIL) would be sought for the expansion of a local secondary school. The requirement for the provision of a primary school is set out in clause b), as are requirements for the provision of social and physical infrastructure, including the provision of a community centre.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Anthony Tapping	N/A	N/A	638608	453	Yes	No	I object to Razor's Farm and Cufaude Farm being in the local plan because the development of this part of Basingstoke is unsustainable in the context of: traffic congestion on the A33; loss of suitable site for the proposed Chineham railway station; lack of infrastructure; lack of medical or educational facilities or shops; loss of countryside; flooding and increase in pollution with potentially inadequate sewerage and drainage systems. Planning Policy states that settlement should accommodate development without encroachment into open countryside. The shape of Basingstoke is already 'skewed' towards a NE/SW axis. Any development of Razor's Farm would be an adverse encroachment into the countryside and severe loss of local amenity, rural beauty and therapeutic green areas between settlements. The River Loddon is already polluted and breaks the law. The local sewerage system is already overloaded and is unlikely to be able to cope with future demand.	Manydown should be the first site to be developed and not a second phase. The short term option of overloading infrastructure by piecemeal development on greenfield sites in the Chineham area must be questioned. Manydown would bring forward the best sustainable opportunity for new infrastructure as a result of the scale of development being suggested, and is in single land ownership which is beneficial from a deliverability perspective.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as loss of countryside, landscape, flooding, pollution and drainage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Improvements to local infrastructure (including waste water treatment) are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the matter of water quality matters. The council has worked closely and will continue to work closely with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on these matters. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Margaret Towsey	N/A	N/A	641427	463	Not Specified	No	Cufaude Farm is in Bramley and at least half of the land at Razor's Farm is also in Bramley. This means that Bramley is taking 200 houses in the village centre and 390 on cufaude and Razors Farm. Lack of infrastructure at Hammore Lane, Cufaude Lane and Chineham onto A33 already congested and A33 at 07:30am most days speed is 30mph. Impact on the business park -some are suggesting they will leave as currently backing onto fields so no one complains about noise - this would change. Area subject to dense housing and schools, GP's under pressure. Alternative at Manydown where road infrastructure is much better. Roads less congested in the area - the houses at SS3.8 could easily be part of Manydown - all ECO features could be easily implemented. The proposal plan for Cufaude Farm indicates that the strategic gap ran right down to established residence, this needs to be altered.	intentionally left blank	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. Matters such as pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Development proposals will need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) and supporting text at paragraph 6.91. Strategic gap boundaries have generally been defined up to the edge of the Settlement Policy Boundary/ the back of existing property curtilages. The boundaries are justified as they follow physical features.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Cllr Chris Tomblin	BDBC	N/A	637009	466	Yes	No	The site is in open countryside, over a ridge line from the Basingstoke town and will represent an extension of Basingstoke town encroaching on local villages to the north and having a detrimental impact on the countryside, local environment and biodiversity. The site contains a rural cluster of properties around the listed Cufaude Farm house, and it will not be possible to mitigate the impact on those properties. The current farm is a well run and valuable asset to Basingstoke's rural economy. The site was identified by P & I councillors during the SHLAA process as having serious access issues with respect to the narrow Cufaude Lane. The site, in conjunction with SS3.3 will impact on the Crockford Lane roundabout and the business park traffic. The TA and IDP identify this roundabout as requiring significant mitigation but fail to identify the source of the funding. It is unreasonable to expect the developer to address the noise issues associated with the MOD base.	The policy of adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements places too much demand on the existing infrastructure and hence the existing communities. We may make new developments attractive places to live in but at what cost to existing inhabitants. A more cohesive approach is required in respect of the sites to the north of Basingstoke, especially in terms ensuring appropriate infrastructure provision. The current approach will not achieve the Vision. The only logical solution must be to maximise the use of the land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. The whole site can take over 8000 houses but the choice to only part develop this site in this local plan has not been sufficiently justified. This site is a clean sheet and so can be well planned - providing for the needs of a new community and not compromising those that already exist. The borough owns the land - purchased for this very reason with tax-payer money - and can then fund the required infrastructure.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as loss of countryside, landscape, biodiversity, heritage assets and pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The site area allocated seeks to retain as much of a separation distance as possible around the listed buildings - this matter is covered by criteria c) of the policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. In particular it assesses the impact on the A33. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. HCC has also produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel is through Razor's Farm as opposed to Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how this could be achieved. In their submission HCC state that a Noise and Vibration Assessment has been carried out on the site, and concluded that using engineering or development layout techniques a satisfactory living environment could be achieved for future residents. The matter is also covered by criteria h) of the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	497	Yes	No	If Cufaude Farm is built it will add more pressures, particularly on the natural heritage of the Loddon valley. There will be an additional impact on the River Loddon, where it cannot currently be demonstrated that the objectives of the WFD can be met. Development of the site would increase traffic on the A33, which is already overloaded beyond capacity. Appendix A of the IDP does not identify any funding for junction improvements for the proposal. Also trip rates are inconsistent with other town areas. Development of SS3.8 would be the start of expansion to the north with no natural boundary before reaching Bramley.	Sherfield-on-Loddon parish council believes that Cufaude Farm should be taken out of the Local Plan submission and that further development should be concentrated on the Manydown land, which was purchased for residential development by the Borough and County Councils on the west side of Basingstoke.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as biodiversity/ natural heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the matter of water quality matters. The council has worked closely and will continue to work closely with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on these matters. Improvements to local infrastructure (including waste water treatment) are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. HCC has also produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel is provided through Razor's Farm rather than by Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how this could be achieved. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Cllr Elaine Still	BDBC	N/A	214658	529	Yes	No	The site is in open countryside, over a ridge line from the Basingstoke town. This site will become an extension of Basingstoke town impacting on local villages to the north and will lose its rural landscape, ie wildlife habitats, loss of footpaths and severely impact on wildlife. This site will have serious access issues as Cufaude Lane is extremely narrow. In conjunction with SS3.3, Chineham business park, Crockford Lane, this whole area will become completely congested.	in my view adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements will only add to placing too much demand on existing infrastructure which in turn will be a heavy burden on existing communities. The sites to the north east of the borough - SS3.3 Razor's Farm, SS3.8 Cufaude Farm, SS 3.9 East of Basingstoke and SS3.7 Redlands, constitutes a major development area. The A33 and surrounding area cannot take the heavy traffic that will generate from these sites. The best solution has to be to maximise the use of the land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. This site can take over 8000 houses and I feel the decision to only part develop this site in this local plan, is unjust! The Manydown site is a blank canvass so in turn can be well planned out to accommodate the infrastructure, roads, schools, etc. for the new communities. After all the Borough Council owns this land and it was bought for the purpose for building houses with tax payers money.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as loss of countryside, landscape, biodiversity, heritage assets and pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The site area allocated seeks to retain as much of a separation distance as possible around the listed buildings - this matter is covered by criteria c) of the policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. In particular it assesses the impact on the A33. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. HCC has also produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel is through Razor's Farm as opposed to Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how this could be achieved. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	535	Yes	No	HCC voted to make 32ha available. However, policy SS3.8 has reduced the BAS122 site boundary to 22.46 (a 30% reduction) and introduced a strategic gap, which encroaches onto the site. HCC have prepared an indicative masterplan based on site as allocated (which they call option 1) - which show that 350 dwellings could be provided. In addition, this option is not effective as it would not deliver the number of houses required by policy SS3.8. It also provides less flexibility to respond to the current uncertainty regarding the achievability of development on the eastern parcel of the site.	HCC have also carried out a masterplanning exercise in relation to the 32.6 ha site comprising all of the land contained within BAS122. This demonstrates that with some amendment to the proposed strategic gap and site allocation boundaries, 390 dwellings could be achieved at 30dph. This approach would respond to the natural site features and restricts development to the area bounded by Cufaude Lane. This option would provide a strong physical boundary to the development and could be further enhanced by additional landscaping. Although development would be proposed within the draft strategic gap boundary, a small revision of this boundary, making Cufaude Lane the delineation, rather than more minor features within the site, would provide a strong, defensible boundary between development and the countryside. This would have a limited additional impact on the local landscape or coalescence of Basingstoke and Bramley. Option 2 would de-risk the allocation of this site.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, strategic gaps have not been defined to protect the countryside or landscape, they prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements. The boundaries are justified, following physical features.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	615	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant. 'The existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particular in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording. Clause g) refers to improving the connection of the site with the existing cycle and pedestrian routes and the Public Right of Way, which can equally apply to connections to the countryside or settlements. In addition, the HCC submission in respect of this site states that along the site's southern boundary is a footpath which provides access from Cufaude Lane to the parish of Sherbourne St John and to the east through Sherfield Park to the A33 and Loddon Valley. The HCC Submission goes on to state that these rights could be extended through the site to enhance access and enjoyment of the countryside as identified in HCC's Countryside Access Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	632	Yes	No	The policy contains reference to a safeguarded link road, but the land for this is currently not safeguarded and therefore reference should be removed. If BDBC is proposing to safeguard this land, then evidence is required that the road is required and deliverable in the plan period. The supporting evidence does not provide this justification as the Transport Assessment does not demonstrate that a link is required. Further work is needed and HCC is willing to share the outcomes of on-going study work. Without the evidence to support the requirement and deliverability of a link road, reference should be omitted.	Amend Clause F as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network and in particular, Cufaude Lane and the A33 Corridor.	Officers recognise that there are deliverability issues with the proposed link road and that study work is currently being undertaken by the Highways Authority. In light of the uncertainty as to whether the proposed link road is required officers agree with the proposed amendments.	Amend Clause F as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network; and in particular, Cufaude Lane and improvements to the junction at Cufaude Lane and the safeguarded link road at Sherfield Park and improvements to Crockford lane roundabout the Binfield roundabout on the A33 and the A33 Corridor.	In response to representation and in light of uncertainty.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Liz Whittaker	N/A	N/A	786332	684	Not Specified	No	Chineham parish is separated from the town by the ring road, the railway line, two major business areas and the pattern of development in relation to adjacent parishes. Chineham is the local centre for services used by the residents of Old Basing, Lychpit and Sherfield on Loddon. Decisions on housing provision must be made taking this into account. Therefore, Razors Farm should not be seen as an extension of Basingstoke, as it is actually contained within Bramley parish boundary. Infrastructure, services and facilities are already stretched to capacity within Bramley and Chineham. The A33 will not be able to cope with the additional traffic from the housing allocations in the area. How is the problem of water quality going to be adequately addressed? Razor's Farm borders on and is accessed from Hampshire International Business Park and is not suitable for housing, being hemmed in by industrial sites and the railway line. The additional housing will reduce employment levels.	Manydown, SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental effects on the existing population. The site should be allocated for greater numbers of housing, it is obvious it can accommodate far more than the current plan allows for. This could cope with a large urban extension to Basingstoke with schools, shopping, leisure and medical facilities without overloading facilities in Chineham and other areas, such as Lychpit and Bramley. The plan does not explain why this site will not be used until 2019, this site should be brought forward sooner and developed fully, before any other site are even looked at. Regard for the impact on the existing population should be the main consideration. The evidence that a series of smaller sites is necessary to provide housing is not logical or persuasive.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the site currently sits within Bramley Parish, the site physically adjoins Basingstoke Town Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore, in planning terms, it is considered appropriate to regard this as an extension to Basingstoke's built up area. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the water quality matters. The council has worked closely and will continue to work closely with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on these matters. HCC have also carried out a Noise and Vibration Assessment which concludes that using engineering or development layout techniques a satisfactory living environment could be achieved for future residents. These matters are also covered by criteria h) of the policy. This particular site would also be separated from the business park by the adjoining Razor's Farm site. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mrs Gail Tomblin	N/A	N/A	638019	771	Yes	No	The development of the site will result in the loss of the rural landscape, use and enjoyment of footpaths, wildlife habitats and impacts upon the free movement of wildlife from area to area. It will not be possible to mitigate for the loss of the rural farmland setting as laid out in paragraph (c). The site was identified in the SHLAA as having serious access issues. The site in conjunction with SS3.3 will impact on the Crockford Lane roundabout and the business park traffic. The TA identifies this roundabout to require significant mitigation but fail to identify the source of the funding. Therefore there is a danger that the development would not be viable. I am concerned that rat-running will be increased through Chineham and along Cufaude Lane for north & south-bound traffic. The sound levels within the existing houses are in excess of the Environmental Health nuisance noise guidelines. This site is currently lacking in utilities infrastructure.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as loss of countryside, landscape, flooding, pollution and drainage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Improvements to local infrastructure (including waste water treatment) are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the matter of water quality matters. The council has worked closely and will continue to work closely with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on these matters. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. HCC have also carried out a Noise and Vibration Assessment which concludes that using engineering or development layout techniques a satisfactory living environment could be achieved for future residents. These matters are also covered by criteria h) of the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	J Lloyd	N/A	N/A	786495	780	Yes	No	Support the greenfield allocation of Cufaude Farm. However, the boundary (as shown on Policy Map 1b)) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House which is suitable for accommodating a substantial number of dwellings. Inclusion of this land would achieve sustainable development in accordance with the Council's conclusions in the SHLAA (BAS122). Including this land will also ensure that the mitigation measures in criteria c) of the policy are effective and enforceable. This is so the setting of Upper Cufaude Farm House and the converted farm buildings that stand adjacent to it are listed and form part of the overall setting are given proper consideration. Also modifying Policy Map 7d) would achieve comprehensive development. It would be in appropriate to leave this site in isolation.	In accordance with the site plan submitted, the boundary of the proposed allocation for Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Cufaude Farm. This will enable the requirements of Policy SS3.8 to be properly delivered and improve the effectiveness of the Plan.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Colin Towsey	N/A	N/A	645444	799	Not Specified	No	All the proposed developments are on greenfield sites. The infrastructure demands, environmental and ecological demands will be greater. The impact on local services needs re-assessing before the plan is finalised. Manydown can absorb all the housing required for the plan period. It puts Basingstoke at the cutting edge of housing development.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As is evidenced by Table 2, paragraph 4.11, on page 26 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan, the greenfield sites cater for the demand which cannot be met by development within the existing settlement policy boundary. The sites allocated have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Matters such as ecology were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	805	Not Specified	No	In accordance with Para's 3.29 - 3.31 in the attached document, in order to render the policy "Sound", bullet (j) should be deleted (which refers to the need to ensure comprehensive development with the Razor's Farm allocation through development of a joint masterplan for the two sites).	In accordance with Para's 3.29 - 3.31 in the attached document, in order to render the policy "Sound", bullet (j) should be deleted (which refers to the need to ensure comprehensive development with the Razor's Farm allocation through development of a joint masterplan for the two sites.	The council's Sustainability Appraisal and site assessments note the benefit of developing this site in conjunction with Razor's Farm in order to reduce the degree of isolation of the proposed allocation. In addition, there would be a high degree of interdependence between the two sites owing to their close proximity.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Ms Naomi Sykes	N/A	N/A	786620	809	Yes	No	Support the greenfield allocation of Cufaude Farm. However, the boundary (as shown on Policy Map 1b)) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House which is suitable for accommodating a substantial number of dwellings. Inclusion of this land would achieve sustainable development in accordance with the Council's conclusions in the SHLAA (BAS122). Including this land will also ensure that the mitigation measures in criteria c) of the policy are effective and enforceable. This is so the setting of Upper Cufaude Farm House and the converted farm buildings that stand adjacent to it are listed and form part of the overall setting are given proper consideration. Also modifying Policy Map 7d) would achieve comprehensive development. It would be in appropriate to leave this site in isolation.	In accordance with the site plan submitted, the boundary of the proposed allocation for Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Cufaude Farm. This will enable the requirements of Policy SS3.8 to be properly delivered and improve the effectiveness of the Plan.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Robert Fish	N/A	N/A	786623	812	Yes	No	Support the greenfield allocation of Cufaude Farm. However, the boundary (as shown on Policy Map 1b)) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House which is suitable for accommodating a substantial number of dwellings. Inclusion of this land would achieve sustainable development in accordance with the Council's conclusions in the SHLAA (BAS122). Including this land will also ensure that the mitigation measures in criteria c) of the policy are effective and enforceable. This is so the setting of Upper Cufaude Farm House and the converted farm buildings that stand adjacent to it are listed and form part of the overall setting are given proper consideration. Also modifying Policy Map 7d) would achieve comprehensive development. It would be in appropriate to leave this site in isolation.	In accordance with the site plan submitted, the boundary of the proposed allocation for Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8) should be redrawn to include land adjacent to Cufaude Farm. This will enable the requirements of Policy SS3.8 to be properly delivered and improve the effectiveness of the Plan.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Michael Poore	N/A	N/A	441355	834	No	No	Upper Cufaude Farm is prime agricultural land which must be kept as such because the country needs to produce more food. To allow development reduces the food potential, destroys the environment and produces additional pollution. The proposal is unsound because no mention is made of access to Cufaude Lane, which is unable to handle existing traffic. The road is too narrow and the edges are continually breaking, the resultant holes make passing even more difficult. The road is also subject to serious flooding making it unusable. The word mitigate is meaningless - the council allows developers to do anything they want without any consideration of residents wishes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as agricultural land, biodiversity and pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). HCC has produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel within the site is provided through the adjacent Razor's Farm site as opposed to being served by Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel of the site would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how technical solutions could be delivered in order to facilitate this.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	859	Not Specified	Not Specified	Provision for bus/deliveries traffic for the future development and school identified in the policy is not catered for or provided for within the Razors Farm planning application. This is both detrimental and therefore against the policy.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	In their submission HCC state that the proposed allocation is likely to increase the need to provide improved bus connections to key local destinations and together with the allocation of the Razor's Farm site this has the potential to significantly improve the customer base for new or extensions to the local bus services. This matter is also covered by criteria g) of the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	791341	881	Yes	No	This site can only be delivered if Razors Farm is delivered first. Infrastructure is already stretched to capacity. The site encroaches further into Bramley reducing the open green space and removing a working farm from the area. The sites are only accessible via commercial and industrial parks (south) and a narrow widening rural road (north). Access from Sheffield Park will add to traffic issues on Cufaude Lane. TA acknowledges impact on Great Binfield and Crockford Lane roundabouts. All allocation sites in the area (total of 2060 houses) will contribute to traffic problems. Without significant road infrastructure changes prior to development the sites are unsustainable and thus the policies are not sound. There will be pressure to Bramley railway station and there are no firm plans for Chineham Railway Station. There is no evidence that sites of this size are needed to meet the Parish needs. Bramley only needs 72 dwellings. Development will impact on employment opportunities.	The boroughs expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affect on the existing population. Evidence suggests, and policy CNS supports, that to develop the northeast of the borough at the proposed rate will need significant changes to and delivery of additional infrastructure. Thus if SS3.8 can deliver in the period 2014-19 then Manydown could do the same rather than starting in 2019/20.	No change. Policy SS3.8 states that this site will only be released after, or in conjunction with, Razor's Farm. In addition, clause j) requires comprehensive development with the Razors Farm allocation through a joint masterplan. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). HCC has also produced a Transport Study which recommends that the main vehicular access to the central parcel is provided through the Razor's Farm site as opposed to Cufaude Lane. The eastern parcel would be served by Cufaude Lane, and the Transport Study sets out how this could be achieved. The provision of Chineham railway station is addressed in policy SS10, and work is continuing with HCC, Network Rail, and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes the phasing for Manydown is 2019/20 to 2028/29.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Kyriacos Marianos	N/A	N/A	784574	974	Yes	No	The infrastructure required has not been considered carefully and is not precise. Vague statements on the plan are not sufficient to proceed.	The detailed infrastructure needs have to be set out precisely and precede the development. Financially, insufficient funding is in place for this vital requirement.	The IDP in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1171	Yes	No	1. Allocation fails the 5 the bullet on page 16 of the Vision. 2. Pressures from new residents will result in additional burden on the biodiversity value of Loddon Valley. 3. Additional impact on the River Loddon whereby it cannot be demonstrated that the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) can be met, in a river which is currently failing to meet the good ecological status as required by the WFD. 4. SS3.8 would increase the traffic on the A33, which is already overloaded, beyond its capacity. It would also require significant changes to Cufaude Lane. 5. Appendix A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) indicates that no funding has been identified to ensure policy SS3.8 criteria f) is delivered. Questions the trip rates in Table 8.26 of the Transport Assessment for SS3.8. 6. SS3.8 would be the start of expansion to the North with no natural boundary before reaching Bramley. Country Watch supports the objections to Policy SS3.8 raised by Chineham Parish Council.	Country Watch supports the objections to Policy SS3.8 raised by Chineham Parish Council. Please see the Chineham Parish Council representations.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Matters such as biodiversity, isolation and coalescence were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the matter of water quality matters. The council has worked closely and will continue to work closely with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on these matters. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. The trip rates used in the Transport Assessment were calculated using industry standard methods. The policy sets out the requirement for the development of the site to include measures to mitigate the impact on the local road network (criteria f). HCC has produced a Transport Study. Appendix A, on pages 68 and 69, of the IPD indicates funding in relation to criteria f) of the policy. It indicates that funding will be through CIL and other sources such as Growing Places. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1237	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority is seeking clarification from BDBC on the issue of safeguarding policy. Within this policy there is currently a reference to the safeguarded link road at Sheffield Park. The land for this link road is currently not safeguarded and therefore the reference to this safeguarding should be removed from this policy. Clarification is required from BDBC as to whether BDBC is planning this as a new safeguarding policy. If the Borough Council is proposing the safeguarding of land for this link road then it will need to provide the supporting evidence demonstrating that the link road is required and deliverable within the plan period. The supporting evidence provided by the Borough Council at present provides no justification for the inclusion of the safeguarding of this site as the transport assessment does not demonstrate that the link road is required.	Further work is needed to establish this and Hampshire County Council is offering the Borough Council assistance with this process including sharing the outcomes of on-going study work. However without the evidence and proof to support the requirement and deliverability of a link road the reference to a safeguarded link road should be omitted. Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause F of this policy is amended removing the reference to safeguarding: F) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network and in particular, Cufaude Lane and the A33 Corridor.	Officers recognise that there are deliverability issues with the proposed link road and that study work is currently being undertaken by the Highways Authority. In light of the uncertainty as to whether the proposed link road is required officers agree with the proposed amendments.	Amend Clause F as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network; and in particular, Cufaude Lane and the safeguarded link road at Sheffield Park and the improvements to Crockford Lane roundabout the Binfield roundabout on the A33 and the A33 Corridor.	In response to representation and in light of uncertainty.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Criteria f) - delete ; at the end of the first line	Officer update - typo	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. i.e. "Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."	Agree with the suggested change.	Amend bullet point h) to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	Policy SS3.8 - Upper Cufaude Farm	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update phasing in line with the updated SHLAA.	updated evidence.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Steven Quick	N/A	N/A	784091	79	No	No	SS3.9 (East of Chineham) - The site proposed has been identified by previous reports (available on the BDBC website) as being unsuitable for development for many reasons including the high risk of flooding, being too close to an incinerator plant and sewage works (which also has plans to expand significantly in the future). The Environmental Agency have also recommended that the site proposed for development be removed from the Local Plan due to its high potential to flood. The potential significant increase to traffic on the A33 and Binfields Roundabout has been well publicised with overall agreement that gridlock would be a reality. In addition to this the site is bordered by a Listed Ancient Monument (Park Pale) which has provided a suitable and successful boundary to the east of Basingstoke for a considerable time in addition to its heritage value. It would be irresponsible for the site to be included within the Adopted Local Plan for the above reasons and countless more.	There are sites highlighted within the draft plan with the potential to fulfill the housing stock requirement (the figure proposed in excess of 700 per year for the duration of the Local Plan would appear excessive). To ignore recommendations from the Environmental Agency (amongst others) must surely declare the Draft Local Plan as not legally compliant or sound.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Noise and odour pollution and heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion e), f) and n). Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	90	Yes	No	This site is not really "East of Basingstoke" it would be more accurate to name it "East of Chineham and Lychpit." A development of this size is unsustainable given failures in the local infrastructure. Any development would add traffic to the heavily congested A33 and would threaten the biodiversity of the Loddon valley. This site has also been identified as a flood risk so it seems illogical to build housing here, especially given flooding to local roads in recent years and interruption to the power supply as a result. The wet meadows here help with the absorption of heavy rainfall so building on them would cause serious damage. Problems will certainly arise through building a dense housing development on the boarder of a waste incineration plant and an overloading sewage works. These facilities were built in their present locations precisely because these locations were well outside the settlement boundary.	intentionally left blank	The site lies to the east of Basingstoke (an area wider than Chineham) and is therefore considered to be a suitable and now well known name for the site. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Flood risk, biodiversity, noise and odour pollution and heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion e), f), k), l) and n). Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	98	Yes	No	A development of this size is unsustainable given failures in the local infrastructure. Any development would add traffic to the heavily congested A33 and would threaten the biodiversity of the Loddon valley. This site has also been identified as a flood risk so it seems illogical to build housing here, especially given flooding to local roads in recent years and interruption to the power supply as a result. The wet meadows here help with the absorption of heavy rainfall so building on them would cause serious damage. Problems will certainly arise through building a dense housing development on the edge of a waste incineration plant and an overloaded sewage works. These facilities were built in their present locations precisely because these locations were well outside the settlement boundary.	intentionally left blank	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Flood risk, biodiversity, noise and odour pollution and heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion e), f), k), l) and n). Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Dr Mary Walker	N/A	N/A	784394	119	Yes	No	I disagree with Policy SS3.9 to locate 900 houses east of Basingstoke because of the negative impact on the infrastructure, water quality, flood risk, pollution and air quality and landscape. This development would be on a contaminated site which may still contain dioxins from a previous incinerator. This site has a new incinerator which will increase heavy transport and it is also on a flood plain. Recently a 1000 houses were built on Sherfield Park near this site. The addition of a further 900 houses would cause an unacceptable increase in traffic on the A33 and gridlock during the rush hours. This would destroy the rural quality of life of all the residents of Stratfield Turgis, many of whom have listed houses bordering on the A33 and already experience unacceptable levels of traffic noise, pollution and vibration.	A change to Policy SS3.10 Manydown section should read a) Provide for the phased delivery of 3,980 dwellings. Since this site allows for the building of 4000 houses, see report to the overview and scrutiny committee, 19th Sept 2013, then the additional 900 houses from East Basingstoke could be built here. This would provide the economy of scale for the infrastructure required, which is government policy for savings, plus it would provide the necessary size for a Secondary School and a strong case for building a western relief road joining the M3 at Junction 7. The impact of this change would be to provide more effective infrastructure at a reduced cost to meet the needs of the local housing plan.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Flood risk, landscape and noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion e), f), g), j) k), l) and n). The site assessment indicates there is no record of land contamination on the site. Development proposals will need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) and its supporting text on contaminated land at paragraphs 6.94 to 6.96. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Onnalee Cubitt	BDBC	N/A	421665	181	No	No	The Local Plan is NOT Consistent with National Policy. It fails to adhere to The Sequential Test as per Para 100 and 101 of the NPPF. SS3.9 should NOT have been selected as this site scores one of the highest Flood Risk Rankings and there are other Category 1 Sites which, as per The Sequential Test, have to be selected first. Sites such as Hounsme Fields which is adjacent to SS3.2.	Replace SS3.9 with Hounsme Fields adjacent to SS3.2 which is not currently selected in this Plan and yet which scores a lower ranking in The Sequential Test.	The policy is considered sound and consistent with the NPPF and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. The council's 'Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test' document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Onnalee Cubitt	BDBC	N/A	421665	182	No	No	The Local Plan is NOT Consistent with National Policy. It fails to adhere to The Sequential Test as per Para 100 and 101 of the NPPF. SS3.9 should NOT have been selected as this site scores one of the highest Flood Risk Rankings and there are other Category 1 Sites such as Hounsme Fields which, as per The Sequential Test, have to be selected first	Replace SS3.9 with Hounsme Fields which is a Category 1 Site, is available and is not currently selected in this Plan and yet which scores a lower ranking in The Sequential Test.	The policy is considered sound and consistent with the NPPF and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. The council's 'Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test' document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	227	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	This is the thin end of the wedge for dwellings being built to the east of Basingstoke. Hampshire County Council needs to commit to upgrading the A33 to a dual carriageway from the North Chineham junction to the Berkshire Border. They've only had 30 years to do it. And Chineham station needs building - this was promised as precondition of the previous development at Sherfield Park.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken, in liaison with HCC, to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. HCC Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria h) in the policy. The Council supports the provision of the Chineham Railway Station and the Plan sets the framework for this delivery through policy SS10. Work is continuing with HCC, Network Rail, and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station development (paragraph 4.77). The Chineham station is not infrastructure that is fundamental to facilitate development. The IDP defines the Chineham station as desirable infrastructure.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Julia Wright	N/A	N/A	784804	304	Yes	Yes	Concerning Policy SS3.9 there is very little detail on how Park Pale will be protected and Old Basing will be preserved and enhanced. I am concerned about the additional traffic. Many of the proposals are very wooly	Need more details on how to protect Park Pale which is an English Heritage monument. Old Basing has no street lights at present and this must be preserved. This also means it should not be impacted by neighbouring lights. Old Basing already has a significant amount of traffic at key commuter and school times. You must ensure that this development does not impact on that, especially due to the lack of pavements in the village. The council really need to think about traffic. Much as we all like the idea of others using public transport for longer journeys (say over 1 mile) very few of us prefer public transport to our cars so why do you think that those in these new houses will! It is very difficult to be supportive of something when little actual detail is given.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Heritage assets were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Park Pale is specifically covered by criteria e). English Heritage welcomes and supports requirements e) and f) of Policy SS3.9 and can advise further on "appropriate buffering" - see comment ID: 542. Development proposals would also need to accord with policy EM11 (Historic Environment) of the Local Plan. The policy deals with the strategic allocation of the site and more detailed matters will be considered through the masterplanning and planning application process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	307	Yes	No	Policies SS3.7 - Redlands and SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke both impact Bramley residents travelling to Basingstoke for employment, leisure and higher order services with the increased traffic volumes on the A33 being the primary cause for concern alongside loss of open green space. There are no specific infrastructure improvements planned to solve the consequential problems and the statements of mitigation have no substance. These developments along with the existing Sherfield Park site will turn the A33 into a residential corridor to Basingstoke rather than support the essential gap required by residents to maintain any residue of the rural aspect in this north east part of the borough.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria h and i) in the policy. Coalescence of settlements was recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and has been given due consideration through the site selection process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	351	Yes	No	Proposals for development of SS3.3, SS3.4, SS3.7, SS3.8 and SS3.9 in effect form a major development area East of Basingstoke. Development of these sites will overload A33, sewerage system, schools, surgeries and local community facilities. Public transport will be insufficient to meet demand. A33 will not have sufficient capacity even with improvements and future dualing will be prevented by these developments.	Do not allocate the site. Delete policy SS3.9. As an alternative increase the developable area and number of dwellings for the Manydown site (policy SS3.10).	The sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria c) in the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	mr antoney stoney	N/A	N/A	784442	360	Yes	No	As a rambler I and our group are against building to the East of Basingstoke. Park Pale old woodland has already been devastated on one side, wildlife will be pushed out. River Loddon more polluted. The joy of the footpaths will be gone. Pyotts Hill has been flooded, like the road up to the incinerator and adjoining fields and land. Pyotts Hill is a rat run morning and evening, school run, workers travelling between Chineham and Hook via Wewnham Lane.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Ecology and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion g), k) and l). As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	N/A	N/A	132338	378	Not Specified	No	Concern that no funding has been identified through the draft IDP to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network. All development creates additional traffic to the North and East of Basingstoke and levels of funding to deal with this are not identified. The Landscape studies of 2008 and 2010 recommended that the north of Pyotts Hill should not be developed and that there should be a buffer between conservation area along Park Pale and any development. River Loddon should be safeguarded. SS3.9 adjacent to a Biodiversity Project Area, concerned that it will adversely impact is ecosystem and habitats, therefore compromising the GIS, EA and P&I OSCOM recommended that site should be removed from LP. Concerned about increased surface water and flood risk, demand on water supplies and need for waste water treatment. Not deliverable- HCC promoting 450 homes. Hounsme Fields site preferred as indicated in the Landscape Capacity Study and the Strategic Biodiversity Assessment.	Delete SS3.9 (and SS3.7) Delete SS3.9 (and SS3.7). Alternative to SS3.9 (and SS3.7)- Hounsme Fields - Apply the Flooding Sequential Test. Additional housing on Manydown - Include Scrapps Farm and the Worting sites. Increase the annual build rate to 350hpa. This would allow for an area of properly planned urban expansion for which Manydown was originally purchased and linked by the proposed Western Relief Road Policy SS3.10 (n & o) Tadley- Include a windfall allowance for Tadley.	Appendix A of the IDP indicates funding in relation site SS3.9. It indicates that funding for will be through CIL and other sources. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Landscape, biodiversity, heritage assets and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criteria d), e), f), g), k) and l) of the policy. Criteria e) requires development proposals to respect and provide appropriate buffering to Park Pale. The council's 'Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test' document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan, 'the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will be met elsewhere in the borough'.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	N/A	N/A	86126	418	Yes	No	Contrary to Policy CN4 - No credible way of mitigating the impact has been recommended. Object to the development being built on the side of a hill. Contrary to EM7 - Areas of the East of Basingstoke are prone to flooding, have not sufficiently considered the increased risk from climate change. Object to increasing the number of lanes around a roundabout - will increase traffic. Object to the proposal for allotment as there is a concern that incinerator and sewage works will make land unsuitable. Concerned effective screening will compromise the open character of the landscape, land sensitive to pollution - land not suitable for retirement homes, decreasing air quality due to increase in traffic. Concern that there will be adverse effects on the wetlands and habitats in the Loddon Valley, many of these being SINCs or SSSI.	Manydown and Hounsme Fields do not have these problems.(b) SS3.9 should be removed as contrary to Policy CN4. the allocation of houses should be moved to site SS3.10 or to Hounsme Fields which have no environmental problems and are therefore a more suitable alternative. A link road to the M3 junction 7 is necessary sooner rather than later and should be included in this plan. There are sites available which are not prone to flooding eg Manydown can take up to 6000 houses (BDBC report to cabinet meeting 30/7/13 item 15 - report). No study of the effect on Stratfield Turgis had been undertaken. Development should not be increased along this road as the infrastructure does not exist to cope with it.It is not clear where the funding is coming from to upgrade the junctions.a study of the land for contamination should be completed before any housing, allotments etc are planned. No adequate remedial or 'mitigation' measures have been put in place.	Development proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People accommodation on the site will need to accord with policy SS3.9 criteria b) and policy CN4. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Flood risk, pollution including land contamination, landscape and biodiversity were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), g), k), l) and n). Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. A planning application will be need to accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) as required by policy EM7 of the Local Plan and the NPPF. This FRA must take into account climate change. Development proposals will need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) and its supporting text on contaminated land at paragraphs 6.94 to 6.96. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	430	No	No	This site is unhelpfully misnamed as it is not "East of Basingstoke" but rather "East of Chineham". Furthermore, HCC has previously described it as an "extension of Chineham", although there is little opportunity for coalescence. It is not at all clear how safe pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided to the nearby district centre and schools, especially during a prolonged period of development in the northern section of the total site. The existence of the waste incinerator and sewage works in the vicinity do not constitute desirable neighbours for residential development. Indeed, both these utilities were first located where they are in order to distance them from the urban settlement. In previous transport assessments, the A33 was deemed to be either at or in excess of capacity. This suggests a need - given the poor accident record - for either major re-engineering or dualling of the carriageway. This issue has not been addressed.	This site should be deleted from the list of proposed Greenfield Site Allocations SS3.	The site lies to the east of Basingstoke (an area wider than Chineham) and is therefore considered to be a suitable and now well known name for the site. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Accessibility and noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.9 includes a criteria on walking and cycle routes. The site will also be subject to masterplanning when these matters can be looked out in extensive detail. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. Development proposals will also need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) of the Local Plan. As part of the	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Chris Tomblin	BDBC	N/A	637009	460	Yes	No	The A33 traffic capacity is already at a maximum. The A33 corridor has a significantly poor air quality assessment. Putting residents in areas of high pollution does not fit the Basingstoke Adopted Vision. The incinerator has been sited remotely for a good reason. The development site falls immediately at the points of maximum grounding of the emissions from the local incinerator's chimney given all the prevailing wind directions. The Environmental Study submitted to EA for granting the operator's licence relied on no houses around the site within the stack discharge map that was issued. The maximum concentration of pollutants will fall upon any dwellings located on this site. This will cause respiratory problems. The sewage works was also sited remotely for good reason. Both sites have unpleasant odours from time to time. The development will impact on the operation of the incinerator and the sewage works, as complaints are bound to happen.	The policy of adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements places too much demand on the existing infrastructure and hence the existing communities. We may make new developments attractive places to live in but at what cost to existing inhabitants. A more cohesive approach is required in respect of the sites to the north of Basingstoke, especially in terms ensuring appropriate infrastructure provision. The current approach will not achieve the Vision. The only logical solution must be to maximise the use of the land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. The whole site can take over 8000 houses but the choice to only part develop this site in this local plan has not been sufficiently justified. This site is a clean sheet and so can be well planned - providing for the needs of a new community and not compromising those that already exist. The borough owns the land - purchased for this very reason with tax-payer money - and can then fund the required infrastructure.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. Development proposals will also need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) of the Local Plan. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Gibberd 2	N/A	N/A	637073	488	Not Specified	No	Land at Manydown was purchased with the specific aim of being able to develop a fully integrated community of 6-800 with all the necessary facilities. Those living at ss3.9 will find themselves in a ribbon development along the A33 with an incinerator and sewage works on its borders. The site will also be isolated from Old Basing and Chineham. In addition, when the traffic to the new Thames Water site starts and if Redlands, Cufaude Lane and Razors Farm are also developed the situation will become unsustainable. This proposal is incompatible with Policies EM1, EM4, EM5 and EM6. The building of 900 houses on the crest of the Loddon Valley must inevitably destroy the current landscape, and it is hard to see how this can be mitigated. The development would also undermine the tranquillity and enjoyment of the landscape. The development will also be detrimental to local biodiversity, hinder green infrastructure and undermine efforts to improve water quality.	Enhancement, not just protection of the natural environment and biodiversity is a key aim of the borough. Confidence is expressed that mitigating measures will overcome the inconsistencies between the development plans and these policies. As with such infrastructure needs like road improvements these proposed mitigating measures must be fully detailed, costed and their efficacy proved before development is allowed. The housing numbers lost if SS3.9 and other sites East of Basingstoke are removed from the plan should be re-allocated to Hounsham Fields, Worting and, in particular, Manydown to the west of the town.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing Noise and odour pollution, landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure and water quality were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criteria d), j), k), l) and n) of the policy. The site assessment states that "The site lies adjacent to housing at Chineham/Lychpit to the east and south and therefore is not isolated. Furthermore, it would not lead to coalescence of settlements." Development of the site either in part or in totality would not lead to coalescence". As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Appendix A of the IDP indicates funding in relation site SS3.9. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	415555	516	Not Specified	No	HCC is only promoting 450 houses on 3.9 during the local plan period as opposed to the 900 proposed in the plan. The site cannot be said to be fully available and is therefore not deliverable. The policy is unsound. The plan contravenes EM7 as it puts 3.9 ahead of other sites with a lower flood risk - unsound. The council accepts that the south east is "water stressed" and that River Loddon currently fails to meet 'good' status under the Water Directive. Unless action is taken before development, not after, the plan is unsound. The landscape studies of 2008 and 2010 recommended that 3.9 should not be developed, but this evidence has been ignored. The EA recommend removal of 3.9 from the list. They described it as "high risk". P & I also consistently recommended that 3.9 should not be developed. The incinerator and sewage works were originally sited away from settlements, now there are plans to put housing close by. developing 3.9 will not protect biodiversity.	Withdraw site 3.9 from this local plan, as it is not possible to deliver the above changes in order to demonstrate this is a suitable site for residential development during the local plan period. Please note that Redlands Farm (ss3.7) cannot be developed in isolation. Alternatives to SS3.9 and SS3.7: Hounsborne Fields (1,000) should be included. This has been included in previous SHLAA's and has a much lower flood risk than 3.9. Tadley and Burghfield. The SHLAA shows that there is the potential for nearly 1,800 houses with over 600 outside of the ONS consultation zone. The exclusion of Tadley is in itself unsound. Manydown. The Council Manydown Executive Committee recommended 4,000 houses over this plan period. The Inspector during the 2005 Inquiry considered that 360 dwellings per annum was realistic, and version 6 of the SHLAA quoted 350 dpa. The allocation should therefore be increased from 3,080 during the plan period. 4000 should be provided on Manydown during plan period.	HCC in their representation on policy SS3.9 states "The County Council as a landowner supports the principle of development of East of Basingstoke and has agreed to make land available for approximately 450 dwellings and supporting infrastructure as an initial phase of development during the Plan period to 2029. It acknowledges that the total site has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings, however, the balance would be delivered as a potential later phase beyond the Plan period". The site is available and deliverable for 450 dwellings within the plan period and the plan has been updated to reflect this. Criteria a) of policy SS3.9 has been amended - see response to HCC comment ID: 1282. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Flood risk, landscape, water supply, water quality, noise and odour pollution and biodiversity were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criteria d), g), k), l) and n) of the policy. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Policy SS4 and EM6 of the Local Plan covers the matter of water quality matters. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr T Lytle	N/A	N/A	785940	526	Yes	No	The plan is unsound and is dangerous to the health and well-being of some future residents. The siting of housing on BAS121 and SOL002 as per policy 3.9 will lead to claims of legal responsibility against HCC and BDBC with resultant compensation being paid for any harm done to future residents. 2 out of 4 of UK personal injury firms approached agreed that there would be a case to be made and compensation to be paid for by HCC and BDBC (and the housebuilder) to any of the residents in the houses built in and around the incinerator and sewage treatment plant. There is a distinct smell of burning and sewage on most days in the portions of land immediately next to these facilities. The type of housing now being built (town houses and apartment blocks) is higher than previous housing and this would tend to negate excess height of the incineratory whose height is 65m to aid in dispersal of the toxic chemicals.	It is strongly suggested that BDBC's Policy SS3.9 is unsound and that BAS121/SOL002 are removed from the plan. This is supported by the recommendations of the P & I Overview Committees Chaired by Cllr Reid in September 2011 and that chaired by Cllr Ruffell in January 2013. It is strongly suggested that BDBC err on the side of safety and choose any one of the reserve sites or increase the number of houses on Manydown. This is due to the possible risk to the health of future residents because of BAS121's immediate location next to the Chineham incinerator and TW sewage treatment plant. More importantly, failure to exclude BAS121/SOL002 could and will lead to claims of legal responsibility in respect of HCC and BDBC for siting housing on these particular sites. This is based on medical evidence and the scenario presented in this representation.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Elaine Still	BDBC	N/A	214658	527	Yes	No	A33 traffic capacity at maximum This site contravenes the sequential test based on flood risk which is defined in the glossary of page 143 of the NPPF. This site is listed as a high risk area (band 8) in the list of other selected sites where there are other sites which are available BAS133 Hounsme Fields, BAS099 Scrapps Hill, BAS141 Land at Worting, these sites are much lower risk and they have not been selected. Grave concerns over the emissions from the local incinerator Chimney with proposed houses being developed too close to the stack. Too close to the Basingstoke sewage works. Unpleasant odours and noise.	In my view adding piecemeal sites to existing settlements will only add to placing too much demand on existing infrastructure which in turn will be a burden on existing communities. The sites to the north east of Basingstoke SS3.3Razors Farm,SS3.9 East of Basingstoke SS3.8 Cufade farm SS3.7Redlands constitutes a major development area. The best solution has to be to maximise the use of land at Manydown SS3.10. This site can take over 8000 houses and I feel the decision to only part develop this site in this local plan is unjust. The Manydown site is a blank canvass so in turn can be well planned out to accommodate the necessary infrastructure for the new communities. After all the Borough council owns this land and it was bought for the purpose of building houses with tax payers money.€.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. Flood risk and noise and odour pollution and biodiversity were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criteria g) and n) of the policy. The council's Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1282	Yes	No	The County Council as a landowner supports the principle of development of East of Basingstoke and has agreed to make land available for approximately 450 dwellings and supporting infrastructure as an initial phase of development during the Plan period to 2029. It acknowledges that the total site has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings, however, the balance would be delivered as a potential later phase beyond the Plan period. Representation includes Technical Appendices (which are available on request).	Land available for approximately 450 dwellings and supporting infrastructure as an initial phase of development during the Plan period to 2029.	Availability of land for approximately 450 dwellings during the plan period is noted. Amend criteria a) accordingly.	Amend criteria a) of policy as follows "Make provision for the phased delivery of approximately 900 450 dwellings". Add the following text to the end of the policy "The site boundary as defined on the policies map has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings. A potential later phase for 450 dwellings may be delivered beyond the Plan period."	In response to representation and HCC's position to make land available for approximately 450 dwellings during the plan period.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1284	Yes	No	A number of clauses appear unjustified or paraphrase other draft Local Plan policies and for internal consistency it is requested that these are amended or deleted: Clause (c) whilst the County Council strongly supports the provision of education facilities to meet local needs, the quantum of housing in the draft allocation does not justify in its own right the provision of a 3-form entry primary school on the East of Basingstoke site. The local education authority will advise on the need and scale of education provision to serve this site and any unmet need in the east of Basingstoke. Representation includes Technical Appendices (which are available on request).	Clause (c)- replace "provision for a three form entry primary school with "safeguard land for and make contributions towards a primary school as required by the local education authority."	Amend criteria c) in response to representation but not as suggested. Amend criteria to reflect further discussions with the Local Education Authority.	Amend criteria c) as follows "...and the provision- reservation of land towards the north of the site for a three form entry primary school on land towards the north of the site."	In response to representation and further discussion with the Local Education Authority.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	542	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site includes Pyotts Hill Entrenchment SAM along its western boundary and partially abuts the Old Basing Conservation Area to the south. English Heritage therefore welcomes and supports requirements e) and f) of Policy SS3.9 and can advise further on "appropriate buffering", although we would prefer "conserve" to "preserve" as this terminology better reflects that of the NPPF and recognises that change can take place affecting the historic environment without loss of, and even enhancing, the significance of heritage assets. EH would also welcome a requirement for a desk-based archaeological assessment and possible field evaluation to be undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application. EH is aware that resolving traffic circulation issues on this site may threaten the scheduled earthwork. EH would be pleased to discuss any proposals for road connections, which would as a minimum require an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation and landscaping.	Agreed that changing the wording would be more consistent with the NPPF and English Heritage advice. The suggested amendment to the policy to require a desk-based archaeological assessment and possible field assessment is not required as these matters are now covered in policy EM11 and its supporting text as a result of amendments in response to representations from English Heritage on policy EM11, and further negotiations with English Heritage. The offer to discuss any proposals for road connections is appreciated.	Amend criteria f) as follows: "Preserve ~~Conserve~~ and enhance the architectural and historic significance..."	In response to representation and to ensure the criteria better reflects the NPPF.	N/A	Agreed with change.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	640	Yes	No	HCC does not consider that the Transport Assessment work carried out for this site is sufficient to specify the requirement for individual junctions to be provided as a direct result of development. Only where discussions have taken place with the Highways Authority and the scheme been justified would HCC consider it appropriate to name specific junctions.	Amend Clause H to remove references to specific junctions as follows: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A33 Corridor, with appropriate..."	Officers agree that criteria h) should be amended to reflect that improvements will be required to the wider A33 corridor rather than limiting improvements to specific junctions at this stage.	Amend criteria h) as follows: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to ~~Thornhill, Binfields and Crookford junctions and~~ the A33 corridor, with appropriate access to the adjacent site at Redlands, and measures to ensure safe and convenient access for all road-users, including vehicles accessing the adjacent incinerator and sewerage treatment works;	In response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1239	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority does not consider that the transport assessment work carried out for this strategic site is currently sufficient to specify the requirement for an individual junction(s) to be provided as a direct result of this proposed development. Only where further discussions have taken place between the Highways Authority and the Borough Council and the need for schemes been justified and agreed would HCC as Highways Authority consider it to be appropriate to name specific junctions in policy text.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause H of this policy is amended removing references to specific junctions to make this policy sound as follows: H) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A33 corridor, with appropriate access to the adjacent site at Redlands, and measures to ensure safe and convenient access for all road users, including vehicles accessing the adjacent incinerator and sewerage treatment works	Officers agree that criteria h) should be amended to reflect that improvements will be required to the wider A33 corridor rather than limiting improvements to specific junctions at this stage.	Amend criteria h) as follows: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to ~~Thornhill, Binfields and Crookford junctions and~~ the A33 corridor, with appropriate access to the adjacent site at Redlands, and measures to ensure safe and convenient access for all road-users, including vehicles accessing the adjacent incinerator and sewerage treatment works;	In response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.8 - Cufaude Farm	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. I.e. Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure."	Agree with the suggested change.	Insert bullet point to read "Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Agreed with change.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Betty S. Waller	N/A	N/A	212349	554	No	No	Policy SS3.9 should not say 'where possible' if acceptable noise and pollution levels can be met. Homes should not be built, therefore this is neither legally compliant or sound. The selection of this site directly contravenes the Sequential Test regarding flood risk as defined in glossary p. 143, which is national policy. SS3.9 is listed as the highest risk area (Band 8) in the list of selected sites, other sites which are reasonably available namely BAS133 Hounsme Fields (1000 houses) have not been selected yet have a much lower rating. Why not put in Hounsme fields, which would give a greater number or be more sustainable? There are also sites at Tadley at less risk.	I have seen and fully endorse the views of Country Watch. The whole draft document is not sound since the infrastructure has not kept pace with the previous development and is unlikely to do so in the future i.e. transport, water quality in the local rivers. Also there would be ever more pressure on what schools we have, the hospital, doctor's surgeries, dentists etc. It needs vast amount of money to deal with the infrastructure which is unlikely to come from developers. How would any heritage site be preserved? Development should be away from Incinerator. This reduced the Strategic Gap. Contradicts policy EM10.1.E as it reduces options for a major upgrade of the A33 corridor. No further vehicular access should be allowed into Old Basing. It is clear from the IDP that apart from improvements to the Black Dam jct, other enhancements are not funded. Only brownfield sites should be considered until enough money for improvement has been collected.	Agree to delete "where possible" from the policy to ensure the criteria better reflects the NPPF and to ensure consistency with criteria f) of policy SS3.7 (Redlands). See also the response to comment ID: 755 (Thames Water). The policy is considered sound and consistent with the NPPF and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. The council's 'Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test' document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan, 'the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will be met elsewhere in the borough.' Transport, water quality, heritage, noise and odour pollution and coalescence of settlements were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. As part of the work	Amend criteria n) of the policy as follows: "...sewerage treatment works, ensure ~~where possible~~ , acceptable noise and odour standards..."	In response to representation. Also, to ensure the criteria better reflects the NPPF.	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Peter Wilson	N/A	N/A	786114	559	Not Specified	No	Policy SS3.9 makes no reference to the safeguarding of vehicular access to the land east of the site (SHLAA Refs BAS102 and BAS103). This wider area has the potential to form a significant urban extension and has the advantage of being closer to the town's principal employment areas and the town centre than sites that are proposed for development in the south-west of the town (SS3.2 and SS3.11). In the interests of the proper longer term planning of the town such an access route should be safeguarded in the current plan.	An additional criterion should be included in Policy SS3.9 to follow (h), worded as follows: "Safeguard land for the provision of a vehicular route or routes through the site to enable possible future development of the adjoining land to the east".	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. Land (BAS102 and BAS103) to the east of the site have not been allocated in the Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	565	Yes	No	Policy cannot be delivered without an adverse impact on the biodiversity of the Loddon Valley and will not enable the biodiversity opportunities identified in the council's Green Infrastructure Plan to be seized and progressed. Site was scored in the Biodiversity Assessment (2010). It scored the poorest of those sites remaining within the SHLAA. Despite this it has the highest level of proposed housing. The Loddon Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) is directly adjacent to the development area. Concerned that this BOA is not mentioned or considered in any assessments for this site or included within the policy.	The site/ policy should be removed from the Local Plan. Should the proposed site remain an allocation, as a minimum the policy must reflect the biodiversity opportunities together with how the proposed development will protect the Loddon Valley from the adverse impacts this development will create. This should include the provision of open space within the development to offset any adverse recreational impacts to the Loddon Valley. The Loddon Valley BOA should be mentioned/ considered in the policy.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Biodiversity was recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criteria l) of policy SS3.9. Specific reference to the Loddon Valley BOA is not required as development proposals will also need to accord with policies EM4 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) and EM5 (Green Infrastructure). These policies and supporting text, in particular paragraphs 6.21 and 6.35, include further guidance on BOAs.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	616	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particular in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording. Clause g) refers to improving the connection of the site with the existing cycle and pedestrian routes and the Public Right of Way, which can equally apply to connections to the countryside or settlements.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	652	Not Specified	Yes	We support the inclusion of criterion g) to avoid development and points of access within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and that detailed master planning consider the expansion of the floodplain. We also support a buffer zone to the Petty's Brook as part of k).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities	N/A	786489	755	Not Specified	No	Thames Water have concerns regarding the proximity of this site just to the west of Basingstoke Sewage Works (please refer to enclosed site location plan). Thames Water consider that Part n) about odour mitigation needs to be strengthened and not just "where possible". Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to mitigation measures necessary to make developments acceptable in planning terms. Given the proximity of the proposed development to the sewage works, Thames Water consider that the developer will need to fund an odour impact study which establishes whether new residents amenity will be adversely affected. Should the odour assessment conclude that residents amenity would be adversely affected then the developer is likely to have to fund odour mitigation to address this impact.	Either additional text should be added to Policy SS3.9 n) or in a supporting paragraph along the following lines: "When considering sensitive development, such as residential uses, close to a sewage treatment works, a technical assessment should be undertaken by the developer or by the Council. The technical assessment should be undertaken in consultation with Thames Water. The technical assessment should confirm that either: (a) there is no adverse amenity impact on future occupiers of the proposed development or; (b) the development can be conditioned and mitigated to ensure that any potential for adverse amenity impact is avoided.	Agree to delete "where possible" from the policy to ensure the criteria better reflects the NPPF and to ensure consistency with criteria f) of policy SS3.7 (Redlands). The additional supporting text is not required as policy EM12 (Pollution) sufficiently covers this. However, agree to add the words "in consultation with the utility provider" to criteria n) to add clarity.	Amend criteria n) of the policy as follows: "...sewerage treatment works; ensure ~~where possible~~ , acceptable noise and odour standards can be met within homes and amenity areas, to be informed by a comprehensive noise and odour studies <u>(in consultation with the utility provider)</u> ..."	In response to representation. Also, to ensure the criteria better reflects the NPPF and to ensure consistency with criteria f) of policy SS3.7 (Redlands).	N/A	Agreed with change.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Anne Lynch	N/A	N/A	442205	822	Not Specified	No	The evidence base provided for SS3.9 does not support a sound basis for selecting the site. The landscape capacity studies of 2008 and 2010 recommend that the north of Pyotts Hill should not be developed. There should be a clear buffer between the conservation areas along Park Pale and any development. Policy EM1 identifies the Loddon as an area which should be safeguarded. SS3.9 threatens this policy and is unsound. The site is also isolated, as noted in the site assessment, and hence car dependent and unsustainable. The EA and Wildlife Trust have recommended the removal of this site on nature grounds. The SHLAA acknowledges that BDBC have been notified by HCC that they will only make available space for 450 homes during the plan period. Therefore, the entire plan is a risk of being found unsound because the council's own calculated housing need will not be met. TA does not model all junctions affected by the proposed development. IDP does not identify the required funding.	Remove SS3.9 from the plan. Replace the 900 homes with the addition of a new site - Hounsme Fields and additional build rate on Manydown. This has the added benefit of providing additional funding support to enable construction of the Western Relief Road.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure and heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), f), j), k) and l) of the policy. HCC in their representation on policy SS3.9 states "The County Council as a landowner supports the principle of development of East of Basingstoke and has agreed to make land available for approximately 450 dwellings and supporting infrastructure as an initial phase of development during the Plan period to 2029. It acknowledges that the total site has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings, however, the balance would be delivered as a potential later phase beyond the Plan period". The site is available and deliverable for 450 dwellings within the plan period and this change in yield has been reflected in the updated plan. Criteria a) of policy SS3.9 has been amended - see response to HCC comment ID: 1282. Further information on the council's housing land supply/ need can be found in the responses to comments made on policy SS1 and also in the council's Housing Topic Paper. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Appendix A of the IDP indicates funding in relation site SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Philip J Lynch	N/A	N/A	442206	824	No	No	The evidence base provided for SS3.9 does not support a sound basis for selecting the site. The landscape capacity studies of 2008 and 2010 recommend that the north of Pyotts Hill should not be developed. There should be a clear buffer between the conservation areas along Park Pale and any development. Policy EM1 identifies the Loddon as an area which should be safeguarded. SS3.9 threatens this policy and is unsound. The site is also isolated, as noted in the site assessment, and hence car dependent and unsustainable. The EA and Wildlife Trust have recommended the removal of this site on nature grounds. The SHLAA acknowledges that BDBC have been notified by HCC that they will only make available space for 450 homes during the plan period. Therefore, the entire plan is a risk of being found unsound because the council's own calculated housing need will not be met. TA does not model all junctions affected by the proposed development. IDP does not identify the required funding.	Remove SS3.9 from the plan. Replace the 900 homes with the addition of a new site - Hounsorne Fields and additional build rate on Marydown. This has the added benefit of providing additional funding support to enable construction of the Western Relief Road.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure and heritage were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), f), j), k) and l) of the policy. HCC in their representation on policy SS3.9 states: "The County Council as a landowner supports the principle of development of East of Basingstoke and has agreed to make land available for approximately 450 dwellings and supporting infrastructure as an initial phase of development during the Plan period to 2029. It acknowledges that the total site has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings, however, the balance would be delivered as a potential later phase beyond the Plan period". These comments have been reflected in the updated plan. Further information on the council's housing land supply/ need can be found in the responses to comments made on policy SS1 and also in the council's Housing Topic Paper. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and j) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Appendix A of the IDP indicates funding in relation site SS3.9.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Philip J Lynch	N/A	N/A	442206	826	No	No	Cabinet approval, oversight by council committees and full council has been influenced by individuals within the council who were involved in the decision over Marydown that was found by the high court to be not legally valid and therefore sought to ensure that campaign groups and councillors who were instrumental in the judicial review had their land selected for development regardless of the evidence base showing that other sites were preferable i.e. Hounsorne Fields or refusal to accept that the land owner was not offering 900 houses in the plan period. This group applied pressure through providing invalid threat of legal sanction to the Old Basing Cllr Marks that he was required to absent himself from all decisions that were party to SS3.9, BAS121, BAS102 because he owns cottages adj. to BAS102. It could be argued that for Cllr Marks to vote against BAS121 or BAS102 he was defending the value of his property he would also be acting in the best interest of his parish.	Remove SS3.9 from the plan	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Marydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Keith Nuttall	Old Basing Royal British Legion	N/A	173091	827	No	Not Specified	I support the submission by County Watch which suggests that "BAS133 Hounsorne Fields was not in the list of Category 1 potential sites from which the formal selection for allocations was commenced by council members early 2013. The BAS133 Hounsorne Fields sites has many advantageous elements and when compared to the SS3.9 East of Basingstoke site. Deletion of SS3.9 and SS3.7 plus inclusion of site BAS133 Hounsorne Fields would result in a similar size grouping of new growth on the town perimeter of 2000 in the SW to 1860 in the north and east. It is a legal obligation of the council to put forward site scoring the least value and adhere to the NPPF (below 100/101) The council has not followed its legal obligation to adhere to Sequential tests. It makes sense to build in an area which would cause the minimum adverse effect to people and traffic. The area has been purchased for this purpose and is available.	Deletion of SS3.9 and SS3.7 plus inclusion of site BAS133 Hounsorne Fields	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Flood risk was recognised in the site assessment, sustainability appraisal, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test and it has been given due consideration through the site selection process. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly (approximately 80%) in Flood Zone 1. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on the policy. The council's has accorded with the requirements of paragraph 100 and 101 of the NPPF. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and j) in the policy. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Marydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Andrew Bowater	N/A	N/A	786121	843	Not Specified	Not Specified	Has been in talks with the owner of Redlands with regards to access across part of my property to enable access from Redlands to the Sherfield Park roundabout. An in principle deal has been agreed that if planning permission is granted for the development of Redlands in conjunction with the East of Basingstoke then the owners can purchase the necessary land to provide this access. The ability to have access on to the Sherfield Park roundabout on the A33, enables to Estate Road to be provided linking through the site at Redlands and East of Basingstoke and back to the A33 at Whitmarsh Lane. The two development sites can then be delivered in a co-ordinated manner with access on to the A33 in two locations.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	891	No	No	Opposed to development to north and east of the existing urban area. Development (in combination with SS3.9 and SS3.7) would increase traffic congestion, impact the landscape and add more pressure Chineham Centre. Parts of site within flood risk areas. Flood mitigation works could impact landscape. The need is for more wet meadows to act as sponges for water, not the destruction of existing. Development could cause irreversible changes to biodiversity such as the Wildmoor reedbeds. Changes to the character of an EU recognised important salmonid river and its landscape in the face of past Environment Agency objections seems perverse. Problematical to build housing bordering on a waste incineration plant and an overloaded sewage works without identifying amelioration before releasing the sites. Criteria h) and n) need further explanation to explain how they will be achieved. Development of this site will restrict options for any future upgrade to the A33 to a dual carriageway.	To remove this site from the Local Plan as it is unsuitable for development and make an additional allocation on SS3.10 Marydown. Misleading to call this site East of Basingstoke- It is east of Chineham and north of Lychpit and Old Basing.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape, capacity of existing services/ facilities, flood risk, biodiversity, water quality and noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion c), d), f), k), l) and n). Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. The odour assessment should be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs H Lytle	N/A	N/A	640699	900	Yes	No	There are considerable health risks to mothers who are pregnant with an unborn child if they live near facilities such as Chineham Incinerator and Thames Water Sewage Treatment Plant, and I am horrified to think that this council lead by Councillor Sanders and your Planning Department could even consider building houses near this works.	I hope that BDBC will delete Policy SS3.9 and BAS121 from the Local Plan. The council should choose any one of the other reserve sites or increase the number of houses on BAS098 (SS3.10) Manydown to make up the shortage of housing required because of its deletion.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Noise and odour pollution were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour assessment is to be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water on these matters. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water. The Chineham Incinerator is regulated under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime. The regulator is the Environment Agency (EA). It requires installations to have a permit containing emission limit values (ELVs) and other conditions. The ELV's are set at a level to protect human health and to minimise environmental impact. There is stringent continuous monitoring requirements for stack emissions and also regular monitoring of other pollutants. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Nigel Bell	N/A	N/A	316285	905	Yes	No	Tranquillity is all too easily lost. Were SS3.9 and SS3.7 to be allowed to proceed they would result in just a little more noise, a little more pollution, this cumulatively contributes to the erosion and loss of tranquillity. These aspects primarily affect people's lives especially when enjoying the Valley's tranquillity. However, it is the domestic animals, the dogs and cats, associated with development, that will damage the tranquillity of the Valley for wildlife.	Delete SS3.9 and SS3.7 from the Plan. If land is required to replace these sites for housing, it would be appropriate to further investigate land broadly west of Basingstoke, without in any way infringing the integrity of Oakley. The land immediately to the West of Basingstoke in undoubtedly part of the landscape, but it is not unique, it lacks a river valley, it lacks variety in its soil, it lacks ready access, and while it is a small part of the chalk downland it should be stressed that Basingstoke possesses many hundreds of acres of such countryside, from the Hannington area west to the land approaching Andover. Any greenfield development there will not (or should not) affect the Test Valley - also one of Basingstoke's gems.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	940	Not Specified	Not Specified	Churches / Places of Worship. No specific provision for space for any new churches in the largest 3 new estates (unless part of a 'community centre').	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Criterion c) covers all social infrastructure which could include a place of worship. The need for such a facility should be considered further through the masterplanning process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	1042	Yes	No	The site is large and in the open countryside. It is difficult to accept how the site can be justified or defended. Approval of this site would undoubtedly create a precedent to attract more development proposals further south and east across the River Loddon to the A30. The development would eliminate Park Place Ancient Monument with the attendant disturbance and potential pollution at such a critical location. Exacerbation of pollution for additional development near the Sewage Treatment Works. Concern that the roads will not be able to cope, there will be additional congestion. The site is in direct contravention with the NPPF flood risk sequential test, when there are other sites available which are at a lower risk of flooding. Please see attachment for further information.	SOL PC believes that both SS3.7 and SS3.9 are insecurely located and should be deleted as they are unsound. The PC believes that Hounsme Fields (BAS133) would be a better, alternative choice for development.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Open countryside, landscape, biodiversity, heritage, pollution and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), f), g), k), n) of the policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. The council's 'Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test' document, which was developed in discussion with the Environment Agency, states that the site is not as significantly constrained as other Category 1 sites. The fact that this site is at higher risk of flooding than other Category 1 sites would not justify alternative sites (at lower flood risk) being allocated. This is because site BAS121 has fewer overall planning constraints than other sequentially preferable sites. Also, the potentially negative flood risk impacts identified in the site assessment work can satisfactorily be addressed through mitigation measures. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. An odour assessment needs to be carried out to	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1124	Yes	No	Landscape Capacity studies (2008 and 2010) recommended that SS3.9 should not be developed. Development threatens EM1. Parts of SS3.9 (& SS3.7) suffer from foul odour and unpleasant fumes from the Incinerator and Sewage Works. Sites do not comply with Policy EM12. SS3.9 will not protect the biodiversity value of the Loddon Valley and will not comply with the NERC Act or NPPF. Site is close to the boundary of the Biodiversity Project Area (BPA). Site will play an important function in supporting valued habitats of the BPA. Site will compromise proposals for Green Infrastructure. The boundary of the proposed site is not justified. Policy undermines the Local Plan vision. In contrast, the Landscape Capacity Study indicates that small scale development could be possible on Hounsme Fields(BAS133). Strategic Biodiversity Assessment concluded that Hounsme Fields had few ecological constraints to development. For previous views from other organisations on SS3.9 see full representation.	Delete SS3.9 and SS3.7. Alternative to SS3.9 and SS3.7 have been identified in our other submissions. They are:- Hounsme Fields - Apply the Flooding Sequential Test. Additional housing on Manydown - Include Scrapps Farm and the Worting sites. Increase the annual build rate to 350/hpa. Include a windfall allowance for Tadley. Site assessment [Volume 1, January 2013] for Site BAS121, which is the basis of the draft local plan SS3.9, does not accord with the area of SS3.9 on the draft local plan map 1b. SS3.9 is in fact constructed partly from the BAS102 from the site assessment. This inconsistency means that the evidence base is not complete and coherent. This must be clarified. In the event that SS3.9 is developed it must include a requirement to preclude any and all vehicular access via Pyotts Hill.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure, heritage, pollution and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), f), j), g), k), l) and n) of the policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and i) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. An 'Odour Study for land near Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works' (May 2011) produced on behalf of HCC accompanied HCC's representations on policy SS3.9 of the Pre Submission Local Plan consultation. HCC anticipate that a second Odour Study will be made available to the Borough Council before the Local Plan is submitted. This second Odour Study will provide a further clarification of the impact of any odour emissions from the STW, and will be based on detailed source sampling and reflect recent investment works at the STW. The odour	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1167	Not Specified	No	The NPPF outlines that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the planning system. On the basis that the housing policies within the Local Plan do not meet the Borough's identified housing needs and are therefore considered out-of-date against the NPPF, we have considered the Lodge Farm site and Poors Farms sites for policy compliance against the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development and the relevant policies of the emerging Local Plan. The level of planned housing growth within the Local Plan is significantly too low to deliver the Borough's economic growth objectives or policies. To address the significant housing supply shortfall identified we are of the view that there are two potential growth scenario options to achieve a more comprehensive sustainable urban extension to the east of Basingstoke. See full response attached	An assessment against all of the relevant policies of the NPPF and the emerging Local Plan provides a clear demonstration that development under Scenario One or Scenario Two would constitute sustainable development which meets the identified needs for sustainable development within the Borough. Development under both Growth Options would have significant environmental, social and economic benefits which far outweigh any impacts resulting from development. In accordance with the emphasis placed by the NPPF on the achievement of sustainable development a comprehensive urban extension to the east of Basingstoke, comprising either Scenario One or Scenario Two, should be allocated within the Local Plan to address the significant housing supply shortfall. The WSP report shows how a comprehensive sustainable urban extension to the east of Basingstoke could be created through allocating the Lodge Farm site and Poors Farm site with the East of Basingstoke (Policy SS3.9 site).	The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. Lodge Farm and Poors Farm are not required to ensure the borough's housing requirements are met. The sites allocated in the Local Plan have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1204	Yes	No	SS3.9 + SS3.7 should be deleted. An alternative and better choice for a similar number of dwellings would be BAS 133 Hounsme Fields. See full representation for a list of advantages of BAS133, as compared to the disadvantages of the SS3.9. The boundary of the proposed site is not justified. Policy undermines the Green Infrastructure Strategy, Landscape Capacity Study and will not protect heritage assets. Development of the site will eliminate existing green infrastructure. Potential for increase in pollution. In principle SS3.9+SS3.7 conflict with para 1.23, para 2.5 (bullet points 5.9,10,11,12) and para. 2.6 (bullet points 8,15,21,23,25). Parts of SS3.9 (and SS3.7) suffer from foul odour and unpleasant fumes from the Incinerator and Sewage Works. Sites do not comply with Policy EM12, footnotes 23, 24, 25 and paras 6.92/6.93. SS3.9 neither includes a requirement to close existing vehicle access to Pyotts Hill, or to preclude any new vehicular accesses to Pyotts Hill.	Delete Policy SS3.9 and consequentially Policy SS3.7.Approval of this site, with or without SS3.7, would create a precedent to attract more development proposals further South and East across the river Loddon to the A30. Delete sites SS3.9 and SS3.7 from Policy Map 1b. Include new Policy SS3.12 Hounsme Fields. Include new site SS3.12 Hounsme Fields on Policy Map 1c. If policy SS3.9 remains in the Local Plan then: 1. Include a requirement in Policy SS3.9 to permanently preclude any and all vehicular traffic from site SS3.9 accessing Pyotts Hill. 2. In Policy SS3.9 and Policy Map 1b delete all of the site north of Whitmarsh Lane, and consequently reduce the overall number of 900 dwellings. 3. Delete consequently site SS3.7 and from Policy Map 1b	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure, heritage, pollution and flood risk were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. These matters are covered by criterion d), f), j), g), k), l) and n) of the policy. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network, including the A33, and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criterion h and j) in the policy. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it is predominantly Flood Zone 1. Matters relating to flood risk are covered by criteria g) of the policy which requires the avoidance of development within flood zones 2 and 3 and also that masterplanning considers scope for the expansion of the flood plain. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this policy. Policy SS3.9 contains specific criteria f) in light of the nearby incinerator and sewage treatment works to ensure acceptable noise and odour standards can be met. Good site layout and the use of buffer zones may help overcome any odour/noise issues. The odour assessment should be carried out in accordance with the criteria submitted by Thames Water. The council has worked and will continue to work closely with Thames Water. Development proposals will also need to accord with policy EM12 (Pollution) of the Local Plan. Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding, partially superseded with updated representation.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1226	Yes	No	Policy Map 1b: To tally with Policy title SS3.9 'East of Basingstoke' and in other texts.	Policy Map 1b. Replace title 'Basingstoke Town East and Chineham' with 'East of Basingstoke and Chineham' to tally with Policy title SS3.9 'East of Basingstoke' and in other texts.	Map 1b defines sites in the east of Basingstoke Town and Chineham area. The title for the map is correct.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1283	Yes	No	A number of clauses appear unjustified or paraphrase other policies and for internal consistency it is requested that these are amended or deleted: Clause (b) - very specific forms of housing are referenced, including self-build housing and pitch / plot provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS). No need for plots or pitches after 2017 is identified in the local planning authority's (LPA) Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Whilst there may be a need for further sites beyond 2017, keen to discuss with the LPA the most effective means of allocating and delivering suitable sites. Whilst keen to explore the potential of self-build for an element of housing delivery, this is too specific a requirement for a site policy. Not yet seen any substantive evidence to justify the necessity. If there is evidence to support, self-build may best be delivered by having a self-contained housing policy to deal with tenure and exemption from CIL payments.	Clause (b) - delete reference to self-build and include a reference to self-build in Policy EN3, if justified Clause (b) delete reference to Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and address these housing needs in a separate Borough-wide policy or policies	The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them. The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	The objection to "self-build" is withdrawn, though the remaining comments and objection still stand. However, HCC no longer wish to speak at the EIP.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1285	Yes	No	A number of clauses appear unjustified or paraphrase other draft Local Plan policies and for internal consistency it is requested that these are amended or deleted: Clause (l) - this paraphrases draft Policy EM4 and adds nothing to the policy. Representation includes Technical Appendices (which are available on request).	Clause (l) - delete.	Given the biodiversity issues identified in the site assessment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1286	Yes	No	A number of clauses appear unjustified or paraphrase other draft Local Plan policies and for internal consistency it is requested that these are amended or deleted: Clause (m) - use of low carbon and renewable technologies is supported but it is too early and difficult to define the most effective and viable approach to meeting the relevant targets for Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulations on site. The clause is premature in advance of more detailed evidence studies. Representation includes Technical Appendices (which are available on request).	Clause (m) - delete.	It is considered to be important to retain criteria m) to ensure that this issue is considered from the outset, in bringing forward development on this site. It is expected that further consideration will be given to this issue through the masterplanning of the site.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria n) as follows: "... ~~sewerage~~ <u>sewage</u> treatment works...".	To amend typographical error.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria n) as follows: "... ~~sewerage~~ <u>sewage</u> treatment works...within homes and amenity areas, ~~to be informed by a~~ <u>through the avoidance of noise sensitive areas and the preparation</u> of comprehensive noise and odour studies".	To ensure consistency with wording in criteria f) of policy SS3.7. Also to amend typographical error.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1287	Yes	No	Delivery period - given the single ownership of the site and direct access from the A33, housing could realistically be delivered within the first five years of the Plan rather than 2019/20 as indicated in the draft site policy for this site. Restricting timing as suggested in the draft policy is likely to be ineffective in ensuring a steady supply of new homes during the Plan period and could result in the backloading of housing delivery, particularly since large scale growth at Marydown is likely to come forward later in the Plan period. An accompanying supporting submission report demonstrates the capacity of the site and masterplan options to achieve the development as part of a phased approach. Representation includes Technical Appendices (which are available on request).	Delivery period - replace "2019/20" with "2017/18".	Amend the phasing as per the suggestion made by the land owner.	Amend last paragraph of the policy as follows: "Development on site will deliver homes and infrastructure in the period ~~2019/20~~ <u>2017/18</u> to ~~2028/29~~ <u>2024/25</u> . The phasing in policy SS3 for the site will also be amended accordingly.	In response to representation.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.9 - East of Basingstoke	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Add to last paragraph "The site boundary as defined on the policies map has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings. A potential later phase for 450 dwellings may be delivered beyond the Plan period".	For clarity	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Robert Frankland	N/A	N/A	784004	77	Yes	No	SS3.10 section m is not specific enough to protect the traffic management within and approaching Oakley along Pack Lane. There needs to be a specific understanding of the impact of the proposed manydown development on the increase of traffic in both directions along Pack Lane. There needs to be specific mention of mitigation measures for the one way width restriction imposed by the Battledown railway bridges and specific mention for the improvement of the Pack Lane/Fox Lane junction in Oakley. Hampshire County Council have already studied this junction with regards to an upgrade to a compact roundabout solution which is currently on hold due to funding justification.	In section SS3.10 para m add after Pack Lane "in particular the width restriction imposed by the Battledown railway bridges and congestion at the Pack Lane/Fox Lane junction in Oakley".	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. The suggested change is overly detailed for the Local Plan and such matters will be considered through the masterplanning exercise and ultimately the development management process. This approach is in line with representations received from HCC as local highway authority.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	945	Yes	No	SS3.10 clause a Clause (a) is supported in principle and recognises that Manydown can fulfill a significant contribution to the housing supply for the Borough over the Plan period, in a sustainable location which can support the economic growth and community needs of Basingstoke town and the wider sub-region. Evidence from the study prepared by Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd ("Tibbalds") in 2012 for the landowners and the URS masterplanning work illustrate the potential capacity of the site as being at least 3,080 dwellings plus supporting infrastructure in the Local Plan period to 2029, in addition to land in and around Worting which is owned by a number of third parties.	Recommended changes to the draft policy and proposals map will reduce the overall greenfield land requirement and create the basis for a sustainable, unified development, whilst allowing adequate flexibility to respond to detailed masterplanning options and known constraints. The allocation includes land in and around Worting estate owned by a number of third parties, which may have capacity for additional dwellings during the Plan period to 2029. To be positively prepared and flexible, the landowners request that the reference relating to 'approximately 3,080 dwellings' is replaced with "at least 3,080 dwellings".	In light of further evidence, including further masterplanning work , it is agreed that the capacity be increased.	Update criteria a) as follows: Provide for the phased delivery of approximately ~~3,400~~ ~~2,999~~ dwellings;	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Victoria Pini	N/A	N/A	432593	91	No	No	Why is this site not being used more effectively for the purpose for which it was purchased? Why so few houses and with development planned so far into the future? Using this site - earmarked for housing development from the date of purchase - would alleviate the pressure on other smaller greenfield sites around the Basingstoke district and surrounding parishes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can be delivered on a site in any given year, it would not be a sound approach to focus development only at Manydown. The spatial strategy proposed in the Local Plan seeks to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision over the whole of the plan period. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Simon Pini	N/A	N/A	784179	99	No	No	Why is this site not being used more effectively for the purpose for which it was purchased? Why so few houses and with development planned so far into the future? Using this site - earmarked for housing development from the date of purchase - would alleviate the pressure on other smaller greenfield sites around the Basingstoke district and surrounding parishes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to focus development only at Manydown. The spatial strategy proposed in the Local Plan seeks to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision over the whole of the plan period. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	958	Yes	No	Clause d) Local Education Authority assessment has identified the need for two primary schools for Manydown, plus a safeguarded site for a secondary school, in advance of a more detailed review of secondary education provision in the west of Basingstoke. Clause (d) is currently unsound because there is no justification for the phased provision of a secondary school for a development of this size. The wording is also inconsistent with the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Options available to the local education authority include the provision of a new secondary school at Manydown, or the expansion of existing secondary schools within the Basingstoke settlement boundary, or both, subject to demography and timescales. The landowners are happy to commit to offering land for a secondary school and contributions towards secondary school places, in advance of an agreed education strategy for the west of Basingstoke.	reword to: " make sufficient land available for the phased provision of two primary schools (a two form entry and a three form entry) and safeguarding for a secondary school site, if required " .	Amend criteria d) in response to representation although changed slightly to make consistent with other policies . Also reflects further discussions with the Local Education Authority.	Update criteria d) as follows: <u>Make sufficient Reserve land available</u> for the phased provision of two primary schools (a two form entry and a three form entry) and <u>also reserve land for</u> the phased provision of a secondary school, <u>when if</u> required;	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	960	Yes	No	Clause e) A substantial proportion of the site will accommodate green infrastructure requirements to Borough Council standards. The requirement to "take account of local deficits" is however unjustified in relation to the needs of the development. The landowners are committed to fully engaging with adjacent communities, service providers and other groups in the detail of green infrastructure provision and will consider the interrelationships with existing needs as appropriate.	delete reference to "take account of local deficits".	Agree to remove this statement as this is unjustified in terms of the needs of the development	Update criteria e) as follows: Include appropriate green space/green infrastructure, including allotments, to meet local needs ~~and to take account of local deficits~~ in line with the council's	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	961	Yes	No	Clause f Mechanisms for delivery of the Country Park are unclear within the site policy, the proposals map, and the IDP, which forms the basis for objection. SS3.10 does not generate the need for a Country Park in its own right and the policy wording "to make provision for a Country Park" is therefore unjustified. The land is however available for this purpose and the landowners can make a significant contribution towards its implementation and future management, particularly in light of the council's statutory duties as open space authority and the County Council's experience in successfully creating and managing country parks across Hampshire. Maintaining the Country Park boundary outside of the 3.10 allocation boundary is the correct approach for soundness, however the policy wording should be amended to make clear that developer contributions towards the Country Park are required from the Manydown development and other developments within the Borough.	Suggested modification: amend clause (f) to delete "provision for" and replace with " contributions towards", specify the Country Park within the IDP and future CIL Regulation 123 list. Introduce a new Local Plan policy for the Manydown Country Park to include the following: "Manydown Country Park will become a major green infrastructure asset of up 100 hectares in area to serve Basingstoke and the surrounding area. It will be a multi-functional space for informal recreation, play, nature conservation, education and land management, with ancillary uses including visitor parking and facilities. A masterplan shall be prepared and approved in advance of implementation and it will be funded through developer contributions and CIL. Connections to surrounding areas, using existing public rights of way and new links via Manydown, should ensure safe and convenient accessibility by walking and cycling."	Agree to update criteria f) to reflect the comments made and also update the IDP accordingly. A separate policy on the countrypark is not considered necessary although additional wording has been added to EM5 (Green Infrastructure) along the lines suggested. The boundaries on Map1 have also been updated to reflect more detailed masterplanning and new information.	Update criteria f) as follows: Make ~~provision for~~ <u>contributions towards</u> a country park, as identified on the Policies Map, which is accessible to existing nearby residential areas; and	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Jeremy Fareilly	Wates Development Ltd	Genesis Town Planning	787807	709	Not Specified	No	Policy Map 1a The designation "Area within which Masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints" appears to be based on the SA 2013, SHLAA and earlier site assessments. The assessment of the Worting parcels appears to have been carried out in isolation and not as one comprehensive large scale development. A wider comprehensive assessment of all the land now shown as part of the Manydown Site Allocation could have generated different scores for the various Parcel 3 sites that now form part of the Masterplan area. The potential effects of the development on the heritage and landscape constraints for the whole area shown will be carried out at the detailed Masterplan stage. Until that stage all land within the proposed SPB should be treated equally. Worting could include an extension of the existing Worting Business Park and the development of between 350 and 500 dwellings, to provide a vibrant, mixed-use community.	The area annotated as "Area within which Masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints" should be re-annotated as "Area within which Masterplanning will take place".	Given the masterplanning work that has been completed it is agreed that criteria g be deleted from the policy	Delete criteria g as follows: ~~g) Limit development within the parts of the allocated area highlighted as having additional constraints to ensure compliance with other criteria in this policy;~~	Response to representations	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	965	Yes	No	Clause (g) refers to the draft proposals map for Policy SS3.10 and includes restrictions on a significant area of land around Worting Road and Worting. The reasons for the clause are unclear but appear to stem from concerns regarding the relationship of the development to Worting conservation area and the landscape. The council's landscape capacity study (2010) identifies the Oakley/Steventon Down landscape character area as having "low capacity" for development and the Enclosed Worting Mixed Farmland as having "medium capacity". Other land within the allocation is identified as having "medium capacity". The landowners are confident that a sensitive approach to the countryside edge and the relationship to Worting conservation area can be addressed through detailed masterplanning and consideration of layout, scale, character and landscape strategy. A blanket restriction on development will not be effective, is not justified and would prejudice the creation of a sustainable community.	Suggested modification: delete clause (g) and amend the proposals map accordingly to include the western boundaries of parcels 4 and 5 from the Tibbalds report; identify the Worting Conservation Area on the proposals map.	Agree that criteria g should be removed and the policies map updated to remove the designation.	Delete criteria g) as follows, ~~Limit development within the parts of the allocated area highlighted as having 'additional constraints' to ensure compliance with other criteria in this policy;~~ and update the policies map to remove this designation.	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	456	Yes	No	The proposed development of 3080 homes over 333ha is within the "setting" of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Therefore, there is the potential from this development to result in harm to the nationally protected landscape. The type of harm is contained within the North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on setting. Issues in relation to paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF are therefore relevant.	Policy should be amended to state: The impact on the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB should be fully assessed, including a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment. The setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB should be conserved and enhanced. Appropriate CIL/ Section 106 payments should be secured to off set the likely level of harm to the AONB. Appropriate CIL/ Section 106 payments should be secured to make provision for the green infrastructure linkages into the AONB. The proposed country park should not be urban in nature. It should retain the rural/ agricultural quality of the landscape.	Agreed that a reference to the AONB is added to the relevant criteria. Policy EM1 (Landscape) provides further details	Criteria h) (now g) updated as follows: Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape, <u>including the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u> , and also the setting and form of existing development.	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1264	Yes	No	Allocation SS3.10 is less than 1km from the AONB. There is no reference to the AONB in the policy. There does not appear to be any clear evidence that this allocation will not result in a negative impact on the AONB, and hence the policy is not consistent with NPPF para 117. Whilst we imagine that the allocation would not be fundamentally unacceptable, any residual landscape impacts on the AONB should be compensated for.	Adding " After mitigation, compensate through offsite measures any residual landscape impacts on the AONB. " would make this clear. The same issue and policy solution applies to policies SS3.6 and SS3.10.	Agreed that a reference to the AONB is added to the relevant criteria. Policy EM1 (Landscape) provides further details.	Update criteria (now g) as follows: Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape, <u>including the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u> , and also the setting and form of existing development.	Response to representation	N/A	Agree with change. However, the residual impact comment still remains outstanding.
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	548	Yes	No	The site at Manydown is a rich multi-period landscape containing a number of important cropmark sites of later pre-historic and Romano-British date, some of which are scheduled, and one Grade II* and eight Grade II buildings at Worting Park and Worting Park Conservation area. EH therefore welcomes and supports in principle, requirements i), j) and k) of Policy SS3.10. However, initial discussions have outlined the need for an initial programme of field evaluation to determine levels of below-ground survival and whether at least some of the non-scheduled remains are of national importance. In principle, all scheduled remains and non-scheduled remains of national importance should be conserved as undeveloped areas within the overall development. Policy SS3.10 should therefore explicitly recognise this potential constraint and requirement k) should be strengthened in order to provide the necessary level of protection as required by the NPPF.	EH suggest an additional sentence at the start of the Policy:"The exact areas suitable for development will be subject to further detailed assessment, particularly of the location, survival, and significance of the archaeological remains on the site. In principle, all scheduled remains and non-scheduled remains of national importance should be conserved as undeveloped areas within the overall development." Requirement k) should be redrafted as "be subject to an initial programme of field evaluation to identify the location, survival and significance of the archaeological remain on the site and provide for the retention (as undeveloped land) and careful management of any important archaeological remains and the recording of any other remains to be lost" (also see comments on EM11). Would prefer "conserve" to "preserve" as this terminology better reflects that of the NPPF.	Clause k) has been amended in order to make reference to need to retain important archaeological remains, in accordance with the presumption of achieving preservation in situ of archaeological sites. Whilst the comments from English Heritage concerning the need for a field evaluation and recording of findings are valid, it is considered that these points are adequately addressed by the amended version of policy EM11 (in particular the amendments to the supporting text) and consequently those requirements are already secured through that policy and do no need to be included in this site specific policy. It is recommended to substitute 'preserve' with 'conserve' in clauses i) and j).	'Preserve' and 'preserving' in the relevant criteria (now h) and i) has been substituted for 'conserve' and 'conserving' in line with the recommendation of English Heritage. Criteria k (now j), new reads as follows <u>Provide for the careful management of any important archaeological remains, including the Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Provide for the retention and careful management of any important archaeological remains, within and adjacent to the site, in a manner appropriate to their significance;</u>	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	986	Yes	No	Clause n) The Parsons Brinkerhoff transport assessment (August 2013) of the Pre-Submission Local Plan does not identify a need for a western bypass or a dual carriageway to serve the town or the Manydown development to 2029, and their inclusion within a site policy is therefore unjustified. A bypass is not referred to in the current Local Transport Plan 2011-2031, adopted in 2013, and the environmental impacts have not been assessed. Moreover, any potential need to safeguard for a dual carriageway by-pass through the northern and north eastern parts of the Manydown site will substantially affect the amount of houses that can be delivered in the Plan period, have serious viability implications for the project and have severance impacts through the new community at Manydown. It would not therefore be sound to include reference to a dual carriageway or bypass in Policy SS3.10.	Suggested modification: Reword to " Include the provision of a frontage link road between the A339 and B3400 and ensure that the ability to connect it to a link road to the south, beyond the Plan period, is not prejudiced. Regard shall be had to the optimum location for crossing the railway line and safeguarding land in its ownership for a future crossing of the railway line. "	It is considered to be important to retain a criteria in the policy to provide a new road between the A339 and B3400 and enabling this road to be extended to the south in the future. Officers agree with the suggested changes with some amendments.	Criteria n (now m) updated to state: <u>Include the provision of a road through the land allocated for housing, from the A339 to the B3400, linking the proposed housing to the existing communities and to provide the ability to connect to potential future sites to the south, with the location of the road being determined through the master planning process. Regard shall be had to the optimum location for this road to cross the railway line(s).</u> The following has been deleted: ~~Include the provision of a link road and reserve land for a new dual carriageway if required, between the A339 and the B3400 and ensure that the ability to connect it to a link road to the south, beyond the plan period, is not prejudiced and regard shall be had to the best location for crossing the railway line(s). The road shall be planned as a western by-pass for Basingstoke;~~	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1158	No	No	We can find no clear justification or need identified for a Western Bypass or Western Link road. The plan contains analysis of the transport pressures on existing roads and it is noted that the western section of the present ring road is the least used part of the dual carriageway section of the ring road. The road proposal appears most odd, in that elsewhere and historically, any road into a new development is funded and considered within the scope of that development. Here we have the proposal for Manydown put forward in the housing section, strangely free from the burden of this infrastructure while the road into and a key part of the proposed development is considered and funded separately. The only reason a western bypass would be needed would be to provide suitable access to the southern part of the Manydown land to enable future development.	The western link road and the western bypass should both be completely removed from the plan. There is no justification for the roads. The process in which the western Bypass and Western Link road has been put forward by the Authority in its role as the planning authority should be thoroughly investigated.	The link road required in the Local Plan period will be provided as on site infrastructure and will be required to serve the Manydown development. Its delivery is likely to be secured as part of any planning permission for the site. The specific reference to the bypass has been removed and the criteria updated.	Criteria n (now m) updated to state: <u>Include the provision of a road through the land allocated for housing, from the A339 to the B3400, linking the proposed housing to the existing communities and to provide the ability to connect to potential future sites to the south, with the location of the road being determined through the master planning process. Regard shall be had to the optimum location for this road to cross the railway line(s)</u>	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1162	No	No	The proposal to build the access to the new Manydown development in the form of a link road connecting the B3400 to the Newbury Road roundabout and restricting the existing use of Roman Road will naturally encourage through-traffic to use the new road. This significant volume of traffic will be passing along a road that is planned to be fronted by housing. It would appear that this is a plan to build a development and road of a character that is being discouraged elsewhere. The dual use of the road as an access for Manydown and a link road taking through-traffic along this same access road will blight the development and is simply a poor proposal. If the development used a traditional, simple access road, such road would be far narrower and would be suitable for traffic calming that could not be used on a through route. The principle of a spine road serving the development that is then also serving as a western bypass is unsound.	The proposal as a whole for both the Link Road and the proposed changes to the existing road network should be thoroughly re-assessed and we believe such proposals to be unacceptable in the form as presented in the plan. With no suitable road infrastructure available the Manydown proposal should be removed from the plan.	At this stage the form of the link road is yet to be determined and this will be considered through the development of a masterplan for the Manydown development. The policy at this stage established the need for a route through the development linking the B3400 and the A339. References to the roman road have been amended in the light of other comments received through the public consultation.	Criteria n (now m) updated to state: <u>Include the provision of a road through the land allocated for housing, from the A339 to the B3400, linking the proposed housing to the existing communities and to provide the ability to connect to potential future sites to the south, with the location of the road being determined through the master planning process. Regard shall be had to the optimum location for this road to cross the railway line(s)</u>	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	989	Yes	No	Clause p) - These issues are covered by clauses (j) and (m).	Suggested modification: delete clause (p) and include reference to connections to and from the Country Park in clause (j).	It is considered to be important to retain parts of criteria P in the policy in order to ensure that specific consideration is given to the impacts of development on Roman Road / Roman Way. Criteria n has been updated to include the relevant references.	Criteria n) (now m) has been updated as follows: <u>"Provide vehicular access to and from the site with the implementation of appropriate traffic management measures to prevent rat-running through existing communities. In addition, there should be safe and convenient access from Winklebury by means of footpaths and cycle paths connecting to the Country Park.</u> Old criteria p has been deleted: <u>Minimise vehicular access to and from the new development via Roman Road and Roman Way. Winklebury in order to prevent rat-running.</u> There should be access from Winklebury by means of footpaths and cycle paths connecting in particular to the Country Park.	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Leek	BDBC	N/A	419994	108	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	I spoke at Council when we approved the draft Local Plan and said that I hoped the new development at Manydown would be integrated fully with the existing Town and not seen as an isolated development. I suggested that clause p) of the Manydown policy needed amendment to achieve that. I still hold that view and would like it to be registered as part of the current consultation. I happy to incorporate your suggested amendment to clause p), as set out below, as my suggested amendment!	Officers consider that the policy should be revised to be less prescriptive on the access options that can be used for vehicular traffic and agree that the site should not be seen as an isolated form of development. It is considered that mitigation measures on the local highway network could successfully protect the access and amenity of existing residents.	Amend criteria (now criteria n) to state <u>"Provide vehicular access to and from the site with the implementation of appropriate traffic management measures to prevent rat-running through existing communities. In addition, there should be safe and convenient access from Winklebury by means of footpaths and cycle paths connecting to the Country Park."</u>	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	695	No	No	Late changes to this policy most notably to include development land in 'strategic gaps' and make provision for a dual carriageway/link road will have the effect of preventing development at the level indicated. This would make development either unviable or reduce the level of provision, requiring the inclusion of other greenfield sites in the plan. I understand that the members of the Manydown Executive Committee along with HCC have raised an objection to point this rather obvious fact out. The late changes to isolate this development from Winklebury are unhelpful and inappropriate.	Remove (m,n,o and p).	The Local Planning Authority is continuing to engage with the landowners of this site to ensure that it can be delivered in the most effective way. This includes both the access arrangements and the form and location of any link road. Officers consider that the policy should be revised to be less prescriptive on the access options that can be used for vehicular traffic and agree that the site should not be seen as an isolated form of development. It is considered that mitigation measures on the local highway network could successfully protect the access and amenity of existing residents. Criteria p) has been amended.	Amend criteria (now n) to state <u>"Provide vehicular access to and from the site with the implementation of appropriate traffic management measures to prevent rat-running through existing communities. In addition, there should be safe and convenient access from Winklebury by means of footpaths and cycle paths connecting to the Country Park."</u>	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	987	Yes	No	Clause o) Similar to clause (n), the reference to a bypass and dual carriageway are unjustified at the present time. Additionally, the Manydown estate does not extend to M3 Junction 7, meaning the safeguarding policy is potentially undeliverable. There is no funding or business case identified and therefore the Plan is unsound in its current form. The landowners are however willing to safeguard land where a need has been demonstrated.	Suggested modification: delete clause (o), assuming that amendments to clause (n) are accepted.	Agreed that criteria o) should be deleted in light of the updates to criteria n)	Amend criteria as follows "In undertaking the master planning process, regard shall be had to the potential requirement for a Basingstoke western by-pass that would link the A339 to Junction 7 of the M3 Motorway. Such a western by-pass would be outside of the land currently allocated for housing but the master planning process should have regard to the optimum point for such a western by-pass to cross the railway line(s) without prejudicing the delivery of the current proposed housing or the construction of the road connecting that housing".	Officers recommended a change in response to the representation received. This wording was then subsequently changed at Cabinet by Cllrs and then finally agreed at Full Council.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Sam Weller	N/A	N/A	784523	138	Yes	No	Oakley has recently been identified beyond reasonable doubt by internationally renowned linguist Professor Richard Coates (University of the West of England) as the site of the Battle of Oakley in AD851, which was the pivotal event that led to the formation of the nation of England. The "Oakley" in question had previously been disputed by historians. It is possible the actual battle took place in the area around Battledown Farm, which may get its name from the Old English word for battle, "beadu". The Manydown housing proposal would see this site buried under housing. Although the Plan document states archaeological considerations will be taken into account in developments, the inclusion of such a potentially nationally important site as one for possible housing is, I believe, contrary to policy EM11 - The Historic Environment.	A complete and thorough archaeological evaluation and examination of the whole Battledown area should be undertaken BEFORE it is considered for inclusion in the housing allocation. If it could be proved to be the battle site, there might be economic benefits for the Borough from tourism, as there are at other major battle sites in the UK.	The heritage assets present on the Manydown land were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. As development is focused to the north of Pack Lane the impact on the land around Battledown Farm will be minimised. Criteria k) ensures the careful management of important archeological remains within and adjacent to the site. The area around Battledown Farm is not included within the proposed allocation.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	184	Yes	No	In SS3.10 a) I believe the total of 3080 homes in the plan period is unambitious and is driven by an arbitrary definition of the western boundary of the development area that is not justified by the topography of the land. I also believe that the case for reserving land for a dual carriageway (SS3.10 n) is unnecessary and undesirable. A western bypass will sever the new communities and encourage travel by car in direct contrast with aim of creating a "connected" and "environmentally responsible" community.	Increase the housing number, amend the western boundary and remove the requirement for the link road to be a dual carriageway western bypass.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. However, the phasing of the site has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The western boundary of the site has been redrawn to encompass a wider area as suggested. Reserving land for a new link road will ensure the proper planning of the area, enabling the delivery of the road in the future if considered necessary. This would not be at the expense of the development of a connected and environmentally responsible community.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	231	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Manydown and the land to the west of Basingstoke presents problems with traffic on Pack Lane and Worting Road. The plan should include a new station at Worting or East Oakley, and/or upgrading Worting Road to a dual carriageway from the Fire Station roundabout to the new development - this will involve building a new railway bridge at Worting.	A Transport Assessment was undertaken to support the Local Plan which identifies that some improvements are required on the strategic highway network to improve capacity at peak times. The Transport Assessment does not identify the need to upgrade / dual the Worting Road. In terms of a new railway station at Worting or East Oakley given the relatively short distance between these proposed locations and Basingstoke Station (approximately 3 miles) and the site being located on the South Western Mainline, it is unlikely that Network Rail or the Train Operating Company (currently South West Trains) would be willing to provide a new station or service such a new station. Given the relative proximity of the site to the town Centre we consider that a frequent bus services will provide the public transport needs for future residents.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Nicholas Bywater	N/A	N/A	784685	266	Yes	No	Policy SS3.10 offers Basingstoke the opportunity to plan a suitable provision of infrastructure, over a wide area, which will provide housing needs for many years to come. However, Policy SS3.10 fails to explaination why only 3,010 units are proposed for this land, why strategic planning cannot be applied to the whole area and why development would not start until 2019. Earlier development of this land would release funds for the infrastructure that is required to bring it forward. The result is that far less appropriate land would be developed for residential use (as suggested by Policy SS3.3), placing greater strain on the local infrastructure on the north side of Basingstoke, and without immediate solutions. Policy SS3.10 is therefore inadequate in terms of its targeted scope and delivery.	A higher allocation of housing (at least 4,000) should be considered in the context of a structured master plan for this area, with development starting as soon as possible.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown over the plan period. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The wider area of Manydown will be subject to masterplanning to ensure the proper planning of the area.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Marilyn Roberts	N/A	N/A	784682	272	Yes	No	The proposal to build 3000 houses on the B3400 and 600 in pack lane with an addition of 150 in Oakley is a vast number in a very small area and would seem to be more of a convenience to builders rather than a public necessity and will inevitably result in traffic problems from the increased number of vehicles. Of particular concern is the road under the railway bridge in the centre of Pack Lane which is a single lane. The construction of such a large number of houses in this area of North Hampshire will put a great strain on services and amenities such as water, sewerage, schools, doctors surgeries ,traffic and parking.	Other options, such as building on brown field sites and empty retail properties, should be thoroughly used before any other land is considered. If other land is needed it should be in a large number of smaller plots rather than the present proposal of a few large plots which will lead to a spreading conurbation which in turn will bring the social problems of such a conurbation.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. Improvements to local infrastructure are outlined in the criteria of the Policy and is supported by the council's IDP. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. The spatial strategy proposed in the Local Plan seeks to achieve a balanced approach to housing provision over the whole of the plan period.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	308	Yes	No	Manydown: the parish council support residents in their request that this site be developed at a faster and greater pace and thus ease pressure on other areas of the borough. The land was purchased for development and to plan not to deliver homes and infrastructure before 2019 is unsound and inconsistent with the aggressive expansion being planned in other areas.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Richenda Power	Countryside Stewardship	N/A	85938	338	Yes	No	This policy is supported but querying the phrasing. Due to length of time to get schemes producing homes the project should start at once and aim to produce homes on the period from adoption to 2028-2029. Therefore emit '2019/20'. The record of non-performance in housing completions fully justifies this relaxation.	Change phasing arrangement to '...will deliver homes and infrastructure in the period from adoption to 2028/29' (site involved as attached)	The phasing of the Manydown allocation allows for the 'masterplanning' of the allocation to take place and allowance for the planning applications for individual phases to be submitted and determined. The phasing, which has been brought forward by one year as a result of the consultation, is therefore considered to be realistic.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	375	Yes	No	Newnham Parish Council supports Country Watch in its comments on Manydown	Newnham Parish Council supports Country Watch in its comments on Manydown	See response to Countrywatch	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Ann Baker	N/A	N/A	785356	400	Not Specified	No	My concerns of all the houses you propose to build on Manydown land. This is prime farmland which will be built on where is our food going to grow if its all under concrete! Also our wildlife is already under threat through loss of habitat. We have to seriously think about our future and maybe occupy some of the empty houses 800 quoted in the Gazette.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites and bring empty homes back into use but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. The Manydown Policy contains specific criteria to mitigate the potential impacts on the landscape, wildlife and habitats (g, h and l).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr and Mrs Galloway	N/A	N/A	785363	402	Not Specified	No	I am writing to object to the latest published local plan. 1. The planned extension of Oakley's borders would serve to destroy the character of the village. 2. The infrastructure of the plan has not been thought through sufficiently. 3. The volume of houses on the Manydown land is excessive and will lend itself to further development. 4. The roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic as it is and there does not seem to be a solution to this in the plan. 5. The question of sewage provision seems the be once again under question. 6. The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Oakley seems to be conveniently forgotten and on the plan is labeled 'owned by the council and available for development'. 7. Where are the people coming from to live in these houses? Where are they going to work? It will surely end up with a greater volume of commuters to London, Reading and the like.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. In terms of sewage disposal, it is considered that this can be accommodated within the Chineham Sewage Treatment works, without adversely affecting the classification of the water body. Account has been taken of the need to prevent the coalescence of Basingstoke and Oakley, and a strategic gap has been identified to maintain the separation. This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information, including housing need arising from economic growth. Since the preparation of the draft Local Plan, additional information has been published and the housing numbers have been updated to reflect this.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mary Tait	N/A	N/A	785375	405	Not Specified	No	I would like to comment on the proposal for over 3,000 new homes and associated road development on Manydown (SS3.10). As an Oakley resident I am very concerned about the building of such a huge estate, which will take up a large amount of productive farmland and eat significantly into the SG between Basingstoke and Oakley. This is in itself almost certain to generate pressure for further coalescence. I understand that there is a lot of pressure for new housing in Basingstoke as with many other areas around London and the SE but I would question why more effort is not going into developing housing in brownfield and mixed-use areas in Basingstoke (actually I would question why more effort is not going into spreading growth and economic development outside the south-east but I appreciate that is outside the scope of this consultation). I think it is a pity that there was not more discussion of alternative options in the document - gives the impression that this is a fait accompli.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Council has previously consulted on issues and options but has now reached the Pre-submission stage of the process. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and issues such as the loss of farmland has been given due consideration through this process. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Account has been taken of the need to prevent the coalescence of Basingstoke and Oakley, and a strategic gap has been identified to maintain the separation.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mary Goldsmith	N/A	N/A	785401	410	Not Specified	No	another 3,000 houses on Manydown land north of the B3400 will put great strain on all the utilities, schools, etc. This will also have an impact on health services, particularly the North Hampshire Hospital which is already over-stretched. The plan to build 600 new houses in Pack Lane will lead to increased traffic problems at the Fiveways junction. It is difficult to comment on the siting of another 150 houses in Oakley when I don't know where they're to be. The traffic leaving Oakley at peak times is already an issue and adding perhaps another 300 cars will be intolerable. Oakley has few facilities (i.e. shops, bus services, cycle paths, access to GPs, meeting places, etc.) as it is and these meagre facilities will be stretched even further. The siting of the Country Park on the outskirts of new development seems wrong. Could this not be sited more to the centre of the proposed (present and future) Manydown Development so that it is easily accessible to more people?	Why not have this as a permanent buffer between Oakley and the expanding Basingstoke - there are woods on the outskirts of Oakley that could be incorporated in such a park ensuring their preservation and maintenance too.	A detailed assessment of housing sites has been undertaken through the site assessment and SA processes. In doing this, the Council has liaised with service providers to understand future needs and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the IDP, which details what is required and possible funding sources. Implications for road infrastructure are set out in the Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. The site forms part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Oakley, has been identified as a location for a limited level of devt, given housing need and the availability of services. Other settlements in the Borough have also been allocated a housing number and / or specific site, which recognises their relative sustainability. Account has been taken of the need to prevent the coalescence of Basingstoke and Oakley, and a strategic gap has been identified to maintain the gap. The location of the country park, reflects proposals put forward by the landowner, and will provide opportunities for links with the wider countryside.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	420	Yes	No	Manydown (a) The size of the site allows for the building of more houses and this should be done. (see Report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees Economic Prosperity and Performance 19th Sept 2013 page 4/14 item 3.3 - up to 4000 homes plus additional 400 on parcel 7 could be delivered within period of Local Plan to 2029.) (c) (d) If the number of houses on this site is significantly increased this would promote finance from developer funds for an upgrade in the proposed infrastructure. This would allow the site to become more self sufficient eg by having a secondary school and reduce the need to travel to other parts of Basingstoke. (m) (n) (o) A western relief road joining to the M3 at junction 7 is required as a matter of urgency and not as some distant possibility.	Increase the number of houses on this site Larger scale development will supply more developer funds for infrastructure, will give economies of scale and will make this a more meaningful residential area with its own shops, secondary school etc. rather than another housing estate on the edge of Basingstoke.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year, it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown over the plan period. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The wider Manydown estate is subject to masterplanning and wider infrastructure issues will be considered as part of that process. To this end, the policy safeguards the provision of a future link road.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Clir Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	426	No	No	Basingstoke and Deane has patently failed to fulfill its duty to co-operate with - in particular - Hampshire County Council. This is evidenced by the paper dated 24.09.13 published by the HCC Executive Member for Policy and Resources notifying intent to object. It is also self-evident that proper consultation was not possible given the short timescales between the BDBC portfolio holder amendments to the draft, the Cabinet decision and then railroading through full council. An interest in the Manydown Development Area was specifically purchased by this local authority for comprehensive and integrated development. The purpose was emphatically NOT in order to prevent development and to have purchased land for such purpose would have been wrong. Furthermore, despite the recent judicial review, to still withhold over half of the subject area to beyond the subject plan period is again seriously against the original intent. This site is also the best option in terms of infrastructure.	There has been insufficient communication with HCC, which fails to meet the requirements of the duty to cooperate. The Manydown site was purchased in order to facilitate development, not to prevent it, and this site is still not being used for its proper purpose. The whole site needs to be put forward for development as an MDA. The above shortcoming can only be addressed by including the whole Manydown area as an MDA.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown over the plan period. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The wider Manydown estate is subject to masterplanning and wider infrastructure issues will be considered as part of that process. BDBC has worked pro-actively with HCC on a number of sites within their sole or joint ownership and will continue to do so as suitable.	See response to HCC representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Jennifer Banks	N/A	N/A	785487	448	Not Specified	No	I strongly OBJECT to 600 houses along Pack Lane. I strongly OBJECT to 3,000 houses on Manydown land north of the B3400. What Oakley NEEDS is RETIREMENT homes!!! There are MASSES of retired people in Oakley living alone (or just two persons) in family size houses. Many already want to downsize and many more will in the near future but they have nowhere to go! Build some Retirement bungalows in and around Oakley then the family sized houses will be released!! It isn't necessary to build more family sized houses they already exist!!! Planners overlook the fact that people get older-----those young parents of 2013 will themselves be looking for retirement homes in 2043. Furthermore -----there will be no countryside left if the planners have their way!!! Miles and miles of HOUSES will cause extreme problems-----DEPRESSION!! Pay more attention to EMPTY houses, find the absentee landlords-----get them to sell up! Stop building on greenfields-----build on wasteland.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites (including empty homes) but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. In terms of the type of homes to be provided, the policies in the Plan seek a mix of dwelling types to meet needs, including homes for older people and those in care, in addition to starter homes and family homes	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Michael Heatherwick	N/A	N/A	785565	461	Yes	No	From the plans we have seen so far there is no funding for the major part of the infrastructure. The last time this development was proposed a Government inspector rejected it on the grounds of poor infrastructure (what's changed?) What new roads are proposed to relieve the traffic on Roman Road. What is proposed in the plan to safeguard the existing children's cemetery? when will the ring road from the Newbury Road to Kempshott be built? (not included in this plan, why not?) The Manydown policy is very short on detail which I suspect makes it difficult to object to at this stage but helps the Borough Council cause.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy SS3.10 clearly sets out the infrastructure required to serve the site, and further detail is outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This also highlights likely sources of funding. Further detail on the specific layout and design of the development will be provided in a masterplan for the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Stephen Reid	Save Manydown Group	N/A	85822	467	Yes	No	The TA in relation to this site contains incorrect information about trips, which should have been spotted by officers or members. Costings for relevant in the IDP for this site are underestimated and throws into doubt the soundness of the plan. The link road costings indicate a single lane road which may not be appropriate. There is no provision for junctions of the new road with the A339 / B3400, or it is likely that rat-running will occur through Winklebury and the Clarke Estate. The Southern part of Manydown is largely land-locked and a new road onto Pack Lane will lead to extra pressure on the double railway bridge. The plan makes no provision for an improved or new rail crossing.	The TA should be revisited and verified with updated trips, and the TA / IDP should include costs for the necessary junctions between the link road and the B3400 / A339, with an indication of how the costs will be met. Further work is needed on crossing the railway line, and road works should be classified as 'essential'. Work should be undertaken to plan the infrastructure for Manydown in its totality, reflecting the previous inspector's advice and planned as a whole.	The Local Plan Transport Assessment contains high level road trip rates for all of the proposed residential developments. There were typographical errors (in the August version) which were corrected (in the September version) but the model had always contained the September trip rates]. The Local Plan Transport assessment provides a high level cumulative assessment of the impacts of the Local Plan on the local highway network and therefore does not undertake detailed junction tests and designs for each of the development proposals (including Manydown) as that is undertaken at a later stage as part of the detailed masterplanning and/or planning application process for those development sites once their respective allocations have been confirmed in the Local Plan. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	See response to Rep 121 for proposed changes	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Rodney Scott	Oakley and Deane Parish Council	N/A	461222	479	Yes	No	Our representation refers only to the lower of the two sites (Parcel 6A) to the east of the railway line and to the north of Pack Lane. This site stands alone from the main site along Roman Road, and will not benefit from the infrastructure on this main site. It cannot be seen from the plan how the existing road structure could cope with the traffic from development on parcel 6A. There is a narrow low bridge on Pack Lane heading to the west where two vehicles cannot pass. To the east is five ways cross roads where delays already occur as traffic from Oakley, Overton and other villages to the west travel into the commercial and shopping sites in the south west of Basingstoke. £151,000 is shown for improving this junction but no details are shown as to how this will make any difference.	Remove this site from the Local Plan	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	See response to Rep 121 for proposed changes	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr B Gilmore	N/A	N/A	785647	480	Not Specified	No	My wife and myself would like to register our objections to the building of 600 homes along Pack Lane on the basis to give access of some 1200 cars on to these local roads will cause huge problems and the location is too close to Oakley thus making a local village into a vast town. To increase Oakley borders to accommodate 150 new homes creates a similar effect, on top of which it creates a serious pressure on the villages utilities and facilities. Finally to even consider building 3,000 homes on Manydown land north of the B3400 must be the consideration of a Council who has completely lost its way. To increase the local population by the amount proposed will completely alter the environment in which we live and cause terrific pressure not only on the population but all the amenities.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and issues such environmental impact has been given due consideration through this process. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. In terms of Oakley, this has been identified as a location for a limited level of development, given local housing need and the availability of services and facilities locally. It should be noted that other settlements in the Borough have also been allocated a future housing number and / or specific site for future housing, which recognises their relative sustainability. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	See response to Rep 121 for proposed changes	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Doctor Adam Noble	N/A	N/A	638528	492	No	No	There has been insufficient consultation regarding housing distribution after the legal judgment requiring that Manydown be included for housing provision. The plan does not take into account for the extra housing need that will result from anticipated commercial and industrial developments within the borough. The plan also does not adequately indicate provision for alternative transport to the private car. By developing only a small number of houses at Manydown, the capital return will not be sufficient to all for adequate infrastructure development. There is insufficient evidence as to how satisfactory infrastructure can be achieved both financially and physically over the plan period. The housing provision is much too dependent on all the sites in the plan: becoming available there is major uncertainty in this respect concerning the Basingstoke Golf Course. would be developers proceeding with development in roughly the time-frame proposed. No mechanism for slippage.	Please see above.	The Borough Council has consulted extensively on the Pre-Submission Local Plan of September 2013, which resulted in over 1,300 representations. This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information, including housing need arising from economic growth. Since the preparation of the draft Local Plan, additional information has been published and the housing numbers have been updated to reflect this. In terms of future infrastructure, the IDP sets out what is required and potential sources of funding. The Govt recognises that there may be some uncertainty about funding beyond the first five years of the plan period, albeit the Borough Council will be seeking to secure CIL funding from future development to provide the required infrastructure. In terms of availability of the golf course, the owners continue to promote the site for development. This plan was based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information, including housing need arising from economic growth. Since the preparation of the draft Local Plan, additional information has been published and the housing numbers have been updated to reflect this.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Jessica Tattersall	N/A	N/A	784782	493	No	No	Manydown should be developed to its full capacity. It is ideal for a comprehensive and thoughtful provision of the area's housing needs and should be developed. The large land sales fund will enable suitable infrastructure to be provided alongside the development.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown over the plan period. The wider Manydown estate is subject to masterplanning and wider infrastructure issues will be considered as part of that process. The wider area of Manydown will be subject to masterplanning to ensure the proper planning of the area.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Richard Burden	N/A	N/A	85874	532	Yes	No	Object to the number o homes to be built west of Basingstoke. There is existing traffic congestion in the area. A new link road between the Newbury Road and the B3400 would further encourage rat runners to take a short cut from junction 7 of the M3 via the North Waltham Lanes through Oakley to the Basingstoke ring road/ Reading direction.	Oakley requires a small roundabout at Pack Lane cross roads as there are highway safety issues.	A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and relevant issues have been given due consideration through this process. The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. Detailed highway matters will be considered through the masterplanning and development management processes.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Nigel and Susan Clarke	N/A	N/A	212798	536	Yes	No	A development of this size will place extra demand on the supply of water to the area. There are already times when the water pressure drops. Water meters will not cause enough water to be saved to provide for all these extra homes. The proposed development will produce large amounts of waste water/ sewage. Questions whether the existing system will have sufficient capacity. River Loddon is currently heavily polluted with phosphates and increase in sewage will lead to more phosphates in river. The proposed development will also increase surface water run-off. Development will lead to the loss of green space and wildlife. The Manydown area plays an important part of the health and welfare of local people. Presently Roman Way/ Roman Road are congested at peak times and there are highway safety issues. The proposed development will make these problems worse for existing local residents. Development of Manydown will have a negative impact on the quality of life of local residents.	Brownfield sites should be developed first. Development of greenfield sites, such as Manydown, should be a very last resort. Consider that the number of homes proposed for Manydown should instead be spread throughout the town, to include e.g. Basing View. Also, if less of Manydown was used for housing, some land could be used to plan woodland or wildflower meadows. A wildlife sanctuary is needed in Basingstoke for education purposes. Estimates that there are 800 empty homes in Basingstoke. If these were occupied the need for new homes would be reduced considerably.	In preparing the Local Plan, the Borough Council has worked closely with service providers, such as the water companies, in addition to statutory bodies including the Environment Agency to consider issues including water supply and sewerage disposal. In terms of sewerage disposal, it is considered that this can be accommodated within the Chineham Sewage Treatment works, without adversely affecting the classification of the water body, whilst no objection has been received in relation to water supply. Surface water will need to be managed in accordance with the latest advice. In respect of highways, a detailed Transport Assessment has been undertaken and this has identified a series of improvements required to accommodate future development, and these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which also includes the requirements for green spaces as a part of the future development. This also refers to the provision of a country park.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Peter Wilson	N/A	N/A	786114	560	Not Specified	No	The proposed development does not include provision for the necessary highway infrastructure. Whereas the policy refers to measures specifically to mitigate the impact of development on A339. It makes no reference to the impact on the road network south of Pack Lane. The plan needs to be amended to make specific provision for necessary highway improvements in the area between B3400 and A30 to be implemented during the plan period in association with the proposed housing development. In particular, either on its own or in conjunction with the Policy SS3.2 and SS3.11 sites, development would have an unacceptable impact on Kempshott Lane and Fiveways junction. Manydown parcel 6 should be deleted from the plan because it is not a sustainable location for development for the following reasons: 1. it is separated from the remainder of the Manydown development 2. Vehicular access is limited to Pack Lane, which at its eastern end joins the town network at Fiveways hot spot.	Parcel 6 of the site (the land between Pack Lane and the railway) be deleted from the proposed development site. An additional criterion should be included to follow (m) to read: "include improvements to the highway network on the western side of the town between the B3400 and the A30 and effective measures to prevent the passage of through traffic on unsuitable roads in Kempshott.	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	See response to Rep 121 for proposed changes	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	568	Yes	No	Policy does not meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. Welcomes the aspiration for a county park but further details of the country park are required to enable certainty of delivery. It is not clear whether Make provision for a country park requires the developer to create the county park or to just provide the land. The Local Plan also does not make clear: Who will provide the county park? (the developers or the Council) Who is it being created for? (all or part of Basingstoke residents or just the new residents). Who will fund the park both during its creation stage and its on-going maintenance stage? What will be the size of the country park? What will be the key components of the park, such as will there be access routes suitable for dog walking etc?	A separate policy for the country park is required setting out the broad principles relating to the country park. It should set out how the county park will be integrated within the surrounding landscape. At present this area contains a number of parkland trees which we wish to see included as an integral part of the country park setting.	The relevant criteria of the policy has been clarified with regards to the role of the landowner in providing land for the park and additional wording has been added to the supporting text to policy EM5	See the response to comment ID: 961 (HCC)	Response to representation and to provide clarity	N/A	Following discussions with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, the Wildlife Trust confirmed they welcomed the additional supporting text to policy EM5 of the revised Pre Submission Local Plan. However, the Wildlife Trust's position that a new policy on the country park should be included in the Local Plan still stands.
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr John Rothera	Kempshott District Residents Association	N/A	122977	584	Yes	No	The proposed housing allocation for Manydown parcel 6 in the Local Plan Policy is unsound for the reasons: 1. Access arrangements for traffic entering/leaving the site, with a capacity to accommodate at least 730 dwellings, are totally inadequate. 2. Traffic generated by 730 dwellings would have a major detrimental impact on roads on the adjacent residential areas and also together with additional traffic resulting from other housing proposals in south-west Basingstoke, on major road junctions in the wider town area. This situation is totally contrary to Policy CN8 of the Local Plan. 3. The large scale housing development would result in significant adverse impact on existing facilities located in adjacent areas, e.g. on schools. 4. Proposals in Policy SS3.10 are irrational and inconsistent -there are proposals to provide green buffers between new housing and Winklebury but not between new housing and Buckskin/Kempshott. 5. Loss of good agricultural land. 6. Parcel 6 is isolated.	Manydown parcel 6 be removed from Policy SS3.10 and be deleted from the Local Plan proposals maps; but in the event that Parcel 6 is retained in the Plan, Policy SS3.10 should be amended to include specific reference to the provision of green buffers along the eastern boundary of the site between Buckskin/Kempshott and the new housing development.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources. Implications in relation to the highways infrastructure are set out in the council's Transport Assessment, which proposes appropriate mitigation measures. The reference to green buffers is considered too detailed at this stage but will be addressed through masterplanning. The existing reference to a green buffer has been removed from criteria i). A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	See the response to HCC (Mark Biles)	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Brian Hannam	N/A	N/A	786176	587	No	No	An earlier attempt by the Manydown Company to initiate development of a small part of the site was rejected by Planners. Their decision was upheld by a planning appeal. The Inspector said that the site was outside the settlement area and was of considerable landscape value. Both these reasons still mitigate against an even larger development of the site. The Plan envisages a series of scattered developments, not an environmentally efficient way of providing housing as it leads to excessive additional transport needs. Generally the plan gives little consideration to negative results of its' implementation and does not explain how infrastructure generally will cope with 6740 extra homes, in particular supply the necessary water and sewerage capacity. Site is isolated and lack of employment areas, leisure and retail will lead to more traffic. A339 and B3400 are already congested. How can a bus service linked? Development would have impact on landscape	Already we see schools and hospitals full, car parks and trains full, and a generally creaky infrastructure. There are no guarantees that infrastructure will be provided ahead of population increases, so the plan will almost certainly degrade the quality of life of the existing population for decades. A better plan to cope with a village sized population increase would be to build an entire new village somewhere that does not have the location/infrastructure problems that face Basingstoke. I suggest that Manydown in particular is completely removed from the plan	The Council has undertaken a detailed assessment of sites, to consider which are the most appropriate for allocation. This involved assessing sites in terms of issues such as transport, biodiversity and infrastructure. Through this work, the Council has liaised with service providers to understand future requirement for additional infrastructure. This highlighted that Manydown should be identified for future housing. In terms of infrastructure, further detail is set out in the IDP, which details what is required and possible funding. This has been informed by a Transport Assessment to consider the implications of development and necessary improvements. In respect of sewerage and water supply, the Borough Council has worked closely with service providers, such as the water companies and the Environment Agency to consider issues including water supply / sewerage disposal. In terms of sewerage disposal, it is considered that this can be accommodated via Chineham Sewerage works, without affecting the classification of the water body.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	605	Yes	No	Policy not consistent with NPPF Section 11 para 9, 109,113,117 not "setting criteria based policies against which..." Especially with respect to buffers for ancient woodland. Minimising impacts "positively" on biodiversity should include pre-development action to translocate species where feasible to prepared receptor sites Country Park is an inadequate expediency not intended for the town. Unjust to people in existing town already far from the country. The natural environment was never considered when purchased as evidenced by the lack of assessment at the time of purchase and decline in habitats during landowner stewardship. NPPF Para 117 emphasises recreation of priority habitats/wildlife corridors and these should be embedded in policy. Some arable and bird species on Manydown are now rare and need habitats. NPPF Section 11 para 109 encourages strategies such as taking early pre-development action to translocate species where feasible to a receptor site.	Amend f. Country Park scale should provide space for Basingstoke and wildlife to compensate major loss of amenity to townspeople, and to habitats and wildlife from land loss, fragmentation, disturbance, footfall and pets. Amend l. Wildlife corridors ensured, to support viable wildlife populations and permeable routes through the landscape for flora and fauna associated with local habitats. New para. v. New roads/cycle/walking routes designed not to fragment wildlife corridors and key habitats by providing green over or underpasses for permeability of flora and fauna. New para w. Limit direct and indirect impacts on local species and habitats, including all sites designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and arable wildflower areas, through on-site and off-site compensation measure that precede as well as being part of development and seek to ensure that there is a positive improvement in the conservation status of these species within the designations;	Additional wording regarding the countrypark has been added to after paragraph 6.36 (supporting text to policy EM5) - See the response to comment ID: 961 (HCC). Further guidance on the countrypark can be found within the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy (2013). It is therefore not considered necessary to include the suggested wording for criteria f). Policy EM4 (Biodiversity) includes criteria "to ensure there will be no harm to the integrity of linkages between designated sites and key habitats." Policy EM4 also includes criteria regarding impacts on local species and habitats, and includes guidance on mitigation and compensation measures. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be judged against all relevant policies. It is therefore not considered necessary to include the suggested amendments to criteria l) and the new criterion.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	617	Yes	No	HCC supports the references in the policy to providing new connections between the development and wider existing rights of way network. However, there also needs to be recognition of providing connections to the countryside. Opportunities should also be sought to improve the connectivity of the walk / cycle network by upgrading or providing new crossings for major roads.	Make it clear what is included within the terms 'the existing green grid' or 'green corridors' by including the following, where relevant: 'the existing green network, including rights of way and other accessible greenspace'	Further clarity on green networks and corridors is outlined in other parts of the Plan, particular in relation to Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure and therefore it is not considered necessary to include the additional wording. Clause g) refers to improving the connection of the site with the existing cycle and pedestrian routes and the Public Right of Way, which can equally apply to connections to the countryside or settlements.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr Diane Taylor	BDBC	N/A	121755	623	Not Specified	No	The roads infrastructure proposed for this major development is far too vague and is disconnected to the housing proposed. There is no clear plan for the early delivery of a link road, nor any suggestion of how this would be financed. Delivery rate of 300 per year would depend on the early provision of new roads to facilitate this rate of building. 600 homes south of the railway lines and north of Pack Lane would create a locked-in development that would be claustrophobic and, in terms of travel, unsound. Pack lane could no support the traffic associated with 600 new homes. The inclusion of good quality agricultural land is not compliant with the NPPF (para 112). 3000 homes in this location is contrary to the stated wishes of the borough residents. This allocation is based on convenience not strategy. The JR appears to have been used as an excuse for using Manydown to make up housing numbers.	Exclude land to the south of the B3400 from the Manydown site. Include clear plans and siting of potential future road link before housing is planned. Reduce the Manydown site to a discrete area close to the A339 to ensure that roads infrastructure is adequate. At paragraph h) include the sentence "no development should take place to the west of the natural ridgeline at the B3400 to ensure that housing is not visible on the western approach to Basingstoke and to ensure there is a considerable gap between any development and the village of Newfound". Ensure that the Planning Inspector is fully aware of the process which has led to the inclusion of this MDA and any influence that may have been exerted. Re-assess the inclusion of Manydown land in conjunction with an assessment of land quality.	A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and issues such as environmental impact has been given due consideration through this process . The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Issues such as loss of agricultural land were recognised in the site assessment and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. The criteria in the Plan include sufficient detail for the strategic allocation and more details will be considered through the masterplanning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	643	Yes	No	The deliverability of the parcel of land to the south of the railway line is questioned due to the impact on the Fiveways Junction. The mitigation proposed in the Transport Assessment do not demonstrate that additional traffic can be accommodated by improvements within the highway boundary. Significant amendments to the junction would require land outside of the highway boundary, involving the purchase of third party land. Without a capacity improvement, journey times could increase significantly. HCC considers that this parcel of land does not meet the requirements of CN8 as it may not be deliverable and would cause undue interference with the safety/operation of the highway. HCC objects to clause O as the Transport Assessment does not evidence the need for this. HCC are currently undertaking more work o the need for this road. HCC objects to clause N as there is no evidence to demonstrate the need for a dual carriageway.	HCC requires clarification and further dialogue with BDBC regarding the transport assessment to fully assess the impact on the highway network of the allocation of the parcel of land south of the railway. HCC requires further evidence to assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass.	The Council will continue to work with HCC in respect of the TA and other highway matters. Criteria o) has been deleted and criteria n) has been updated, as outlined in response to HCC comments submitted by Mark Biles (please see these for further details). A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of futher testing.	See the response to HCC (Mark Biles)	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Miss Fiona Biermann	N/A	N/A	638524	692	No	No	The plan is not legally compliant because despite the legal judgment requiring that Manydown be included for housing provision, there has been little consultation regarding housing distribution. The plan has not been positively prepared because it does not take into account the extra housing that will be needed with Basingstoke's increased commercial and industrial activities e.g. developments in the Basing View area. The plan also does not provide details on what provisions will be made for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. The plan is not justified compared to alternative plans as it is not sensible financially. With only a small number of homes on the Manydown site, the capital return will not be enough to ensure that the infrastructure is developed appropriately. The plan is unlikely to be effective because it has not been confirmed that: all the sites in the plan will be available, the developers will deliver in the proposed timescales. No alternatives sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Extensive consultation has been undertaken in respect of housing distribution, across the borough and in different locations around the town. This has been supported by a detailed site assessment and sustainability appraisal to consider the implications. The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. In terms of access to each site, there is a specific requirement for access by car and non-car modes, and this is supported by more detailed requirements in the IDP. Detailed viability assessments have been undertaken for all of the policy requirements of the plan, and the types of site that are proposed for allocation, in order to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the CIL regulations. Discussions are continuing with the landowners of relevant sites in order to understand issues around individual sites, including deliverability. The Plan also contains a housing buffer to enable some flexibility in terms of non-delivery.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Jeremy Farely	Wates Development Ltd	Genesis Town Planning	787807	705	Not Specified	No	Wates Developments Limited are concerned about the level of detail contained within the policy, some of which is too prescriptive and unjustified. Parts of the policy also duplicate other development control policies set out in the plan. Criterion a) the housing requirement for the borough needs to be increased (see SS1 comments) and Manydown can take additional development. b) The requirements to provide a proportion of self-build units and permanent pitch/plot provision to meet identified need for gypsies, travelers is too prescriptive and premature (pending publication of studies relating to these matters and emerging masterplan). It is also unreasonable to expect or require the Manydown development to provide for this type of accommodation if not needed in this location. The other criteria are either premature and will be addressed in the masterplan, or are unnecessary as they duplicate other policies already contained within the document. see response for full details.	Criterion a) should be changed to enable the delivery of more than 3,080 dwelling at Manydown, the word "approximately" should be deleted and replaced by "minimum". b) It is recommended that the reference to the provision of accommodation of Self-Build plots and for gypsies etc is deleted and that this type of need is provided for in the borough wide policy or policies as well as through the masterplanning process. g) should be deleted and the area annotated as "Area within which Masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints". h) should be deleted. j) should be deleted. j) the reference to restricting coalescence between Worting and Wooten St Lawrence should be removed from this clause. k) should be deleted. l) should be deleted. Whilst it is accepted that the development of the wider Manydown allocation will have a long lead in time, the parcels of land around Worting could be developed faster.	It is considered that the level of detail contained within the plan is suitable to enable the delivery of a high quality development whilst responding to the characteristics of the site eg criteria h, j,k,l. Whilst the plan should be read as a whole, the most pertinent issues associated with a site are included to highlight site specific elements. a) The plan is based on an assessment of future housing need, taking into account the advice in the NPPF and the most up-to-date statistical information regarding demographic and economic trends. Further information is outlined in the 'Housing Topic Paper' and up to date SHMA. The use of the word 'approximately' provides a suitable balance between flexibility and reflecting the number of units that could be suitably accommodated on the allocated part of the site b)The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF and is considered suitable in the policy. The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travelers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation, along with others, will provide for them. Criteria g is considered appropriate to ensure that the sensitivities of this area are fully considered throughout the development process. The delivery of the site has been brought forward as a result of the consultation responses.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	769	Not Specified	No	SS3.10 Manydown m) It is not clear how any mitigation in respect of B3400 would be effected. The road needs attention now and with development proposed at Overton and Whitchurch, not just because of Manydown. n) The whole link between A339 and M3 jct 7 needs to be planned and build, not just the link between A339 and B3400, if there is not to be a negative impact on all local roads from the Manydown development. o) Consideration should be given to the construction of a Basingstoke Parkway Station at Battledown to relieve access to the town centre p) I have serious reservations about BDBC's ability or intention to respond sensitively to landscape and setting of this site. In the past planning (e.g. at Hatch Warren) has been injured with unpleasant impacts as a consequence.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	To inform the Local Plan, a detailed Transport Assessment has been undertaken to consider the implications of all proposed development on the highway network, and any mitigation that may be required. This flags up a number of junction improvements, which are set out in the IDP. It does not highlight the requirement for a full western bypass at this stage. Neither has the requirement for a new parkway station been identified. However, detailed site assessment work has flagged up a number of detailed requirements in terms of landscape and biodiversity, and these are highlighted in policy SS3.10.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr and Mrs Philip and Anne Johnson	N/A	N/A	786586	784	Not Specified	No	The traffic has increased in the area, lorries and heavy machinery use the Roman Road and Roman Way as a shortcut. I am concerned that the traffic will increase from the proposed Manydown development. Surely there are measures that can be installed to deal with.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The infrastructure and traffic for Manydown has been considered through the IDP and TA. Further consideration will be given to this through the masterplanning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Anna Gamble	N/A	N/A	786591	787	Not Specified	No	why locate the country park where most people will have to drive to it? the west side of Basingstoke is lacking in open space.) If hundreds of houses are built north of Pack Lane How would the smaller houses in Worting be protected? Where will the traffic go? Neither Pack Lane or Worting railway bridges can cope. The 3400 is probably more able to take some extra traffic but what happens when it snows? Scrapp's Hill becomes unusable very quickly in snow. My personal feeling is that we do need some more housing but it needs to be social housing. At present in Basingstoke several developments have stalled/slowed down because young people cannot afford to move on when they have families. There is a general problem with putting social housing so far from town as the cost of bus fares is so high. There would be an urgent need for a primary school to serve the new development.	I would think that building houses should be west of the children's cemetery and south of the Newbury Rd with their main access being to the Newbury Rd. Roughly where I think the country park was on the plans.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. The site has been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and a detailed site assessment process. The location of the country park relates to the covenanted land in the area. The location and scale of development has also been informed by other pieces of evidence base, such as a Transport Assessment, which considers the implications of development on the highway network. In terms of the tenure of the proposed housing, draft policies require that 40% of homes should be affordable and there should be a mix of market housing (in terms of size etc) on each site, in order to meet future needs. The provision of new homes will be supported by infrastructure, including new community facilities, schools, open space amongst other things. These are detailed in both the policy that allocates the site and the IDP. The location of specific elements will be considered through the masterplanning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Cook	N/A	N/A	786618	806	Yes	No	Living on Pack Lane I am well aware it is used as a short cut from Oakley. This means it is very difficult from 7.30- 9am and 4.30 - 6pm Monday to Friday. In view of the number of houses proposed on the adj. field we can expect even more vehicles on this narrow and dangerous road say up to 500 - 600. I shall need a 'keep clear' sign to my drive as well all the other residents. In view of the number of heavy vehicles morning on to the site and the hold ups they will cause it would be best to close off the bridge to permit ease of access. Has any work been planned to check for Roman remains? Ease of crossing the road to the bridle paths must also be considered and the speed limit increased in its length along Pack Lane. There seems little in the plan to ensure bee friendly planting on the estate. The existing estate along old Kempshot Lane has no such provision for wild flower planting unlike Manydown Farm's planting of such areas.	intentionally left blank	A detailed site assessment and Transport Assessment have been undertaken to inform decisions around the location of development. These consider the implications of new development on the existing highway network, and propose various improvements where required. The site assessment also considers other issues, such as landscape and the presence of archaeological remains in allocating sites. The specific policy that highlights the requirement for any development flags up the issues that need to be considered, and includes specific requirements to ensure that the development respects the wider landscape and provides linkages to the existing landscape framework.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Dan Hall	N/A	N/A	786640	816	Not Specified	No	I wholeheartedly object to the 600 houses along Pack Lane and even more alarming 3000 houses on the Manydown land and feel that we are heading towards the 'Oakleystoke' concept. Concern that grade a agricultural land would be lost along with trees, hedgerows and wildlife. Any traffic mitigation measures would cause traffic congestion. Insufficient capacity for people to live the area and the infrastructure is inadequate. Loss of amenity for existing residents. More pollution and noise. The development would create an urban sprawl to the west of Roman Road and would set a precedent for more development in the area.	intentionally left blank	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Loss of agricultural land, landscape impacts, biodiversity, noise, pollution etc were recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and have been given due consideration through the site selection process. Such issues are addressed within the specific criteria of the policy. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	862	Not Specified	No	No funding is currently proposed for either the provision of a link road or the land reservation for a new dual carriageway stated anywhere in Appendix A. This is both detrimental and therefore against the full implementation of the Policy.	intentionally left blank	It is proposed that the Borough Council will use CIL funds and other sources of money to provide the necessary infrastructure. There will also be a requirement on the landowner to provide points of access to the site from the existing highway network.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr RD Glover	N/A	N/A	786857	877	Not Specified	No	Localism is a key element of the planning policy, however it has not been properly applied to Manydown. More specifically, the firms who will develop the site have no connection with Basingstoke and they will not provide long term jobs for Basingstoke people.	The council controlled Manydown developments should not be in that position and have the potential to be so different. The council could provide employment for Basingstoke based firms and Basingstoke building employees by 'parceling' up this site so that it can be developed by local firms. This would provide 15 years work and employment for local people. Measure should be incorporated into the policy to promote the above.	This issue needs to be addressed outside of the Local Plan process as the form of delivery of the site is an issue for the council as landowner. The supporting text to Policy CNS (Infrastructure) has been amended to state that. It is proposed that other policies in the draft Local Plan will require an element of training for local people associated with major new development sites in the borough. This will be explained in more detail in a draft SPD on Planning Obligations.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	887	No	No	Site should be allocated for greater numbers. It is known that Manydown could accommodate greater numbers; Version 7 of the SHLAA estimated the yield as up to 6000 units. Large urban extension can deliver the needs of all residents for well designed, integrated, sustainable surroundings with the amenities such as schools, shopping, leisure and medical facilities without overloading facilities in other areas. If there is to be greenfield development then it should be a planned urban extension rather than a series of unrelated smaller greenfield developments. The Plan fails to explain why this site will not be providing homes until 2019. With a will to achieve the master planning, this site could brought forward sooner. No substantial sites should be brought forward without prior substantial improvements in infrastructure, especially water and transport, before development starts.	There is insufficient allocation on this important site.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year, it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The wider area of Manydown will be subject to masterplanning to ensure the proper planning of the area.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	791341	889	Not Specified	Not Specified	The parish council support residents in their request that this site be developed at a faster and greater rate and thus ease pressure on other areas of the borough. The land was purchased for development and to plan to not to deliver homes and infrastructure before 2019 is unsound and inconsistent with the aggressive expansion being planned in other area.	intentionally left blank	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The wider area of Manydown will be subject to masterplanning to ensure the proper planning of the area.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Nigel and Susan Clarke	N/A	N/A	212798	898	Not Specified	Not Specified	Concerned as to how Manydown development will be managed. It will impact on the wildlife (incl. existing barn owls) and will be a loss to the locals who value and enjoy walks. We welcome the planned small conservation area but feel more needs to be done. How will this area be protected from vandalism. Would like to see the existing tree lined roads (when you come into Basingstoke via the older estates) carried on into any area of new build. Native trees and shrubs should be planted throughout any new estate and hedgerows to help the wildlife incl. bird boxes and bat boxes. There is also the issue of run-off water that currently is soaked into the ground, perhaps a green ribbon of land plus hedgerow along the edge of the road between buildings and road would be helpful. Cycle paths need to be provided and linked to the existing network.	intentionally left blank	Further masterplanning of the site will consider in more detail the requirements in respect of biodiversity and landscape, building upon the requirements of the draft policy (SS3.10) and other documents, including the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The policy also requires the management of surface water run-off and access by non-car modes, including connections to existing routes. The advice of the Environment Agency will also be sought in respect of surface water run-off to ensure that this is dealt with in a managed way.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	907	Not Specified	Not Specified	The policy mentions the need to ensure new housing is suitable for noisy areas in which it is to be built, but does not address the intolerable noise that will result in Oakley if the proposed Western Bypass is built. Basingstoke has survived thus far without the road, so I suspect it is not really needed. Given the noise blight it will bring to Oakley residents, any provision for it in the Plan should be removed.	intentionally left blank	To inform the Local Plan, a detailed site assessment has been undertaken to consider all of the main greenfield sites around key settlements in the borough. This examines sites in terms of issues such as access, landscape, biodiversity, pollution, noise and impact on agricultural land. This has been used to make an informed judgment on which are the most appropriate sites to develop, and flags up key issues that would need addressing in developing the sites. Consideration is currently being given to the location and design of the proposed link road, which will include the impact on existing and new communities. Criteria of the Manydown policy and also draft policy EM121 (Pollution) will ensure that acceptable noise standards will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Linda Oxford	N/A	N/A	786899	910	Not Specified	Not Specified	The road system at present would not be able to cope with increased building of communities in this area. Already traffic from Oakley to Kempshott along Pack Lane to the traffic lights become congested and this is similar to the congestion that builds up at the mini roundabout at the edge of Buckskin and Winklebury, the B3400, especially during early morning rush hour. In general the Basingstoke road system is struggling with traffic congestion without any increase in car numbers. If the town is going to grow any further it is likely to become grid locked at peak times and Christmas. Can I suggest the towns traffic flow be monitored to gain an overall view of the impact of the towns proposed growth. Brighton Hill roundabout for instance is almost grid locked in the mornings, that's now, not in a few years time!	intentionally left blank	A Transport Assessment was undertaken to support the Local Plan which identifies that some improvements are required on the strategic highway network to improve capacity at peak times. The majority of these improvements relate to upgrading existing highway junctions to increase the capacity of the junction and mitigate the impacts of Local Plan Development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Linda Oxford	N/A	N/A	786899	913	Not Specified	Not Specified	Any building work from Kempshott toward Oakley would create a precedence and a prelude to future growth and encroachment. Oakley is village with its own character and culture which should be valued and protected. The residents of Oakley do not want to be engulfed by ugly housing estates. We value the beauty of Oakley and its surrounding countryside with it's many beautiful country walks which would be destroyed if built on.	intentionally left blank	In order to protect the character of villages and to prevent the coalescence of settlements, the borough council has included a number of strategic gaps in the draft Local Plan. This includes a gap between Oakley and the edge of the Manydown settlement to ensure that Oakley is protected from the impacts of development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	933	Yes	No	Overall, the landowners consider the Pre-Submission Local Plan to be a positive document that has sought to set out a clear strategy for the future of the borough, and provide an allocation for 3,080 dwellings at Manydown within the Plan Period to 2029. In that context, these landowner representations are intended to shape the draft site allocation and policy wording in a manner that would assist the local planning authority to achieve a Local Plan which is "sound" and therefore would provide the basis for a sustainable development at Manydown that is consistent with the long term Vision and which would be deliverable within the Plan period. The level of detail contained in the Pre-Submission Local Plan in relation to Manydown is considered to be prematurely prescriptive and unjustified. This has resulted in a number of negatively worded clauses that are not consistent with wider sustainability objectives in the Local Plan.	Draft Policy SS3 requires masterplans to be developed through community engagement and approved by the local planning authority in advance of outline planning applications. This process is set out in the Masterplan and Development Brief Protocol contained in Appendix 5 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan and is supported by the landowners. The landowners believe that this masterplanning protocol and process can address a number of the important issues identified in the clauses of the Manydown policy, especially those relating to the quality of life for residents of nearby communities. The landowners therefore suggest to the LPA that it is appropriate to insert a new clause or sentence in Policy SS3.10 that references the masterplanning protocol and so provides confidence to residents that there is a process of engagement with the existing communities to shape the emerging masterplan prior to the submission of a planning application.	The Borough Council has taken a consistent approach to drafting up site based policies, which respond to the issues and opportunities raised in the site assessment work and other pieces of evidence base. These are necessary to ensure that important issues are flagged up from the outset and to avoid possible future issues in dealing with detailed proposals for each of the sites. It is not considered necessary to add a new clause as this is already covered in the overarching Policy SS3 which applies to all sites.	No change	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	941	Not Specified	Not Specified	Churches / Places of Worship. No specific provision for space for any new churches in the largest 3 new estates (unless part of a 'community centre').	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Criterion c) covers all social infrastructure which could include a place of worship. The need for such a facility should be considered further through the masterplanning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	950	Yes	No	Very specific forms of housing are referenced in Clause (b), including self-build housing and pitch/plot provision for Gypsies, Travelers and Travelling Showpeople. However, no need for plots or pitches after 2017 is identified in the local planning authority's Gypsy and Traveler Accommodation Assessment, which is before the Manydown site is envisaged for development. Whilst there may be a need for further sites beyond 2017, the landowners are keen to discuss with the local planning authority the most effective means of allocating and delivering suitable sites. Whilst the landowners are keen to explore the potential of self-build for an element of housing delivery at Manydown, it is considered that this is too specific a requirement for a site policy and is therefore unlikely to be effective in isolation. We have not yet seen any substantive evidence to justify the necessity for self-build housing on this or other sites.	Suggested modification: delete reference to self-build housing and Gypsy and Travelers and Travelling Showpeople and address these housing needs in a separate Borough-wide policy or policies as well as through the masterplanning process. If there is evidence of a need to support self-build houses, this may best be delivered by having a self-contained housing policy to deal with tenure and exemption from CIL payments, as opposed to trying to achieve this through SS3.10.	The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travelers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them. The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF.	No change	N/A	N/A	The objection to "self-build" is withdrawn, though the remaining comments and objection still stand. However, HCC no longer wish to speak at the EIP.
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	955	Yes	Yes	Clause c) The provision of community infrastructure to meet the needs of the new community at Manydown is a necessary and desirable objective, which the landowners strongly support. The emerging masterplan (and supporting evidence) prepared by URS supports the place-making principle of up to three local centres within Manydown, with potential for one of the centres to evolve into a main centre beyond the Plan period, if required. It is critical for viability that the location and arrangement of these centres allows them to draw on local as well as passing trade and footfall, being accessible, walkable and related to the most connected movement networks.	It is critical for viability that the location and arrangement of these centres allows them to draw on local as well as passing trade and footfall, being accessible, walkable and related to the most connected movement networks.	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	968	Yes	No	This clause is a repetition of borough-wide landscape policies and should be deleted. It is an appropriate level of detail for development management policy EM1 in the Local Plan rather than for a specific site policy.	Suggested modification: delete clause (h)	Given the landscape issues identified in the site assessment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	970	Yes	No	Clause i) This clause is a repetition of national and Borough-wide heritage policies and should be deleted. It is an appropriate level of detail for development management policy EM11 rather than for a high level site policy.	Suggested modification: delete clause (i)	Given the historic environment issues identified in the site assessment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	975	Yes	No	Clause j) Wootton St Lawrence is a distinct village to the north-west of the draft allocation, and the proposals for a Country Park will provide effective separation between 3.10 and the village. The policy aspiration for Wootton St Lawrence is supported. Worting is however included within a major development allocation adjacent to the urban edge. Whilst the objective to protect the identity and character of Worting is supported, the objective of restricting coalescence will not be effective if the local planning authority wishes to promote this land for development. The identity and character are more likely to be protected by the existing landscaped boundary of the conservation area and sensitive masterplanning of the Worting estate. These inter-relationships with Winklebury can be explored through more detailed masterplanning as required by draft policy SS3 and so the prescriptive nature of clause (j) is unjustified for a specific site policy.	Suggested modification: Reword to " Retain the distinct identity and character of Wootton St Lawrence and Worting and restrict coalescence between Wootton St Lawrence and the new development. Retain the alignment of Roman Road and consider the inter-relationship and connectivity between Winklebury and the new development during subsequent masterplanning and community engagement. Include safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle access to and from neighbouring areas to the Country Park and proposed facilities within the development ."	The objective of preventing the coalescence of villages is a key aim of the Plan, as supported by the strategic gaps policy. The importance of coalescence to Worting village was highlighted through the site assessment process and it is considered that this issue should be outlined in the policy itself. As stated, the inter-relationship between the new development and Winklebury can be explored through more detailed masterplanning as required by draft policy SS3 and therefore the detailed reference to buffers has been removed from the criteria.	The criteria has been updated as follows: Retain the separate identity and character of Worting and Wootton St Lawrence, and restrict coalescence between these villages and the new development and retain the separate identity and character of Winklebury, including conserving the ancient boundary of the Roman Road as a green boundary. ~~by use of green buffers respecting the landscape as currently viewed from Winklebury;~~	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	981	Yes	No	Whilst the landowners strongly support the protection of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs), this clause does not add anything to existing national policies and guidance.	Suggested modification: delete clause (k)	Given the presence of archaeological features on the site, as identified in the site assessment work, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy. In response to comments made by English Heritage, it is considered to be appropriate to strengthen this criterion	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	984	Yes	No	Clause l) Whilst the landowners strongly support the principle of biodiversity protection, this clause is a repetition of draft Policy EM4.	Suggested modification: delete clause l).	Given the biodiversity issues identified in the site assessment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	985	Yes	No	Transport improvements to mitigate the impacts of development, as outlined in clause (m), are supported by the landowners and justified with reference to the initial strategic transport assessment work published by JMP in 2013. Land adjacent to Pack Lane, south of the railway line, is not necessary to deliver 3,080 dwellings, provided that clause (g) is amended as suggested. In this scenario, no transport improvements to Pack Lane would be needed to serve the development.	Suggested modification: assuming clause (g) is amended as suggested, delete reference to Pack Lane.	The yield at Manydown has been increased to include some development at Pack Lane (although less than previously considered in light of highway considerations) to give a total of 3,400 units at Manydown over the Plan period.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	990	Yes	No	Clause q) The landowners support the principle of clause (q). However delivery of public transport "from the outset" relies on the advance construction of principal access routes and sufficient residential catchment to create a viable bus service, meaning that the clause is unviable in its current form.	Suggested modification: replace "provision of public transport from the outset" with "phased provision of public transport".	Whilst more detailed masterplanning in the future will determine the timing and phasing of different parcels of land within Manydown, it is considered that there will still be the opportunity to secure a form of public transport to and from the site from the outset, albeit, this may not reflect the final design and route of any future bus service to serve the site. For example, it may be possible to enhance existing bus services initially, prior to specific services being provided. This will ensure that residents have the opportunity to use alternatives to their car from the outset, prior to firm travel patterns being developed. This issue will need to be explored in greater detail through the masterplanning work.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	991	Yes	No	Clause r) Existing Building Regulations and the Code for Sustainable Homes contain stringent targets for carbon reduction. Whilst the landowners are committed to exploring the potential for on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies, the clause as worded is inflexible and fails to recognise other potential mechanisms for achieving carbon reduction targets, such as improving building fabric performance, energy saving measures and utilising low carbon energy grids.	Suggested modification: delete clause (r) and include within a Borough-wide policy (e.g. EM8).	It is considered to be important to retain criterion r) in each of the site specific policies in order to ensure that this issue is considered from the outset, in bringing forward development on this site. It is expected that further consideration will be given to this issue through the masterplanning of the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1002	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1006	Yes	No	Clause (s) duplicates existing provisions required by relevant British Standards. Noise and vibration impacts from the adjacent railway line will be assessed and mitigation measures incorporated within the development. The emerging URS masterplan identifies land adjacent to the railway as being suitable for SuDS which would create an appropriate development setback to reduce potential noise impacts. Since publication of the NPPF and the revocation of PPG24: Planning and Noise, there is a lack of planning guidance at a national level and local planning authorities may therefore choose to introduce local policies to address this issue. This is likely to be more effective and consistent as a Borough-wide policy or guidance rather than a site-specific requirement.	Suggested modification: delete clause (s) and cover if required within a Borough-wide policy (e.g. EM12) or guidance.	It is considered to be important to retain clause s) in the policy in order to ensure that the important issues of noise and vibration are considered at an early stage. These issues are highlighted in the site assessment as requiring further consideration.	No change	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	1039	Yes	No	The number of houses proposed at Manydown should be increased. The current number of dwellings proposed conflicts with the Inspectors view at the 2005 Local Plan inquiry. If the Tibbalds report is used then the site potential is 3696 dwellings, based on the housing density figures. The land at Manydown offers a groundbreaking extension to the town and the bigger the development the better the chance of securing the finance for the vital infrastructure that will be required. A western relief road should be provided. Additionally, SHLAA sites BAS 099 Scrapps Farm and BAS 141 Worting should be included as sites to be developed, both sites are shown to be achievable in this location and being developed well within the plan period.	The policy wording does not state the basic calculation for 3080 dwellings. The Parish Council requests that the policy incorporates at least the proposed density of dwellings per HA. We request that you specify the density, which needs to be comparable with other selected sites. The Parish Council requests that the number of houses proposed be increased as stated. There is no safeguarding map proposed or area of land described to satisfy the requirement for a western link road between the A339 and M3 junction 7. The PC request that such a map should be used in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the PC requests that Scrapps Farm and Worting are included in the Local Plan as housing allocation sites.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. Both of the sites mentioned are within the Manydown allocation. The wider area of Manydown will be subject to masterplanning to ensure the proper planning of the area.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1043	Yes	Yes	Clause (t) is supported. Technical work by URS demonstrates the potential to utilise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to address surface water run-off. This work also identifies potential to utilise existing or planned capacity at Oakley and Basingstoke sewage treatment works for early development phases, with an option to provide an on-site sewage treatment works, should it be required.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1044	Yes	Yes	Clause (u) is supported, since it is justified in considering the longer term planning of the west of Basingstoke beyond the Plan period, consistent with the rationale for the public acquisition of an interest in the Manydown estate, €To secure the better planning of the area'.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A		Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1051	No	No	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	a) to be amended as follows: provide for the phased delivery of approximately 3,500 dwellings. g) to be deleted. Map 1a amended as below: The area hatched in red is amended to be included within the yellow hatched area.	The phasing of the site has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. It is agreed that criteria g be deleted as suggested and the area hatched in red on Map 1a be included within the yellow hatched area instead.	See response to HCC (rep 965)	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1067	Yes	No	Overall, the landowners consider the Pre-Submission Local Plan to be a positive document that has sought to set out a clear strategy for the future of the borough, and provide an allocation for 3,080 dwellings at Manydown within the Plan Period to 2029. In that context, these landowner representations are intended to shape the draft site allocation and policy wording in a manner that would assist the local planning authority to achieve a Local Plan which is "sound" and therefore would provide the basis for a sustainable development at Manydown that is consistent with the long term Vision and which would be deliverable within the Plan period. The level of detail contained in the Pre-Submission Local Plan in relation to Manydown is considered to be prematurely prescriptive and unjustified. This has resulted in a number of negatively worded clauses that are not consistent with wider sustainability objectives in the Local Plan.	Draft Policy SS3 requires masterplans to be developed through community engagement and approved by the local planning authority in advance of outline planning applications. This process is set out in the Masterplan and Development Brief Protocol contained in Appendix 5 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan and is supported by the landowners. The landowners believe that this masterplanning protocol and process can address a number of the important issues identified in the clauses of the Manydown policy, especially those relating to the quality of life for residents of nearby communities. The landowners therefore suggest to the LPA that it is appropriate to insert a new clause or sentence in Policy SS3.10 that references the masterplanning protocol and so provides confidence to residents that there is a process of engagement with the existing communities to shape the emerging masterplan prior to the submission of a planning application.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1070	Yes	No	SS3.10 clause a Clause (a) is supported in principle and recognises that Manydown can fulfill a significant contribution to the housing supply for the Borough over the Plan period, in a sustainable location which can support the economic growth and community needs of Basingstoke town and the wider sub-region. Evidence from the study prepared by Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd ("Tibbalds") in 2012 for the landowners and the URS masterplanning work illustrate the potential capacity of the site as being at least 3,080 dwellings plus supporting infrastructure in the Local Plan period to 2029, in addition to land in and around Worting which is owned by a number of third parties.	Recommended changes to the draft policy and proposals map will reduce the overall greenfield land requirement and create the basis for a sustainable, unified development, whilst allowing adequate flexibility to respond to detailed masterplanning options and known constraints. The allocation includes land in and around Worting estate owned by a number of third parties, which may have capacity for additional dwellings during the Plan period to 2029. To be positively prepared and flexible, the landowners request that the reference relating to 'approximately 3,080 dwellings' is replaced with 'at least 3,080 dwellings'.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1072	Yes	No	Very specific forms of housing are referenced in Clause (b), including self-build housing and pitch/plot provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. However, no need for plots or pitches after 2017 is identified in the local planning authority's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, which is before the Manydown site is envisaged for development. Whilst there may be a need for further sites beyond 2017, the landowners are keen to discuss with the local planning authority the most effective means of allocating and delivering suitable sites. Whilst the landowners are keen to explore the potential of self-build for an element of housing delivery at Manydown, it is considered that this is too specific a requirement for a site policy and is therefore unlikely to be effective in isolation. We have not yet seen any substantive evidence to justify the necessity for self-build housing on this or other sites.	Suggested modification: delete reference to self-build housing and Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and address these housing needs in a separate Borough-wide policy or policies as well as through the masterplanning process. If there is evidence of a need to support self-build houses, this may best be delivered by having a self-contained housing policy to deal with tenure and exemption from CIL payments, as opposed to trying to achieve this through SS3.10.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1075	Yes	Yes	Clause c) The provision of community infrastructure to meet the needs of the new community at Manydown is a necessary and desirable objective, which the landowners strongly support. The emerging masterplan (and supporting evidence) prepared by URS supports the place-making principle of up to three local centres within Manydown, with potential for one of the centres to evolve into a main centre beyond the Plan period, if required. It is critical for viability that the location and arrangement of these centres allows them to draw on local as well as passing trade and footfall, being accessible, walkable and related to the most connected movement networks.	It is critical for viability that the location and arrangement of these centres allows them to draw on local as well as passing trade and footfall, being accessible, walkable and related to the most connected movement networks.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1077	Yes	No	Clause d) Local Education Authority assessment has identified the need for two primary schools for Manydown, plus a safeguarded site for a secondary school, in advance of a more detailed review of secondary education provision in the west of Basingstoke. Clause (d) is currently unsound because there is no justification for the phased provision of a secondary school for a development of this size. The wording is also inconsistent with the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Options available to the local education authority include the provision of a new secondary school at Manydown, or the expansion of existing secondary schools within the Basingstoke settlement boundary, or both, subject to demography and timescales. The landowners are happy to commit to offering land for a secondary school and contributions towards secondary school places, in advance of an agreed education strategy for the west of Basingstoke.	reword to: " make sufficient land available for the phased provision of two primary schools (a two form entry and a three form entry) and safeguarding for a secondary school site, if required ".	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1079	Yes	No	Clause e) A substantial proportion of the site will accommodate green infrastructure requirements to Borough Council standards. The requirement to "take account of local deficits" is however unjustified in relation to the needs of the development. The landowners are committed to fully engaging with adjacent communities, service providers and other groups in the detail of green infrastructure provision and will consider the detail of interrelationships with existing needs as appropriate.	delete reference to "take account of local deficits".	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1082	Yes	No	Clause f Mechanisms for delivery of the Country Park are unclear within the site policy, the proposals map, and the IDP, which forms the basis for objection. SS3.10 does not generate the need for a Country Park in its own right and the policy wording "to make provision for a Country Park" is therefore unjustified. The land is however available for this purpose and the landowners can make a significant contribution towards its implementation and future management, particularly in light of the council's statutory duties as open space authority and the County Council's experience in successfully creating and managing country parks across Hampshire. Maintaining the Country Park boundary outside of the 3.10 allocation boundary is the correct approach for soundness, however the policy wording should be amended to make clear that developer contributions towards the Country Park are required from the Manydown development and other developments within the Borough.	Suggested modification: amend clause (f) to delete "provision for" and replace with " contributions towards", specify the Country Park within the IDP and future CIL Regulation 123 list. Introduce a new Local Plan policy for the Manydown Country Park to include the following: "Manydown Country Park will become a major green infrastructure asset of up 100 hectares in area to serve Basingstoke and the surrounding area. It will be a multi-functional space for informal recreation, play, nature conservation, education and land management, with ancillary uses including visitor parking and facilities. A masterplan shall be prepared and approved in advance of implementation and it will be funded through developer contributions and CIL. Connections to surrounding areas, using existing public rights of way and new links via Manydown, should ensure safe and convenient accessibility by walking and cycling."	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1083	Yes	No	Clause (g) refers to the draft proposals map for Policy SS3.10 and includes restrictions on a significant area of land around Worting Road and Worting. The reasons for the clause are unclear but appear to stem from concerns regarding the relationship of the development to Worting conservation area and the landscape. The council's landscape capacity study (2010) identifies the Oakley/Steventon Down landscape character area as having low capacity' for development and the Enclosed Worting Mixed Farmland as having "medium capacity". Other land within the allocation is identified as having "medium capacity". The landowners are confident that a sensitive approach to the countryside edge and the relationship to Worting conservation area can be addressed through detailed masterplanning and consideration of layout, scale, character and landscape strategy. A blanket restriction on development will not be effective, is not justified and would prejudice the creation of a sustainable community.	Suggested modification: delete clause (g) and amend the proposals map accordingly to include the western boundaries of parcels 4 and 5 from the Tibbalds report; identify the Worting Conservation Area on the proposals map.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1085	Yes	No	This clause is a repetition of borough-wide landscape policies and should be deleted. It is an appropriate level of detail for development management policy EM1 in the Local Plan rather than for a specific site policy.	Suggested modification: delete clause (h)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1086	Yes	No	Clause i) This clause is a repetition of national and Borough-wide heritage policies and should be deleted. It is an appropriate level of detail for development management policy EM11 rather than for a high level site policy.	Suggested modification: delete clause (i)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1087	Yes	No	Clause j) Wootton St Lawrence is a distinct village to the north-west of the draft allocation, and the proposals for a Country Park will provide effective separation between 3.10 and the village. The policy aspiration for Wootton St Lawrence is supported. Worting is however included within a major development allocation adjacent to the urban edge. Whilst the objective to protect the identity and character of Worting is supported, the objective of restricting coalescence will not be effective if the local planning authority wishes to promote this land for development. The identity and character are more likely to be protected by the existing landscaped boundary of the conservation area and sensitive masterplanning of the Worting estate. These inter-relationships with Winklebury can be explored through more detailed masterplanning as required by draft policy SS3 and so the prescriptive nature of clause (j) is unjustified for a specific site policy.	Suggested modification: Reword to " Retain the distinct identity and character of Wootton St Lawrence and Worting and restrict coalescence between Wootton St Lawrence and the new development. Retain the alignment of Roman Road and consider the inter-relationship and connectivity between Winklebury and the new development during subsequent masterplanning and community engagement. Include safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle access to and from neighbouring areas to the Country Park and proposed facilities within the development ".	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1089	Yes	No	Whilst the landowners strongly support the protection of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs), this clause does not add anything to existing national policies and guidance.	Suggested modification: delete clause (k)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1090	Yes	No	Clause l) Whilst the landowners strongly support the principle of biodiversity protection, this clause is a repetition of draft Policy EM4.	Suggested modification: delete clause l).	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1091	Yes	No	Transport improvements to mitigate the impacts of development, as outlined in clause (m), are supported by the landowners and justified with reference to the initial strategic transport assessment work published by JMP in 2013. Land adjacent to Pack Lane, south of the railway line, is not necessary to deliver 3,080 dwellings, provided that clause (g) is amended as suggested. In this scenario, no transport improvements to Pack Lane would be needed to serve the development.	Suggested modification: assuming clause (g) is amended as suggested, delete reference to Pack Lane.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1092	Yes	No	Clause n) The Parsons Brinkerhoff transport assessment (August 2013) of the Pre-Submission Local Plan does not identify a need for a western bypass or a dual carriageway to serve the town or the Manydown development to 2029, and their inclusion within a site policy is therefore unjustified. A bypass is not referred to in the current Local Transport Plan 2011-2031, adopted in 2013, and the environmental impacts have not been assessed. Moreover, any potential need to safeguard for a dual carriageway by-pass through the northern and north eastern parts of the Manydown site will substantially affect the amount of houses that can be delivered in the Plan period, have serious viability implications for the project and have severance impacts through the new community at Manydown. It would not therefore be sound to include reference to a dual carriageway or bypass in Policy SS3.10.	Suggested modification: Reword to " Include the provision of a frontage link road between the A339 and B3400 and ensure that the ability to connect it to a link road to the south, beyond the Plan period, is not prejudiced. Regard shall be had to the optimum location for crossing the railway line and safeguarding land in its ownership for a future crossing of the railway line."	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1094	Yes	No	Clause o) Similar to clause (n), the reference to a bypass and dual carriageway are unjustified at the present time. Additionally, the Manydown estate does not extend to M3 Junction 7, meaning the safeguarding policy is potentially undeliverable. There is no funding or business case identified and therefore the Plan is unsound in its current form. The landowners are however willing to safeguard land where a need has been demonstrated.	Suggested modification: delete clause (o), assuming that amendments to clause (n) are accepted.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	N/A	N/A	787475	1096	Yes	No	Clause p) - These issues are covered by clauses (j) and (m).	Suggested modification: delete clause (p) and include reference to connections to and from the Country Park in clause (j).	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1099	Yes	No	Clause q) The landowners support the principle of clause (q). However delivery of public transport "from the outset" relies on the advance construction of principal access routes and sufficient residential catchment to create a viable bus service, meaning that the clause is unviable in its current form.	Suggested modification: replace "provision of public transport from the outset" with €"phased provision of public transport".	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1101	Yes	No	Clause r) Existing Building Regulations and the Code for Sustainable Homes contain stringent targets for carbon reduction. Whilst the landowners are committed to exploring the potential for on-site renewable and low carbon energy technologies, the clause as worded is inflexible and fails to recognise other potential mechanisms for achieving carbon reduction targets, such as improving building fabric performance, energy saving measures and utilising low carbon energy grids.	Suggested modification: delete clause (r) and include within a Borough-wide policy (e.g. EM8).	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1104	Yes	No	The Council Manydown Executive Committee recommended 4,000 houses over this plan period. Tibbalds Planning and Design produced a report in September 2012 which recommends 350dpa. Tibbalds stated that they used a "reasonably conservative" development density of 20 dwellings per hectare when calculating potential site capacity. The average density of sites in the Local Plan is 24dph, similar to calculations in the Landscape Capacity Study of 2010. There is no reason given for these differences. The allocation appears constrained by the council's estimated yield rate of 300 dpa. However, there is no evidence for the potential yield on other sites. Using the Tibbalds figure of 24dph gives a site potential of 3,700. Scrapps Farm and Worting sites (Category 1 sites in the SHLAA), owned by a third party, do not appear to be included in the Master Plan for Manydown.	Increase Manydown yield to 4,000 and also include Scrapps Farm and Worting sites as they could provide in excess of 300 houses. Along with the higher build rate this would have the potential for 4,000 houses over the plan period.	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. The mentioned sites fall within the Manydown allocation	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1105	Yes	No	Clause (s) duplicates existing provisions required by relevant British Standards. Noise and vibration impacts from the adjacent railway line will be assessed and mitigation measures incorporated within the development. The emerging URS masterplan identifies land adjacent to the railway as being suitable for SuDS which would create an appropriate development setback to reduce potential noise impacts. Since publication of the NPPF and the revocation of PPG24: Planning and Noise, there is a lack of planning guidance at a national level and local planning authorities may therefore choose to introduce local policies to address this issue. This is likely to be more effective and consistent as a Borough-wide policy or guidance rather than a site-specific requirement.	Suggested modification: delete clause (s) and cover if required within a Borough-wide policy (e.g. EM12) or guidance.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1107	Yes	Yes	Clause (t) is supported. Technical work by URS demonstrates the potential to utilise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to address surface water run-off. This work also identifies potential to utilise existing or planned capacity at Oakley and Basingstoke sewage treatment works for early development phases, with an option to provide an on-site sewage treatment works, should it be required.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1108	Yes	Yes	Clause (u) is supported, since it is justified in considering the longer term planning of the west of Basingstoke beyond the Plan period, consistent with the rationale for the public acquisition of an interest in the Manydown estate, €"to secure the better planning of the area'.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1111	Yes	No	The final sentence of the policy refers to delivery from 2019/20 to 2028/29. It is recommended that the delivery period is changed to 2017/18 to 2028/29, to provide some flexibility over housing delivery and to reflect the fact that some phases could come forward earlier in the Plan period depending on economic conditions.	Suggested modification: replace "2019/20" with "2017/18".	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1113	Yes	No	Policy Map 1a Removing the unjustified restrictions within clause (g) will enable the allocation to be delivered entirely north of the railway line, as a unified, comprehensive development which provides the best opportunity for a cohesive, sustainable community. The landowners consider the allocated land to the south of the railway (parcel 6a) to be peripheral and segregated, and recommend its removal from Policy SS3.10. Since parcel 6a has been assessed by the LPA as being potentially suitable for development, the Local Planning Authority may wish to consider allocating it as a reserve site or simply keeping it within the settlement policy boundary, to provide some flexibility in housing delivery and account for any Borough-wide shortfalls during the Plan period. This, together with the implications of other comments in this landowner representation, would lead to a number of modifications to the allocation boundary shown in Proposals Map 1a (as shown on the attached Figure 3).	Suggested modification 1. Amend the proposals map in line with the redraft of clause (g) as set out above 2. Identify the Worting Conservation Area 3. Identify the Manydown Country Park as a separate allocation and label accordingly 4. Correct the Country Park boundary to accurately reflect the existing restrictive covenant 5. Show an indicative alignment for the link road between the A339 and B3400, based on the submitted JMP transport study 6. Delete parcel 6a from Policy SS3.10 and consider the potential to include the land within the settlement boundary or as a reserve site.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.		N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1126	Yes	No	In principle the Worting Business Park Ltd and Flavia Estates support the proposed allocation of Manydown as a major urban extension. Whilst it is entirely appropriate to include Worting within the Masterplan area, there is no justification for seeking to limit development at Worting to the extent implied by Policy SS3.10. Worting has the potential to form a vibrant and attractive mixed use neighbourhood at the heart of Manydown capable of accommodating about 500 dwellings as well as new employment opportunities. The limitations currently imposed on Worting are based on the conclusions of the SA. However, the assessment contained within the SA are neither robust nor credible. They incorrectly assess development at Worting as having a number of 'negative' and 'strongly negative' impacts. Furthermore, the delayed phasing (post 2019) is not justified in relation to Worting, as the development of this area is relatively unconstrained and not dependent on new infrastructure.	Policy SS3.10 should be amended to provide for the delivery of approximately 3500 dwellings. Para g) should be deleted and the reference to Worting in para j) should be removed. The delayed phasing (post 2019) is not justified in relation to Worting. Development at Worting is relatively unconstrained and not dependent on the provision of major new infrastructure. It can therefore be delivered without delay and in so doing, it can make a useful contribution to maintaining a 5-year supply of housing land. There is no justification for arbitrarily delaying the release of this site. Generally, it is entirely inappropriate to gear (and therefore potentially limit) the delivery of housing from an allocated site to the maintenance of a 5-year land supply. Policy SS3.10 should be amended by deleting "in accordance with the requirement to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing site".	Due to issues associated with the delivery of large development sites, including the long lead in times associated with the masterplanning and development management processes and also the number of units that can physically be delivered on a site in any given year it would not be a sound approach to significantly increase numbers at Manydown. The phasing of the site has however been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. Criteria g) has been deleted. It is considered suitable to retain the criteria restricting the coalescence of Worting village. The NPPF requires the Plan to deliver a rolling 5 year housing land supply and therefore the reference to this is considered suitable.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1150	No	No	The plan is inconsistent in its treatment of two elements in the Manydown development. It firstly removes the access road into the development from SS3.10 and places it (in the form of a Link Road) in the transport plan. Secondly, the separate proposal for a Country Park which is not even on land within the proposed development is kept as part of the Manydown development proposal. The Country Park proposal is not linked to the development in any way other than it is adjacent to the proposed development and is in the same ownership. The country park should be a stand-alone proposal separate from the Manydown proposal. As it presently stands the Country Park proposal appears to be a clumsy attempt to sweeten a devastating proposal that will blight the lives of the residents in the area with a vague notion of giving them some countryside space which they already have while taking away the essential countryside space they presently enjoy.	Exclude the Country Park proposal from the Manydown development proposal and include it in the appropriate section CN7. Consider the Link road only as part of the Manydown development.	The criteria relating to the countrypark has been updated, as outlined elsewhere in this schedule - see response to comment ID: 961 (HCC). It has been added to the IDP and supporting text of EM5 (Green Infrastructure). Criteria in the policy relating to the link road have been updated and this how picks up the access point.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1155	No	No	The present plan is very vague in its assessment and deliverability of the development. The site requires the "Link Road" to be in place but there is no provision in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as to how the Link Road will be funded. With a proposed development rate of some 300 homes per year, a number of areas would need to be developed at the same time, so the link road would need to be in place. If a sequential approach is used to develop areas 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 in order then each area would not be able to deliver the required numbers each in a short time. With the high cost of infrastructure, it is not possible to just build half of Manydown. The Manydown Development Framework documents and the site assessment both are clear on this. See full rep for the full details of this point.	The Manydown proposal should be removed as it unable to provide the flexibility required to follow changes in demand and may commit the borough to Greenfield development ahead of Brownfield opportunities.	The Plan positively supports the development of suitable brownfield sites but greenfield allocations are required to meet the borough's housing needs. The policy, supported by the IDP, provide sufficient detail to guide the appropriate development of the site whilst also allowing flexibility for the master plan to consider the detailed elements of the proposal. A link road will be provided as on site infrastructure and will be required to serve the Manydown development. As such this is likely to be secured as part of any planning permission for the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1163	No	No	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan Infrastructure Requirements table (page 72) shows the Indicative cost of the Link Road (section from A339 to B3400) as £3.6 million. This is a new road of some 2.8 kilometres with major junction changes at each end. This figure does not appear to be realistic. Elsewhere the same table shows simple junction improvements at a mini roundabout to cost £3.2 million. The link road is planned as part of a western bypass scheme. No estimate of the cost of the whole scheme appears to have been carried out even though the northern section is proposed but has been assessed as part of the whole scheme. A more realistic figure for the cost of the link road is 32 million, whereas the western bypass would be more in the region of 91 million. This is no considered to be an acceptable use of public money, especially given the lack of justification for the road. The lack of precision in this regard is misleading.	The actual cost of the road proposal should be clearly calculated and its viability fully assessed before it is proposed. The due process required by the council in agreeing such expenditure should be followed. The plan should be investigated to uncover why the cost of the road has been drastically understated. The viability of the Manydown land as a development site should be re-assessed by the landowner in the public interest. Safeguards should be put in place so that any cost of any roads serving development at Manydown are taken directly from profits from that development not passed to burden the general roads budget. (This is to safeguard that any share of profits paid to the former land owner reflect the real profit from the land rather than an inflated profit which excludes the burden of infrastructure costs).	The IDP provides a high level estimate of the costs of implementing a 2.8 kilometer single carriageway. The cost of the link road was based on high level costings for a typical single carriageway link road. Should further work indicate that the design of the road needs to be amended, then the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated accordingly. The Local Plan Transport assessment provides a high level cumulative assessment of the impacts of the Local Plan on the local highway network and therefore does not undertake detailed junction tests and designs for each of the development proposals (including Manydown) as that is undertaken at a later stage as part of the detailed masterplanning and/or planning application process for those development sites once their respective allocations have been confirmed in the Local Plan.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1185	No	No	Object to the allocation. It is considered to be highly unlikely that the land currently identified for residential development will be the last of the land within the Manydown Estate to be developed for housing and other uses and has the potential to accommodate a very large number of dwellings, both during the current plan period and also in the longer term. One of the primary concerns is that the Local Plan marks the beginning of decades of large-scale piecemeal development on the western side of Basingstoke. Is there a better alternative for long term strategic development at the sub-regional level? The allocation is not effective in terms of providing enough dwellings to meet acknowledged long term housing needs. Unconvinced that the allocation is suitable or deliverable given a number of constraints. The Local Plan is not legally compliant given the absence of an appropriate level of cooperation with neighbouring authorities.	The LPA should consider whether or not they hold within their administrative area sufficient land, which is free from significant environmental constraints; accessible to the wider sub-region; and is capable of accommodating a sustainable large-scale location for growth. ZAL controls Micheldever station which is of a sufficient scale, strategically located between the settlements of Basingstoke, Andover and Winchester, to accommodate a level of housing and economic growth which would offer a sustainable and deliverable alternative to Manydown.	The Borough Council has prepared a comprehensive SHLAA, which involved several opportunities for sites to be highlighted to the council for possible future development within the Borough boundaries. The SHLAA provided a basis upon which to consider greenfield sites in more detail through a site assessment process which, in turn, informed the allocation of sites for inclusion in the Local Plan. It is not considered to be necessary to seek the formal allocation of land outside of the borough to meet the borough's needs at present. In Duty to co-operate discussions with neighbouring boroughs, there has been no discussion regarding the Micheldever Station site, as an alternative site to meet needs at a sub national level.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1195	Yes	No	The number of houses proposed, 3080, should be increased. The figure of 3080 is constrained by the council's estimated rate of yield per year. If the Tibbalds Report figure of 20dph has been used, then using 24dph, as for other sites, this would increase the site potential to 3696. Manydown provides an opportunity to comprehensively plan a large strategic site. Should advance the anticipated construction date of the western-bypass. Support the route of the Western 'Bypass' to be renamed 'Link', as defined in the Transport Assessment (TA) (2013). BAS 099 Scrapps Farm and BAS 141 Worting sites should be allocated as SHLAA version 7 states they are achievable should development come forward at Manydown. No safeguarding map for the link road in the Local Plan but the TA(2013) indicates a line from the railway to M3 junction 7, close to BAS 133 Hounsme Fields. Possibility of land within SS3.10 to become a reserve of some 400 dwellings. See representation for full comments.	1. The policy wording does not state the basis of calculation for 3080 dwellings. Request that the policy incorporates at least the proposed density of dwellings per Ha which needs to be comparable with other selected sites. 2. Request the number of houses proposed 3080, be increased. 3. There is no safeguarding map proposed or area of land described to satisfy the requirement for a Western Link road between A339 and M3 junction 7 (criteria n) and o)). Request that such a map or description of land, or preferably both, be published and the wording of criteria (n) and (o) and Policy Map 1a as necessary be modified accordingly, particularly as the progress of a master plan for the whole of the Manydown land is proceeding currently. 4. Requests that BAS 099 Scrapps Farm and BAS 141 Worting sites be included in the Local Plan in conjunction with the development of the Manydown site. This could allow for the possibility of land within SS3.10 to become a reserve of some 400 dwellings.	The phasing of the site has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased to 3,400, as a result of the consultation process. Scrapps Hill and Worting fall within the Manydown allocation. Transport matters have been picked up and amended elsewhere in this schedule	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1225	No	No	Policy Map 1a. Consider land should be expanded within " Key locations for development"	Policy Map 1a. Consider land should be expanded within " Key locations for development"	In response to the consultation the site boundary has been moved out to encompass a wider area.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1242	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority has specific objections in relation to clause O). The Borough Council's supporting Transport Assessment only models a single carriageway road. The TA clearly states that the provision of this link road in full will only provide modest reduction in junction improvements required. The "potential savings are unlikely to be in proportion to the cost for delivering the entire bypass". It also states that "For other junctions listed in table 3.21 the variations in highway demand as a result of the implementation of the Western bypass are insignificant and deemed immaterial in terms of their potential in scaling down the highway mitigations recommended in this study". At present HCC as the Highway Authority is not able to determine if there is a requirement to safeguard land for a dual carriageway or for provision of a full western bypass due to its prematurity and lack of evidence.	Hampshire County Council requires further evidence to assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass. The County Council welcomes the chance to work with BDBC to fully assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass.	Officers recognise that there is no evidence currently justifying the need for a full Western Bypass. Amendments have been made to criteria N of the policy which will enable criteria O to be deleted.	Criteria O has been deleted and amendments to Criteria N have been made (see other reps)	In response to representations	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1243	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority has specific objections in relation to clause N). No evidence has been provided to demonstrate the need to safeguard land for a dual carriageway and therefore the same reasoning for raising specific objections to Clause O apply to Clause N. However, Hampshire County Council welcomes the chance to work together with the Borough Council to assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass.	Hampshire County Council requires further evidence to assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass. The County Council welcomes the chance to work with BDBC to fully assess the requirement and deliverability of a western bypass.	Officers recognise that there is no evidence currently justifying the need for a full Western Bypass. Amendments have been made to criteria N of the policy which will enable criteria O to be deleted.	Criteria O has been deleted and amendments to Criteria N have been made (see other reps)	In response to representations	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1260	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council has a responsibility for countryside access, recreation and rights of way across Hampshire including the Local Plan area of Basingstoke and Deane. The County Council welcomes the references within sections 26.21 - 26.29 regarding the provision of a country park. However there is a need to emphasise and clarify that this country park will meet the needs of Basingstoke town and the wider community of Basingstoke and Deane and not just those within any new community developed within the allocated site at Manydown.	The country park should be included as an Infrastructure Requirement within the IDP schedule with the following text: Provision of a country park to serve communities within the town of Basingstoke and the wider area, with pedestrian and cycling access from surrounding / adjacent neighbourhoods: Policy/Site: SS3.10 Priority: Desirable Delivery: 2019-2029 Indicative Costs: £3.7m Identified funding: 0 Funding shortfall: £3.7m S106: Yes CIL: Yes	The IDP has been updated along the lines suggested. The relevant criteria of the Manydown policy has also been updated with supporting text added to Policy EM5 (G1)	See updates outlined elsewhere in schedule	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1289	Not Specified	No	There is no evidence to support the inclusion of point b in the policy. The Manydown site is scheduled to be built between 2019 and 2029 and there is no evidence for need in this period, or if this is a suitable site for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. Provision is properly dealt with in Policy CN4. BDBC and HCC are obliged to promote the land at Manydown for development and ensure the proper planning of the area. There is no need for a competitive return to provide an incentive to the landowner to sell the site. Whatever the outcome of further viability work being undertaken it cannot be used as evidence to justify a reduction in the 40% affordable housing target for this site. There is nothing in the council's evidence base to justify a new dual carriageway. The new link road is acceptable but needs further definition and clarification. Clarity is required so TA can assess traffic flows and IDP can identify mitigation required. See attachment for further details.	In order to ensure that the plan is "justified" by the available evidence: - delete the words that follow "self-build units" from subparagraph b) in policy SS3.10 - amend policy CN4 to delete the paragraph "The council will meet ...and SS11" - amend the following paragraph in CN4 to read "The council will meet the identified needs for accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople by granting planning permission where: ...". Items a) through g) then continue as in the Pre-Submission Local Plan - make any other consequential amendments. If the Policy is amended to provide for "at least 3,080 dwellings" or to omit clauses which might be covered by national policies or other policies in this Plan, make corresponding changes to all the other Strategic Site policies, to ensure that the Plan is "justified" by the available evidence. Keep the target of 40% affordable housing, recognising the powers under which the site was purchased. See attachments for further details.	The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them. The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF. As outlined in Draft Policy CN1, 40% will be the starting point for negotiations on all sites. It is agreed that there is no justification for the dual carriageway at this stage and the reference has been removed from the policy. The routing of the link road between the B3400 and A339 will be determined through the masterplanning process. An indicative route was used for the purposes of the TA modelling.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles)	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Alison Slinger	N/A	N/A	784440	123	Not Specified	No	I wish to protest in the strongest terms to the proposed housing development in and around Oakley in particular the 3,000 houses on the Manydown land north of the B3400 and the 600 houses along Pack Lane. This will completely change the nature of Oakley as a village. Oakley will lose it's identity as being distinct from Basingstoke. As there are many other options around Basingstoke I feel you have yet to fully justify your proposal. Your proposal will also put an incredible strain on all the local services and amenities such as schools and Doctor's surgery.	We should consider other options such as building houses on brown field sites within the existing boundary of Basingstoke; one example of this is the land behind Toys R Us and also the area north of the A339 between Ramsdell Lane and the Weybrook Golf Club which I believe is also Manydown land and also the land South of the M3 between junctions 6 and 7.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and issues raised have been given due consideration through this process. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Brian Hunkin	N/A	N/A	786750	839	Not Specified	Not Specified	Concerned re development plans in the Oakley area. Moved to Oakley 20 years ago to enjoy village life. The proposed developments on Pack Lane and extension of Oakley's borders infringe the strategic gap which currently maintains village status. However, my major concern is with infrastructure. Oakley is already one of the largest villages in Hampshire, yet already lacks the community infrastructure to support the current population, in particular shops, restaurants etc. let alone a larger population created by further development. Whilst I appreciate the current need to build new houses surely there are sufficient brown field sites that could be developed before eating up more countryside and destroying village life to the west of Basingstoke.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. A detailed assessment of all possible housing sites in the borough has been undertaken through the SHLAA and site assessment/sustainability appraisal processes and issues raised have been given due consideration through this process. A key objective of the Plan is to maximise development on brownfield sites and bring empty homes back into use but due to the needs of the borough, greenfield sites are required. The Council has liaised with service providers to understand their future requirement for additional infrastructure and this is reflected in the policy criteria and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which details what is required and possible funding sources.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Pre-submission Local Plan Objective.doc	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1290	No	No	Comments relate to Map 1a. The available evidence does not support the proposals in Map 1a. The January 2013 Site Assessment notes that the land at Manydown is predominantly of "good" agricultural quality with some "very good". NPPF 112 also says that there should be significant development of agricultural land only where it is "demonstrated to be necessary". The Map seeks to allocate more land than is needed for development up until 2029. The draft Pre-Submission Local Plan included in the report by planning officers to the Planning and Infrastructure oscom on 26 June 2013 proposed an allocation on Manydown (Map 1a in Appendix 3) which allocated less BDBC/HCC land than the area hatched yellow in the published Pre-Submission plan. Their report of 15 July 2013 to the Pandt oscom. Map 1a allocates about 50% more land on Manydown than the map put forward the previous month, although the target for the plan period remained at 3,080 dwellings. See attachment for further details.	The LPA should retain the SPB around Manydown proposed in Map 1a in the Pre-Submission Local Plan where it is north of the railway line but remove the land south of the railway from the SPB. The LPA should also remove the designation of some of the land within the SPB as "Area in which Masterplanning will take place but development will be limited due to heritage and landscape constraints". If the landowners for Manydown bring forward publicly-available evidence that supports their request for the SPB to be extended west beyond the shallow north-south ridge which crosses the B3400 and the LPA intends to extend the SPB in that way, there should be a further period of public consultation on that aspect after the evidence has been published.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and is considered to be a suitable location for housing. Loss of agricultural land was recognised in the site assessment and sustainability appraisal and has been given due consideration through the site selection process. The site boundaries have been changed as a result of the consultation and a yield of 3,400 is considered to be suitable based on masterplanning and other available evidence. Further public consultation will take place on the proposed changes.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Officer change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update criteria t (now r) in response to representations from Thames Water regarding the need to produce a drainage strategy	Update as follows: Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and of site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy.	Response to representation	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1241	Yes	No	The deliverability of the parcel of land south of the railway line is questioned because of the principle impact on the Fiveways junction. However, the mitigation proposals within the Transport Assessment for the Fiveways junction (section 4.18) do not demonstrate that the additional traffic can be accommodated by a junction improvement that can be delivered within the limits of the highway boundary. Without an improvement to the 'Fiveways' junction or an alternative access arrangement to this parcel of land, the highway authority considers that the development of this site would cause undue interference with the safety and operation of the highway network and would therefore conflict with Policy CN8.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requires clarification and further dialogue with BDBC regarding the Transport Assessment in order to fully assess the impact on the highway network of the allocation of the parcel of land south of the railway line of the Manydown strategic allocation.	There is ongoing dialogue with HCC on this parcel of land and further testing has been undertaken. This testing suggests that a lower level of development on this site is achievable and consequently a new criteria has been added restricting development on this area to approximately 300 units unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.	Include criteria t) to read: On the land south of the railway line and north of Pack Lane, development will be limited to a yield of approximately 300 units, unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.	Response to representations and updated evidence base.	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr and Mrs A Stacey	N/A	N/A	784437	121	Not Specified	No	The proposal to build 600 new houses in Pack Lane will inevitably lead to traffic congestion at Fiveways junction, particularly at peak times, unless significant road improvements are made - in addition, another 3,000 houses on Manydown land north of the railway will exacerbate this.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	Include criteria t) to read: On the land south of the railway line and north of Pack Lane, development will be limited to a yield of approximately 300 units, unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.	Response to representations and updated evidence base.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mrs Lesley Shrimpton	N/A	N/A	784983	331	Not Specified	No	Pack Lane is not a big enough road to accommodate the traffic which would be associated with the development of parcel 6. Development of this part of the Manydown site would be detrimental to highway safety.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. This is supported by the Infrastructure Development Plan. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	Include criteria t) to read: On the land south of the railway line and north of Pack Lane, development will be limited to a yield of approximately 300 units, unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.	Response to representations and updated evidence base.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Officer change	N/A	N/A					<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Add additional wording to criteria s) to explain the annotation in the Policies Map regarding development at Manydown beyond the plan period in order to improve transparency and provide a context for the masterplanning work.	Include following wording in criteria s) Ensure that it does not prejudice the integration of future development at Manydown beyond the plan period. <u>The policy map indicates the area subject to wider masterplanning.</u>	Improve clarity of the Plan	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Overall the MCL consider that the Pre-Sub LP is a positive document which has sought to set out a clear strategy for the future of the borough. In addition, they support the allocation of the site and consider that the proposed number of units is deliverable within the timeframe set out in the LP. However, they consider that there is currently a lack of clarity concerning the potential housing yield, which would be solved by replacing the requirement to deliver 'approximately 3,080 dwellings' with 'at least 3,080 dwellings'. In addition, they consider that some of the policy clauses constitute unjustified restrictions. MCL assert that the country park is not justified by the Manydown development alone. Parcel 6a should be allocated to allow flexibility of delivery. More specifically, they object to criteria: a), b), d), e), f), g), h), k), l), m), n), o), p), q) and final sentence of policy. MCL supports criteria: t), u). Commented criteria: c), i), r) No comment on criteria s).	Require 'at least' 3080 dwellings on the site, stipulating at least 3000 on the Manydown Estate. Delete reference to gypsy and travellers. Delete reference to self-build. Remove requirement for country park. Delete all reference to Pack Lane. Final sentence of policy: Replace 2019/20 with 2017/18 .	The Borough Council has taken a consistent approach to drafting up site based policies, which respond to the issues and opportunities raised in the site assessment work and other pieces of evidence base. These are necessary to ensure that important issues are flagged up from the outset and to avoid possible future issues in dealing with detailed proposals for each of the sites. The yield at Manydown has been increased to give a total of 3,400 units at Manydown over the Plan period. It is considered that the word 'approximately' provides sufficient flexibility. The boundaries on Map 1 have also been updated to reflect more detailed masterplanning and new information. The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF. Agree to update criteria f) to reflect the comments made and also update the IDP accordingly. Additional wording has been added to EM5 (Green Infrastructure) in respect of the country park. Agree that criteria g) should be removed and the policies map updated to remove the designation.	Please see responses to HCC reps for further details on changes to SS3.10.	N/A	N/A	Partially outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Criteria a) - MCL supports the phased delivery of 3,080 during the course of the plan period. However, they consider that there is currently a lack of clarity concerning the housing yields on the different parts of the land which make up the allocation. MCA accepts that the delivery of 3,080 is deliverable during the plan period, but consider that it needs to be recognised that other parts of the site may come forward after 2029. MCL also notes that the proposed allocation includes land owned by various third parties, which may have the capacity for additional dwellings during the plan period.	In order to be positively prepared and flexible, MCL requests that the reference to 'approximately 3,080 dwellings' be replaced with 'at least 3,080 dwellings, of which at least 3,000 are to be on the Manydown Estate'.	The yields of different parcels will be considered further through the masterplanning exercise. The phasing of the site has been brought forward, as suitable, and the yield increased, as a result of the consultation process. Further wording on developmnet beyond teh plan period has been added to criteria s and this links in with the policy map. The word 'approximately' provides flexibility in the delivery of the site.	Please see responses to HCC reps for further details on changes to SS3.10.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause b) - Very specific forms of housing are referenced in Clause (b), including self-build housing and pitch/plot provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. However, no need for plots or pitches after 2017 is identified in the local planning authority's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, which is before the Manydown site is envisaged for development. There is no substantive evidence to justify the necessity for self-build housing in this allocation. Without proper evidence this requirement is overly prescriptive, unjustified and unsound.	Delete reference to gypsy, travellers and travelling show people, as well as the requirement for self-build. The self-build element could form a separate, borough-wide policy, if it can be justified through a proper evidence base.	The inclusion of 'the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them. The provision for a proportion of self-build homes accords with the thrust of paragraph 50 and 159 of the NPPF.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause c) - MCL supports the provision of community facilities, shopping facilities and sports and leisure facilities as an importance part of this urban extension.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Supported noted	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause d) - this is unjustified and unsound as there is no evidence to justify the phased provision of a secondary school for a development of this size. MCL supports the provision of two primary schools in a phased manner.	Make sufficient land available for the phased provision of two primary schools, to be delivered when required during the plan period. Masterplanning should cover the longer term larger development potential and ensure that land is safeguarded for a secondary school that can be delivered if required in a location suitable to serve the entire development, including that delivered beyond the plan period.	The criteria has been updated to reserve land for the secondary school IF it is required.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause e) - the requirement to take account of local deficits is not justified and is hence unsound.	delete the reference to the need to take account of local deficits.	Agree to remove this statement as this is unjustified in terms of the needs of the development	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause f) - MCL strongly supports the principle of a substantial amount of open space forming a part of a 'Sustainable Urban Extension'. However, MCL does not consider that a development of this size justifies the requirement for a large scale country park. The consequent overprovision of open space would undermine the viability of the site, and threaten the capability to fund other planning obligations. Therefore, this requirement is unjustified and unsound.	Amend clause f) in order to delete 'provision for' and replace with 'contributions towards. Specify the country park within the IDP and CL Regulations list.	Agree to update criteria f) to reflect the comments made and also update the IDP accordingly. A separate policy on the countrypark is not considered necessary although additional wording has been added to EM5 (Green Infrastructure) along the lines suggested. The boundaries on Map 1 have also been updated to reflect more detailed masterplanning and new information.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause g) - 'additional constraints' has not been justified. Therefore, this lack of clarity means that the requirement is not effective, justified or sound.	Delete clause g), and amend the proposals map accordingly to include western boundaries of parcels 4 and 5 from the Tibbalds report .	Agree that criteria g) should be removed and the policies map updated to remove the designation.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause h) - comment. This clause is a repetition of the borough landscape-wide policy and should be deleted.	Delete clause h)	Given the landscape issues identified in the site assesment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause i) - comment. This clause is a repetition of the borough-wide policy and should be deleted.	Delete clause i).	Given the historic environment issues identified in the site assesment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause j) - MCL strongly supports proposals to provide for open space and effective separation between the Manydown site and the village of Wootton St Lawrence. However, the provision of open space, which already forms a part of the allocation, already provides the protection sought, meaning that the clause only serves as unnecessary repetition. Worting is also included within the allocation, and hence these provisions are not compatible with the wider policy. The identity and character will be protected by the existing landscape boundary of the conservation area and therefore it would be more effective to refer to this specific measure to give clarity to this element of the policy. Winklebury is part of Basingstoke and to ensure sustainable development it is correct for the development to be masterplanned to enhance connectivity between proposed new area of development and those existing. Masterplanning should consider in detail these matters and avoid new development being inaccessible from existing parts of the town.	Protect the identity and character of Wootton St Lawrence by making land available for a Country Park. Protect the identity and character of Worting by protecting the existing landscaped boundary of the conservation area. Masterplanning will consider in detail the inter-relationship and connectivity between Winklebury and the land allocated under this policy including safe pedestrian and cycle access to and from neighbouring areas to the Country Park and proposed facilities within the development.	The objective of preventing the coalescence of villages is a key aim of the Plan, as supported by the strategic gaps policy. The importance of coalescence to Worting village was highlighted through the site assessment process and it is considered that this can be given due consideration through the masterplanning without negatively affecting the wider development of Manydown.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause k) - MCL strongly support the protection of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, however, protection of Scheduled Monuments is already covered by national policy and thus this is an unnecessary repetition.	Delete clause k)	Given the presence of archaeological features on the site, as identified in the site assessment work, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy. In response to comments made by English Heritage, it is considered to be appropriate to strengthen this criterion.	no change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause l) - for many years MCL has been at the forefront of conservation, and care of the environment. MCL strongly supports the principle of biodiversity protection. However, this clause is a repetition of draft policy EM4.	Delete clause l)	Given the biodiversity issues identified in the site assessment work and the large-scale nature of the site, it is considered to be important to clearly establish the expectations of development on the site through this site specific policy.	no change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause m) - Pack Lane, which is located to the south of the railway line is not impacted on by the part of the development likely to be delivered within the plan period.	Delete all reference to Pack Lane	The sites is considered to form part of the most sustainable strategy for the borough when assessed against the alternatives. A criteria has been added to limit development on the site adjacent to Pack Lane to approximately 300 units, in light of further testing.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause n) - The TA does not identify a need for a western bypass or a dual carriageway to serve the town or Manydown up to 2029, and their inclusion within a site policy is therefore unjustified and unsound. It is essential to ensure the delivery of the site is not jeopardised by unjustified provisions which are unsound and not positively prepared. The need for a single carriageway link road between the A339 and B3400 is identified in the 2013 JMP Transport Study produced for BDBC and HCC.	Make provision for a single carriageway link road between A339 and B3400. Masterplanning work should be carried out to take into account possible development after the end of the plan period in 2029 to ensure the ability to cross the railway line and that the scheme to be delivered within the plan period does not compromise the wider scheme for the Manydown site to be delivered beyond the plan period.	It is considered to be important to retain a criteria in the policy to provide a new link road between the A339 and B3400, the relevant criteria have been updated in light of the consultation	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause o) - Similar to clause n) the reference to a bypass and dual carriageway are unjustified at the present time and no positively prepared. Additionally, the Manydown Site does not extend to M3 Junction 7, meaning the safeguarding policy is potentially undeliverable. There is no funding or business case identified and therefore the Plan is unsound in its current form. The points raised are covered by the proposed modification to clause n).	Delete clause o)	Agreed that criteria o) should be deleted in light of the updates to criteria n)	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	clause p) - This issue is covered by clause j).	Delete clause p) and include reference to connections to and from the Country Park in clause j).	It is considered to be important to retain parts of criteria P in the policy in order to ensure that specific consideration is given to the impacts of development on Roman Road / Roman Way. Criteria n has been updated to include the relevant references.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause q) - MCL supports the provision of efficient public transport and the principle of clause q). However, it is not viable to impose this from the outset. A level of development is required to provide financial contributions and suitable patronage for public transport initiatives. The provision of these measures should be identified at the planning application stage but the delivery should be phased to ensure it is achievable.	Replace 'provision of public transport from the outset' with 'phased provision of public transport'.	Whilst more detailed masterplanning in the future will determine the timing and phasing of different parcels of land within Manydown, it is considered that there will still be the opportunity to secure a form of public transport to and from the site from the outset, albeit, this may not reflect the final design and route of any future bus service to serve the site. For example, it may be possible to enhance existing bus services initially, prior to specific services being provided. This will ensure that residents have the opportunity to use alternatives to their car from the outset, prior to firm travel patterns being developed. This issue will need to be explored in greater detail through the masterplanning work.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause r) - comment. Existing building regulations and the Code For Sustainable Homes contain stringent targets for carbon reduction, and it is considered that this clause is a duplication of the requirements of such legislation.	Delete clause r)	It is considered to be important to retain criterion r) in each of the site specific policies in order to ensure that this issue is considered from the outset, in bringing forward development on this site. It is expected that further consideration will be given to this issue through the masterplanning of the site.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause t) - support	N/A	Supported noted	No change		N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Clause u) - support	N/A	Supported noted	No change		N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	The Manydown Company	N/A	N/A	786187	602	Yes	No	Final sentence - The final sentence of the policy refers to delivery from 2019/20 to 2028/29. It is requested that the delivery period is changed to 2017/18 to 2028/29 to provide positive flexibility over housing delivery and to reflect the fact that some phases could come forward earlier in the Plan period depending on economic conditions.	Replace '2019/20' with '2017/18'	Agree with comments made and policy has been updated.	See response to HCC (Mark Biles) representations for the details of the relevant changes.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1045	Yes	No	The final sentence of the policy refers to delivery from 2019/20 to 2028/29. It is recommended that the delivery period is changed to 2017/18 to 2028/29, to provide some flexibility over housing delivery and to reflect the fact that some phases could come forward earlier in the Plan period depending on economic conditions.	Suggested modification: replace "2019/20" with "2017/18".	Agree with comments made and policy has been updated accordingly.	Policy has been updated as follows:... in the period 2017/18 ~~2019/20~~ to 2028/29, in accordance....	Response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.10 - Manydown, Basingstoke	N/A	Officer change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert at the end of the last paragraph "Development will be informed through the preparation of a masterplan".	For consistency	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Stafford Napier	N/A	N/A	413817	53	Yes	No	(See separate Word Document for explanation of each reason listed below) 1. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para's 24 and 34 - Distance from town and employment. 2. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 30 in respect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 3. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 17 in respect of public transport and walking and cycling provision. 4. Insufficient road capacity contrary to Policy CN8. 5. Uncertain sewerage infrastructure availability. 6. Contrary to Objective 1 of the Strategic Plan for Sport & Recreation, inconsistent with the LRNA Evidence Base and contrary to Policy EM5 Green Infrastructure and Policy CN7. 7. Uncertainty of Availability	This Policy should either be removed from the Plan OR an additional sentence should be added to the Policy as follows : "In view of the uncertainty of availability and affordability of the necessary infrastructure improvements associated with this site, it will not be developed until the sewerage network, transport and golf course provisions have been assured and funding committed" AND Paragraph d) should be amended as follows : " Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape by providing a buffer around ancient woodland on the site and respect its location etc...."	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the policy criterion. It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. Reference to ensuring adequate infrastructure for sewage and surface water is covered by criterion j). The reference to a buffer around the woodland is covered by criterion e). The owners of the site have confirmed that it is available for development.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Alexander Miller	N/A	N/A	777609	56	Not Specified	No	This proposed development appears to be in contravention of your policy CN7(a) which requires the retention and maintenance of existing leisure facilities. It acknowledges that the developer will probably propose providing a new golf course to replace this facility, however, it is extremely unlikely that any replacement, if in fact provided, will be in or near to Basingstoke and as such does not constitute a replacement facility. A development of this size, some 900-1000 dwellings would generate significantly high traffic flows in an area close to an acknowledged dangerous junction of the M3 and access to the A30 either directly or via Beggarwood Lane would exacerbate an already difficult problem with traffic flows during peak time on the A30. It is not sufficient to say that this may not occur as in all likelihood in such a large development it is obvious that a large proportion of the residents, for school run/business would wish to move at peak times (A30/through estate).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by criteria f)-i) in the policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Cllr Terri Reid	BDBC	N/A	784362	115	Yes	No	In relation to policies SS3.11 (Golf Course) and SS3.2 (Kennel Farm) I believe the plan to be unsound as it is unsustainable. Both sites are contrary to NPPF paras 24 &34, NPPF 30 and NPPF 17 in view of the distance from major employment and local facilities and in the effect they will have to overload the local transport network. The turning down of the Tesco application which would have included improvements to the Brighton Hill roundabout has further emphasised this point. I would also suggest that both sites would have a detrimental effect on sewerage infrastructure as per IDP Para 33.15 Finally, Site SS3.2 Kennel Farm would imperil local ancient woodland and SINCS in contravention of NPPF 17, 117 and 118	Remove the above sites from the document or demonstrate sufficient infrastructure investment to mitigate the effects of these developments.	Kennel Farm has now been granted planning permission for up to 310 homes on appeal. The appeal reference is APP/H1705/A/13/2200861. Both sites have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Both policies include criterion to address the need for adequate infrastructure being provided for sewage and surface water drainage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Jeffrey Northam	N/A	N/A	628923	116	No	No	This proposed development appears to be in contravention of your policy CN7(a) which requires the retention and maintenance of existing leisure facilities. It s acknowledges that the developer will probably propose providing a new golf course to replace this facility, however, it is extremely unlikely that any replacement, if in fact provided, will be in or near to Basingstoke and as such does not constitute a replacement facility. A development of this size, some 900-1000 dwellings would generate significantly high traffic flows in an area close to an acknowledged dangerous junction of the M3 and access to the A30 either directly or via Beggarwood Lane would exacerbate an already difficult problem with traffic flows during peak time on the A30. It is not sufficient to say that this may not occur as in all likelihood in such a large development it is obvious that a large proportion of the residents, for school run/business would wish to move at peak times (A30/through estate).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Matters relating to transport are covered by creation f)-j) in the policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	281	Yes	No	(See separate Word Document for explanation of each reason listed below) 1. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para's 24 and 34 - Distance from town and employment. 2. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 30 in respect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 3. Unsustainable - Contrary to NPPF Para 17 in respect of public transport and walking and cycling provision. 4. Insufficient road capacity contrary to Policy CN8. 5. Uncertain sewerage infrastructure availability. 6. Contrary to Objective 1 of the Strategic Plan for Sport & Recreation, inconsistent with the LRNA Evidence Base and contrary to Policy EM5 Green Infrastructure and Policy CN7. 7. Uncertainty of Availability	This Policy should either be removed from the Plan OR an additional sentence should be added to the Policy as follows : "In view of the uncertainty of availability and affordability of the necessary infrastructure improvements associated with this site, it will not be developed until the sewerage network, transport and golf course provisions have been assured and funding committed." To Policy SS3.11 i) after "cycle link to Dummer" add "improved access at the Southwood junction to the footpath network north of the A30"	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. Infrastructure improvements associated with the site are covered under the combined criterion. It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. Reference to ensuring adequate infrastructure for sewage and surface water is covered by criterion j). The reference to a buffer around the woodland is covered by criterion e). The owners of the site have confirmed that it is available for development. It is felt that criterion i) in the policy adequately covers pedestrian routes.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	310	Yes	No	Basingstoke golf course is not available for development unless members vote to sell. This renders the policy flawed. This is a site for 1000 homes. Where will they go if the land is not available.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The owners of the site have confirmed that it is available for development.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Peter Wilson	N/A	N/A	786114	561	Not Specified	No	The Golf Course is an unsustainable location for development for the reasons set out below. Moreover the proposal is unlikely to be deliverable as it is uncertain that the site would be made available for development within the Plan period. 1. Distance from employment areas, the town centre and other higher-order facilities 2. Unacceptable impact on the local road network 3. Uncertain deliverability	Proposed site SS3.11 should be deleted from the Plan. If, notwithstanding this objection, the site is retained in the Plan the policy should be amended by replacing criterion (f) with the following: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the Kempshott roundabout, Beggarwood Lane and the A30 corridor and effective measures to prevent the passage of through traffic on unsuitable roads in Kempshott".	The inclusion of criterion f) combined with criterion h) is satisfactory to address these points.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr John Rothera	Kempshott District Residents Association	N/A	122977	593	Yes	No	The Policy is unsound for the reasons: 1. The site is unsuitable - contrary to NPPF paragraphs 24 and 34 - distance from town centre and employment locations 2. The site is unsuitable - contrary to paragraph 30 of NPPF in respect of recovering greenhouse emissions - unsustainable 3. inadequate road capacity, contrary to Local Plan Policy CN8. 4. The development would in time encourage further development to the south-west, thus further elongating and unbalancing Basingstoke's built up area. 5. Development of the site would result in the Loss of a very valuable and well-located recreational facility. 6. Development would result in the destruction of a well established landscape, including the felling of many mature trees 7. it is impossible for the housing proposal to meet the requirements of the Local Plan Policy CN7 & 8. There is considerable uncertainty that the site is available for development.	Policy SS3.11 be deleted from the Local Plan	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. It has been confirmed that there is no policy requirement to replace the golf course as there is enough provision across the borough. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Both policies include criterion to address the need for adequate infrastructure being provided for sewage and surface water drainage. The owners of the site have confirmed that it is available for development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria c) as follows "...and the ~~provision-~~ <u>reservation</u> of land for a ~~two three~~ form entry primary school."	In response to further discussion with the Local Education Authority.	N/A	N/A
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	702	Yes	No	HCC does not consider the clause F is clear and needs improvement to make sense. It only requires a reference to the A30 corridor to make it more effective.	Amend clause F as follows: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A30 Corridor.' (Remove references to the Kempshott roundabout and Beggarwood Lane).	Change recommended.	Remove reference to Kempshott roundabout and Beggarwood Lane so criteria now reads: 'Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A30 Corridor'.	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.1 - Swing Swang Lane, Basingstoke	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	756	Not Specified	No	From a wastewater/sewage treatment capacity perspective Thames Water do not currently anticipate any significant issues in meeting the proposed housing numbers set out in the plan. However, Thames Water have previously raised concerns about a number of proposed housing sites and the sewerage capacity [the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to a sewage treatment works] to serve them which doesn't appear to have been included in this section specifically as requested. Please refer to the attached spread sheet which sets out Thames Water's comments in relation to the sites allocated under Policy SS3.	It should be stated in the Local Plan in relation to the sites identified on the attached spread sheet that Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity in these areas which are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from these developments. It will therefore be necessary for a drainage study to be completed. i.e. Thames Water have concerns regarding the sewerage network capacity to serve the site. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate sewerage capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure..	Agree with the suggested change.	Alter j) to read "Ensure adequate infrastrucutre is provided for sewerage (on and off site) nad surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy"	Response to representation.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	653	Not Specified	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	We would recommend the following change: There is a very minor extent of Flood Zone 2 towards the south west corner of the site. A policy criterion to ensure the site sequentially responds to flood risk in its layout will be sufficient to mitigate the presence of Flood Zone 2.	Change recommended.	Insert an additional criterion k) ~~Avoid development and points of access in the small area of the site within flood zone 2.~~	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	786	Yes	No	Support the allocation. Masterplan/Development Brief - do not support the policy text which requires the preparation of a masterplan or development brief. Phasing - no technical justification for the phasing of the golf club site at the end of the plan period from 2024/25 - 2028/29. The phasing appears to be based upon assumptions about the availability of the site, which are entirely without foundation. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People - Part (b) of Policy SS3.11 requires the site to make provision for a mix of dwellings. We support the principle of this but have concerns about the requirement to make provision for permanent pitch/plot provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People. The local plan is not considered to be sound in this respect as it does not fully consider the objectively assessed needs for the traveller community for the entire plan period.	The text to Policy SS3 should be amended to remove reference to consultation with the local community and the requirement for the Council to approve the masterplan prior to submission of the application, as this is not subject to any control under the Town & Country Planning Act. An alternative text for the policy is:- "Development on the sites is expected to come forward through the preparation of a masterplan or development plan brief. Where two or more sites are adjacent to each other, Masterplanning should be undertaken jointly". Phasing for the golf club site should be amended. Delete part (b), replace with:- "Make provision for a mix of dwelling sizes and types to meet local needs". We consider that the Council should allocate a piece of land within the ownership of the Borough or County Council for immediate release to ensure that the current and short term needs of the traveller community can be met.	The involvement of the community in the completion of masterplanning is considered suitable and in line with national guidance. The policy is worded to allow flexibility in that it is the Council's preference for this approach but it is not restrictive. The phasing of the golf club has been reviewed and amended. The inclusion of the provision of a pitch/plot for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' is planning positively in order to meet the longer terms needs of these communities. The criterion states that these needs will be identified in the GTAA and any updates. If any such needs are identified this allocation along with others will provide for them.	The phasing of the golf club should read " 2020/21 to 2028/29". Include sentence at the end to read "Development will be informed through the preparation of a masterplan"	Response to rep.	N/A	Superseded with updated representation
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mrs Christine Northam	N/A	N/A	786629	814	No	No	Distance from town and employment areas The CO2 emissions from additional cars will add to global warming. The developments would be beyond the ridgeline and have steep gradients for both cyclists and walkers There is inadequate road congestion A requirement for a major sewerage and upgrade to the network. Loss of amenity value of Golf course	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. It has been confirmed that there is no policy requirement to replace the golf course as there is enough provision across the borough. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Both policies include criterion to address the need for adequate infrastructure being provided for sewage and surface water drainage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	791341	895	Not Specified	Not Specified	This site is not available for development unless members vote to sell. This renders this policy flawed. This is a site for 1000 homes. Where will they go if the land is not available.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The owners of the site have confirmed that it is available for development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mrs Catherine Dodd	N/A	N/A	613030	896	Yes	No	The site is a valuable recreational facility. The site is a considerable distance from the town centre and the business areas of Basingstoke. The reliance on the private car would be huge and the current road structure would be inadequate to cope with the enormous traffic increases in traffic. The golf club is a long established sporting facility and it is inappropriate to lost such an amenity to housing development. The golf course site was also the site of the Kempshott House/Park and the golf course visually retains the parkland areas that went with the house and this is another reason for protecting it from development. Development of this site would be totally inappropriate and constitute urban sprawl, which would destroy valuable areas of countryside and must be avoided.	This site should be removed from the plan/policy deleted. If the site/policy must be retained in the plan then road infrastructure, schools and sewage works etc. must be funded and in place before development.	The site has been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives. It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. As part of the work in developing the Local Plan a full Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impacts of development on the local road network and mitigation measures that are required. Both policies include criterion to address the need for adequate infrastructure being provided for sewage and surface water drainage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	942	Not Specified	Not Specified	Churches / Places of Worship. No specific provision for space for any new churches in the largest 3 new estates (unless part of a 'community centre').	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Criterion c) covers all social infrastructure which could include a place of worship. The need for such a facility should be considered further through the masterplanning process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1173	Not Specified	No	Policy SS3.11 Basingstoke Golf Club allocates the Basingstoke Golf Club site to deliver 1,000 dwellings in the period 2024/25 to 2028/29. However, as paragraph 4.15 of the Report to Cabinet dated 23 January 2012 and the paragraphs 7.18 and 7.19 of the Planning and Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee dated 20 September 2011 outline, there are availability and deliverability issues associated with the site which need resolving, namely relating to the complex ownership and the need to provide an alternative golf course before the land is released. We believe these issues remain and until properly resolved the site cannot be considered to be deliverable and should therefore not be a strategic allocation. At best the site should be a reserve housing allocation.	The site cannot be considered to be deliverable and should therefore not be a strategic allocation. At best the site should be a reserve housing allocation.	It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs The owners have confirmed that the site is available for development.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1244	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority does not consider that the current wording of clause F of the policy is sufficiently clear. The current wording does not make sense and HCC as Highways Authority consider that a rewording of Clause F of the policy with specific reference to the A30 Corridor only will make it more effective.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests that Clause F of this policy is amended as follows: F) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A30 corridor.	Change recommended.	Amend as suggested (see response to Rep. 702)	Response to rep.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS3.11 - Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1281	Not Specified	No	The selection of Basingstoke Gold Course is not part of 'the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. BAS 102 Lodge Farm would be more appropriate. The Golf Course is the site furthest from the main centres of employment, the transport infrastructure is expensive, the A30, Wallop Drive is one of only two junctions where the traffic impacts cannot be effectively mitigated, site furthest from the sewage treatment works at Chineham, the site is not technically available now and therefore not deliverable.	Remove the golf course and replace with Lodge Farm, this would make the Plan sounds and it would then have the 'most appropriate strategy'. Introduce a new policy for Lodge Farm, which includes an amendment to the Policy Maps.	The site has been selected for allocation in the Local Plan following detailed site assessment work and sustainability appraisal of site options. These include but are not limited to, conclusions from assessments of infrastructure capacity including transport impacts and mitigation, landscape and biodiversity studies. Following this work this site was deemed as a site which forms the most appropriate strategy when compared to alternatives.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1175	Not Specified	No	The Council's current SHMA is out-out-of date, but it fundamentally underestimates the level of housing needs within the Borough and wider housing market area. The Borough Council has therefore not sought to identify and then meet its identified housing needs in full. Nor has it demonstrated how its housing needs will be met within the Borough or within the wider housing market area. The overall housing requirement within the Local Plan has not been positively prepared, it is not justified or effective and it is not consistent with paragraph 159 of the NPPF. We are therefore of the view that it is not sound. We are of the view that the most appropriate scenario to determine the Borough's housing needs in full requirement is "Employment800", which provides a housing requirement of 1,714 new homes per annum.	To positively plan to meet both identified housing and economic needs within the Borough a newly arising housing figure of between 992 and 1,123 dwellings should be used to inform the Borough's identified housing needs requirement.	The plan sets out a strategy for meeting the borough's objectively assessed housing needs, based on available evidence. Further information is set out in the updated SHMA and Housing Topic Paper.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	Member of Parliament	N/A	121767	427	Yes	No	The EA already says that the River Loddon is failing and that water quality is impacting on ecology. It is not acceptable for the Loddon to be exposed to more risk of further deterioration by waiting for the results of monitoring before deciding if development can go ahead. It is unacceptable that the policy aspiration would be only to reverse any deterioration and not seek to improve it	The policy must ensure that permissions would only be granted where it can be proved that to do so would not impact on the absolute water quality levels and that proposals would in the long term contribute to an improvement in water quality.	Please see comments under Policy EM6 - Water quality.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1154	Yes	No	Policy needs to be proactive and perform the statement in Policy EM6 (second paragraph) that Policy SS4 will prevent further development.	Policy SS4: Second paragraph - replace "resist granting" with "not grant". This would make the Policy proactive and perform the statement in Policy EM6 second paragraph that 'Policy SS4 will prevent further development.	Comment noted. The word 'resist' serves the same purpose.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	885	No	No	Policy is in contradiction with paragraph 4.10.	Water supply and water quality need to be properly reconciled with the proposed development before building takes place.	Please see comments under Policy EM6 - Water quality.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	33	No	No	I cannot see enough detail on the preservation of water quality, particularly groundwater protection and storm runoff in the major new developments; also there is an air of despair about improving the Borough sewage works to cope with the new developments. If you cannot prevent the discharge from worsening from its already unacceptable quality, no development at all can take place.	A grey water re-use scheme should be built into all the self-contained developments. Storm water should not be mixed with foul water but stored for use or, if clean enough, directed to re-charge the aquifers. A community action plan to reduce phosphates and other pollutants from domestic washing and cleaning agents should be incorporated. Natural technology, i.e. a reed bed, might be interposed between the sewage works and its discharge into the river (land needs to be acquired).	Please see comments under Policy EM6 - Water quality.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	870	No	No	Policy SS4 seeks to ensure that a five year supply is maintained in the Borough at all times, outlining a preference to the priority to the development of brownfield sites. Gladman support the local authority's commitment to ensure that it maintains a 5 year land supply and ensuring that the plan can be delivered. However, the priority given to the development of brownfield sites lacks justification and is not supported by the NPPF. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that Planning polices and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed. This does not mean that it is there is a preference towards brownfield, especially when read in context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF Para 14). Gladman remind the council that the Framework should be read as a whole and object to the priority place on the delivery of Brownfield sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Within the borough, brownfield land is considered to be the preference for development in the first instance. This approach is supported by Policies SS1 and SS6. The Plan will deliver a balanced strategy to meet the borough's housing needs and includes significant greenfield allocations. The Policy includes a requirement to review the plan if a future supply cannot be demonstrated and therefore is compliant with the NPPF.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Gleeson Strategic Land	Gleeson Strategic Land	N/A	787094	956	No	No	The aspiration to prioritise brownfield sites is supported. However, there needs to be a flexible application of policy for the plan to be effective and to ensure a rolling 5 year housing land supply in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Policy SS4 should therefore be worded so as to not prevent the release of greenfield sites where they are appropriate and their release is justified. This need for flexibility is especially in view of the intention to deliver the majority of the required housing through large extensions to Basingstoke, and to take account of past difficulties in the Borough to deliver homes. Distribution is also important to achieve sustainable development and the local needs of particular settlements. Policy SS4 as currently worded, risks constraining delivery by prioritising brownfield sites at the expense of enabling suitable and deliverable greenfield sites to come forward.	To ensure policy SS4 is effective in maintaining a 5 year land supply, it should acknowledge that release of some greenfield sites will be necessary to ensure housing needs are met, in addition to the development of appropriate brownfield sites. This will ensure a policy which is clearer, and which promotes a flexible approach when considering housing sites.	Within the borough, brownfield land is considered to be the preference for development in the first instance. This approach is supported by Policies SS1 and SS6. The Plan will deliver a balanced strategy to meet the borough's housing needs and includes significant greenfield allocations. The Policy includes a requirement to review the plan if a future supply cannot be demonstrated and therefore is compliant with the NPPF.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Flavia Estates	Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1057	No	No	There is a need for housing development to come forward as soon as possible, so to serve the pressing need for both market and affordable housing. By phasing certain developments towards the latter part of the plan period, there is a clear risk that the Council will continue to fail to address the present housing land supply shortfall. As drafted, this policy represents an inflexible and negatively worded policy that threatens to constrain housing delivery within the borough. For instance should one site phased early in the plan period fail to come forward a housing land supply shortfall will inevitably remain. Priority should not be given to brownfield sites as this serves to generate an inflexible strategy that would fail to provide flexibility in meeting defined housing needs given ultimately greenfield releases are imperative.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is agreed that there is a need for development to come forward to meet needs and the plan enables such as approach. The policy states that 'in principle' development will come forward in line with phasing but the wording of the policy allows some flexibility. The phasing outlined in the site specific policies has also been updated to reflect representations etc. and incorporate more flexibility. Within the borough, brownfield land is considered to be the preference for development in the first instance. This approach is supported by Policies SS1 and SS6. The Plan will deliver a balanced strategy to meet the borough's housing needs and includes significant greenfield allocations. The Policy includes a requirement to review the plan if a future supply cannot be demonstrated and therefore is compliant with the NPPF.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS4 - Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert the word "Policy" in front of policy title.	consistent formatting	N/A	N/A
4.48	4.47	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1003	Yes	No	Agree with the approach to ensure provision of 5 year supply and that a review of the Local Plan will be triggered if a future supply cannot be demonstrated. However further details are required as to what will the trigger point be (e.g. as soon as no 5 year supply identified on the production of an AMR or continuous assessment where no sign of improvement).	Further details are required as to what will the trigger point be (e.g. as soon as no 5 year supply identified on the production of an AMR or continuous assessment where no sign of improvement).	Agreed that further clarity is required and additional wording has been added to the supporting text to improve clarity.	Additional wording added to Paragraph 4.48 'A review of the plan will be triggered where additional allocations are necessary for the borough's housing needs to be met, for example, as a result of the non-delivery or delayed delivery of a greenfield allocation'.	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.49	4.48	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	671	Not Specified	Not Specified	Paragraph 4.49 states that the council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency and the water companies. Whist STWs may be important with regards to water quality and WFD, other parties may be involved.	We would recommend the following change: "...the Environment Agency and relevant parties ..." or "...the Environment Agency and stakeholders ..."	Agree to change.	Change wording as follows: In such situations, the council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency, the water companies <u>and other relevant parties</u> to identify...	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
4.49	4.48	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	654	Not Specified	Yes	A phased approach to development within Basingstoke, in line with the recommendations of the evidence base, has been incorporated and we support this policy. To ensure that the policy is in line with Policy EM6 (EM6 states this in its policy) we would recommend the following change: (Within the policy) "...indicates a likely deterioration in individual elements band status..." Further to this, Paragraph 4.49 states that the council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency and the water companies. Whist STWs may be important with regards to water quality and WFD, other parties may be involved.	We would recommend the following change: "...the Environment Agency and relevant parties ..." or "...the Environment Agency and stakeholders ..."	Agree to change.	Change wording as follows: In such situations, the council will work in partnership with the Environment Agency, the water companies <u>and other relevant parties</u> to identify...	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert the word "Policy" in front of policy title.	consistent formatting	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Move the paragraph relating to 150 units for clarity and add for it to read "A further 150 homes will need to be identified through neighbourhood plans/neighbourhood development orders, or other suitable means, in areas outside of those listed above".	To improve clarity	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	595	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Supported.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	259	Yes	No	There is concern that the Neighbourhood Planning process nationally is very much a top down rather than bottom up process and this is exacerbated to some extent by the borough council imposing the number of houses within the Local Plan without allowing the parish council to carry out detailed analysis into what it right for the community. People in Overton don't want the housing - it's as simple as that - and so to encourage them to take part in the plan is going to be challenging. However, it is better than the alternative, which is the imposition of a one site.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base and 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs U Kercher	N/A	N/A	206137	73	Yes	No	The Local Plan proposes an excessive number of houses for the village of Overton.	Smaller pockets of development, decided upon by the residents of the village would be more appropriate.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. A number of the objections are also implicitly addressed by the neighbourhood planning mechanism, which enables the provision of a number of smaller sites if this is the community's preferred approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr and Mrs Kenneth Towell	N/A	N/A	419589	397	Not Specified	No	The one obvious weakness with the plan must be to build 620 houses in Whitchurch and Overton. The infrastructure, particularly car parking and the roads are no sufficient to cope with the influx. There is bound to be an average of 2 cars per household, and these 1200 extra vehicles will result in chaos on the B3400. What measures are going to be put in place to overcome this problem. The same increase in population will overload the local schools, surgeries and sewage system.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Any site proposals in a Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to a site assessment process which will examine the existing infrastructure and road networks.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	454	Yes	No	There is insufficient reference to sites within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places restrictions on development within nationally protected landscapes.	Additional text should be added to the supporting text to policy SS5 to state that "Sites within the North Wessex Downs AONB will be restricted through the aims of the Countryside and Right of Act 2000 to conserve and enhance the AONB and due to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF.	Any development in the AONB would be assessed against Policy EM1 as the Plan should be read as a whole. Therefore there is no need to add an additional reference here.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Gary Smallbone	N/A	N/A	442435	789	Not Specified	No	We are not naive enough to believe the above is achievable and are aware Bramley is going to be forced to find space for another 200 homes. We are aware that currently there are two sites that are likely to be targeted by developers. Fields next to Strawberry Fields (on Stratfield Saye Estate) Fields behind Clift Meadow. NEITHER SITE IS APPPEALING since it will involve the loss of fields and views that cannot be replaced and will in our opinion change the character of Bramley. We consider that any future housing needs should be targeted not at Bramley. Other areas nearer to Basingstoke and more easily integrated into Basingstoke's infrastructure should be developed first. Not least Manydown which was purchased for this purpose. Bramley's infrastructure is at bursting points with problems such as:- Pollution of the river Loddon Inadequate parking for the station Traffic congestion at level crossing High volumes of traffic on small country lanes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Manydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Rodney Scott	Oakley and Deane Parish Council	N/A	461222	392	Yes	Yes	We support the policy on Neighbourhood planning.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Hugh Tottenham	N/A	N/A	636730	1065	Yes	No	The new homes consultation in Bramley showed residents were in favour of no more new homes in Bramley and showed a negative reaction to the recent development of German Road. The village has no infrastructure for more housing. The roads are not suitable for the number of vehicles that use them on a daily basis. The railway crossing is dangerous already. 200 homes will further increase the problems associated with the issues mentioned above.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	202	Yes	No	The strategy to make larger settlements larger and benefit from existing infrastructure is flawed in the case of Bramley. Bramley village has expanded more than any other area within the borough since 1984, with the most recent large scale development completed in 2010 (German Road site), which provided 200 dwellings providing 47% as affordable housing. That development was not needed in order to meet local housing need and has put considerable pressure on the inadequate infrastructure in the village. Bramley's infrastructure is cited as a reason to develop further, however, the reality is that it is already at capacity and the potential to increase or improve it is limited, in particular in relation to the road network. The proposed developments SS3.7, 3.9, 3.8 and 3.3 will create significant traffic congestion on the A33, and will result in the C32 being used to avoid such delays. There is no station car park, with commuter parking causing significant problems in the village.	The Local Plan strategy of making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure investment. It can be seen that this allocation of 200 dwellings would contribute to wider infrastructure problems but most importantly the very local infrastructure with its limitations would be in an unsustainable situation. The borough's expected/encourage immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services. Manydown SS3.10, is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental impacts on the existing population, who surely should have priority. Evidence suggests, and policy CNS supports, that to develop the north-east area of the borough at the proposed rate will need significant changes to and delivery of additional infrastructure. However, there is no plan within the proposal to address the specific infrastructure issues.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	315	Yes	No	SS6 permits development outside of settlement policy boundaries for a rural exception site for affordable housing. Could not policy CN2, rural exceptions for affordable housing, be employed to support Bramley's need for those 72 households on the housing register rather than building 200 homes to allow the 40% affordable/social housing ratio to support the need? this would provide local housing for local people in need whilst minimising the documented strains on Bramley's infrastructure.	(Please see above, as the problem and the solution are closely linked)	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 200 units, which is additional to other sources of housing supply, is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities. Furthermore, Paragraph 4.31 of the Pre-Submission document states that 'development could be brought forward on multiple sites or on one phased site to ensure proposals respond positively to the character of the areas and help create a more integrated community'. This could include the provision of affordable homes.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Chris Flooks	N/A	N/A	637722	362	Yes	No	The new residents of SS3.3 and 3.8 will have a significant impact on Bramley. Bramley has been overdeveloped in recent decades, exacerbated by insufficient infrastructure improvements. Choosing to located further development in Bramley on the premise that it has a railway station is unrealistic, as the parking at the station is totally inadequate, and the railway line is getting much busier, and will become more so as a result of electrification of the line. The C32 is used as a detour from the congested A33 to the A340 and cannot cope at present, as situation which will be exacerbated by the effects of the Redlands, Razors, Cufaude and Sherfield Park developments. The school has recently been extended but is also already nearing maximum capacity again. The doctors surgery is also struggling to cope with the demands being placed on it. There is no provision for walking safely between Bramley and the adjacent villages nor are there safe cycle routes. No high speed broadband.	The approach involving making large settlements even larger cannot begin to be sustainable without considerable pre-development infrastructure. The allocation of 200 dwellings would contribute to the wider infrastructure problems, and would create an unsustainable situation. The borough expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without a lasting detrimental impact on existing residents. There is no reason why Manydown cannot be developed at an appropriate pace in order to keep up with the demands for new housing. Proposals are needed within the plan to address the specific infrastructure issues flowing from the plan.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Manydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No Change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs Gail Tomblin	N/A	N/A	638019	582	Yes	No	I object to the development of Cufaude Farm (SS3.8) and Razor's Farm (SS3.3) on the following grounds: SS5 point a) allocated 200 homes to be distributed in Bramley by the neighbourhood plan. However, Cufaude Farm is entirely in the parish of Bramley (390 dwellings proposed) and most of Razor's farm is also in the parish of Bramley (420 dwellings proposed). This means that the allocation for Bramley significantly exceeds the allocation by at least double the number, just on these two sites alone.	Maximise the use of land to the west at Manydown SS3.10. The site can take up to 8000 homes. Bring forward the delivery of homes from 2019 to much earlier. The site can be well planned and provide for the needs of a new community. It is clear that the financial gain from fully developing Manydown will provide substantial funding to allow the plan to be delivered.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). Whilst Cufaude and Razor's Farm are located within Bramley parish they lie adjacent to Basingstoke Town. The policy enables the local community to decide how the housing number will be met in Bramley and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Manydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	126	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Approach supported.	Support Noted	No change	N/A	N/A	Resolved
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	842	Yes	No	Given Oakley is acknowledged as one of the more sustainable settlements within the borough, consider that the planned 150 houses for Oakley are an insufficient number to cover the plan period, and that a number more in line with Whitchurch/Overton would be appropriate. Oakley has a higher population than any of the other settlements in the borough, barring Basingstoke. Oakley is bigger by population than Whitchurch, Overton and Bramley. Oakley has seen comparatively little new housing over the existing local plan period, certainly in comparison to smaller settlements such as Whitchurch and Overton. Paragraph 4.37 acknowledges that there is a high housing need in Oakley (425 households in housing need), and therefore, the current proposal of 150 homes will not make much of an effort to deal with the current housing need, exacerbating the current problems being faced with regard to housing need.	The local plan needs to recognise that Oakley should accommodate more housing development than is currently planned. In order for the local plan to be justified and sound, it needs to address current housing need. Policy SS5 does not seek to address the current housing needs, nor cater for future population growth in Oakley. Accordingly, the proposed number of homes to be built in Oakley needs to rise substantially from the current planned figure, to something more in line with the housing numbers planned for Overton and Whitchurch.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1056	Yes	Yes	The Borough Council and County Council as landowners support the principle of neighbourhood planning. The local planning authority has confirmed the boundary (which replicates the Parish council boundary) for the proposed Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan. Notwithstanding this confirmation, it is requested that the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan boundary does not overlap with the eventual boundary for Policy SS3.10 (Manydown) in order to be internally consistent and provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the development, which is a common approach amongst local authorities where Neighbourhood Plans are being developed. The development of the Manydown allocation (the majority of which falls outside Oakley and Deane Parish) raises wider strategic considerations which cannot effectively be resolved through a Neighbourhood Plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted. The Neighbourhood Area for Oakley was designated on the 24th July 2013 and sets out the Area for which Neighbourhood Planning will take place. If a Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Parish Council it will need to comply with the Local Plan once it is adopted.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Resolved

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Rydon Homes	N/A	749508	943	No	No	Fully support the policy and in particular the 150 homes allocated for Overton. However, the number for Overton should be higher as there is the ability to accommodate up to 656 dwellings on available sites within Overton as demonstrated in the SHLAA 2013 v7. Overton ranks highly in terms of sustainability and is listed as a Category 1 Service Centre. Policy should include a higher number for the further 150 homes that need to be identified in areas outside of the of those listed in the policy. There is a high number of Category 2 SHLAA sites which are not suitable for strategic allocation, but may be suitable for promotion via neighbourhood plans (see SHLAA 2013 appendix 4). Sherborne St John will be able to accommodate a moderate amount of new housing compared to other villages within the Category 4 settlement hierarchy. The village is one of the more sustainable settlements within the Category 4 classification Support the final paragraph of Policy SS5.	The Council should seek to identify a higher housing provision to be accommodated through the neighbourhood plan process for both Overton village and the lower tier settlements. This will assist in providing an adequate level of supply to meet a higher level of housing provision for the Borough.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period given the village's housing needs and constraints (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Graham Watts	N/A	N/A	781241	71	Yes	No	Concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure provision, and the impact of the additional housing on the existing infrastructure, in particular in relation to Overton. The respondent feels that Overton cannot accommodation an additional 270 dwellings.	Concentrating purely on Marydown would at least make the plan legally compliant and sound.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base and 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs Katie Tottenham	N/A	N/A	784029	1054	Yes	No	The housing allocation for Bramley as a village has been noted as 200 houses. The inclusion in the plan of SS3.3 and SS3.8 (in the parish of Bramley) makes the actual figure 1030. Paragraph 4.30 on the Neighbourhood Plan is unsound as Bramley has already potentially been allocated sites. The public transport system in Bramley is not well supported. Furthermore, the infrastructure of Bramley is unsuited to the needs of the existing community let alone new residents.	The area north of Basingstoke has no master plan so why should Marydown?	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Barratt David Wilson Homes	Barratt David Wilson Homes	Luken Beck	784198	100	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Supporting Comments on Policy SS5 (e) - We believe that the settlement of Whitchurch can and should accommodate at least a further 200 dwellings as proposed by policy SS5. There is land in our control, described as site Whit 18 in the SHLAA, which is suitable and available for development. We support the proposed Neighbourhood Planning process to help identify and deliver such appropriate local community facilities as part of the possible future residential development at Whit 18. We would also support the reconsideration of increasing the scale of proposed future housing under policy SS5 (e) at Whitchurch as previously proposed in the Council's report to Cabinet on 28 the February 2013. We support the need for the Council to identify further housing sites in any of these settlements if such sites are not identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process by 2017.	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Ms Louise Hayling	N/A	N/A	784338	386	Yes	No	The housing allocation for Bramley as a village is 200. However, when SS3.3 and 3.8 are included it is 1030. Bramley has expanded more than any other area since 1984. The latest development, German Road estate, was not built to meet the needs of local residents and has put tremendous strain on the existing infrastructure. Bramley needs to provide 72 dwellings for affordable housing to meet local demand, and this must be allowed on infill sites. Para 4.30 is unsound as Bramley already has allocated sites at 3.3 and 3.8. The New Homes consultation in Bramley showed that residents were in favour of no more new homes in Bramley. There will be an adverse impact on the quality of the Loddon catchment area. Development will mean the distinctiveness and quality of the local landscape and the distinctive and high quality features of the local built environment will not be protected or enhanced. The local social and physical infrastructure cannot cope. Keep the village as a village.	Marydown was purchased specifically to cater for the future housing needs for Basingstoke and should be used to much greater capacity. It is ridiculous to defer the deliverability of two thirds of these homes to beyond the plan period and ludicrous to purport that it cannot deliver until the latter stage of the plan because of infrastructure requirements. Marydown was originally proposed to accommodate at least 9000 homes which has been fought against for a number of years and this deferral will lead to the carving up of many other areas where infrastructure and environmental issues and concerns have not been sufficiently addressed. Rural areas like Bramley risk being swallowed up into one major conurbation with other sprawling in-fill developments. The council should get on with the Marydown development to the full extent it was intended, for the good of the whole borough and leave the villages alone.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Marydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr and Mrs A Stacey	N/A	N/A	784437	122	Not Specified	No	The proposal to build another 150 houses in Oakley is not viable in our view. The traffic congestion at peak times is already significant - how will the roads cope with circa another 300 cars? Also utilities and schools will be stretched further.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base, and 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan). The neighbourhood planning mechanism enables the Parish Council to propose a number of sites to accommodate development, which could then be voted on in the referendum. In order to allocate a site for housing through the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council would need to complete further assessments to examine the impact upon existing infrastructure, services and facilities.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Cllr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	185	Yes	No	The 150 homes in Overton are not justified by the evidence base, in particular no survey of existing homes in Overton was carried out. This level of development will create a dormitory town environment and result in increased car travel due to the poor state of public transport connections.	SS5 d) should read Overton approximately 50 homes	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base including local housing need information. 270 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Overton to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how part of the housing number will be met.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Kyriacos Marianos	N/A	N/A	784574	976	Yes	No	The infrastructure required has not been considered carefully and is not precise. Vague statements on the plan are not sufficient to proceed.	The detailed infrastructure needs have to be set out precisely and precede the development. Financially, insufficient funding is in place for this vital requirement.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base including a sustainability appraisal and site assessment process which considered infrastructure issues within the borough's settlements. Detailed infrastructure needs are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies the plan, and such issues will also need to be addressed through the neighbourhood planning process..	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mrs Michelle Ashley	N/A	N/A	784775	293	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change		N/A	Supports Plan.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Miss Karen Bentall	N/A	N/A	785033	349	Yes	No	a) The plan does not seek to meet objectively assessed development requirements re: housing, nor infrastructure, as large scale development is no appropriate in Bramley. The new housing needs to be integrated via smaller sites and the correct level of infrastructure must be provided in conjunction with the local neighbourhood development plan. b) The plan is not appropriate when considered against the reasonable alternatives e.g. Marydown. c) The plan is not deliverable in terms of existing infrastructure on the C42 roadway and must show indications of a 10yr demographic plan. The plan must also show the impact of traffic plans and must take greater account of transport requirements, parking facilities, traffic speed and congestion around railway crossing. d) Plan not consistent with government guidance as it must ensure that housing density is restricted to an agreed limit and new builds do not merge. The plan should also include accessible green spaces.	Development for Bramley needs to be via small site allocations, and most consideration of the transport/highways implications is required, especially with regard to the addressing the existing problems in Bramley in that regard. A 10yr demographic forecast also needs to be incorporated into the plan, along with greater regard for accessible spaces and more sustainable transport options.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base including housing forecasts and the completed Transport Assessment. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities. Paragraph 4.31 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan states that 'Development could be brought forward on multiple sites'. This would allow development to respond positively to the character of Bramley.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mary Tait	N/A	N/A	785375	406	Not Specified	No	On the plan for 150 new homes in Oakley (SS5), I would like to make the point that the road infrastructure here would be stretched to cope with a lot of extra development - the junction of Hill Road and St John's Road, where I live, is very tight and there is already a lot of congestion further down Hill Road and Rectory Road to the junction with the B3400.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base, including a Transport Assessment. 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan). The neighbourhood planning mechanism enables the Parish Council to propose a number of sites to accommodate development, which could then be voted on in the referendum. In order to allocate a site for housing through the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council would need to complete further assessments to examine the impact upon the existing road infrastructure, services and facilities.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Nik Lyzba	Royal British Legion	N/A	786428	734	Yes	No	In our view, the phrasing of this policy would not be effective in the delivery of housing, nor would it be consistent with national policy. With regard to the housing figures proposed for Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley, Overton and Whitchurch the policy provides that "the council will support the relevant parish/town council to identify the most appropriate means of meeting this requirement through neighbourhood planning, rural exception schemes or a review of the Settlement Policy Boundaries." The purpose of the Local Plan should be to make provision for housing, rather than merely supporting town and parish councils in doing so through their neighbourhood plans. The wording of the policy should be amended to make provision for at least the provision of new houses in each of the settlements (subject to the comments made in respect of the overall housing provision above) rather than merely seeking to support others.	The wording of the policy should be amended to make provision for at least 200 new homes in Bramley (subject to the comments made in respect of the overall housing provision above) rather than merely seeking to support others and the parish council in making this allocation.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Dr P. R. Thrift	N/A	N/A	786622	808	Not Specified	Not Specified	We have lived in Oakley for 35 years and we love that it is close to Basingstoke yet separated by countryside. This is now plan to erode by building 600 new houses along Pack Lane. We do not think there is infrastructure in place for such a plan. Pack Lane is already overloaded with traffic. There is single file under the Battledown railway bridges and this would get worse. On a school day traffic conditions have reached a dangerous level around Oakley schools with cars even parking at bus stops and with the overflows extending to side roads. Oakley itself has grown from 500 to over 5500 inhabitants over the past 50 years. This means Oakley has already grown more than any other village around Basingstoke. To extend the borders to accommodate 150 new homes is blatantly wrong. Other villages have escaped very lightly. We believe they should share the common burden.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	871	No	No	Concerned with the approach taken by the council in Policy SS5. Although the policy includes a monitoring aspect as well as a mechanism to ensure that shortfall is met post 2017 subject to the progress of neighbourhood plan making, this strategy would have the negative affect in preventing sites that are in accordance with the development plan from coming forward for development on grounds of prematurity. This could result in an undersupply in these settlements and would be in conflict with the NPPF (paras 14 and 47). The plan should not be reliant on the neighbourhood plans that may never get adopted. Although each parish/town Council has received approval for a designation boundary for the plan, the plan has yet to demonstrate that it is sound at examination and won approval by referendum. A Local Plan needs to ensure that it is deliverable. The mechanism of allocating sites through neighbourhood plans provides an unnecessary delay for development in these areas.	Gladman believe that should the Council wish to pursue its approach to Neighbourhood Planning, the Council should allocate more land sufficient to meet needs up to 2017 to enable needs to be delivered now. This approach will ensure that the plan is consistent with the framework whilst maintaining a prominent role for neighbourhood planning. Should neighbourhood plans become delayed or never materialise the council should respond accordingly to ensure that housing supply is not disrupted at this level.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the borough's 5 year land supply. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach to neighbourhood planning is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Peter Lord	N/A	Sourthern Planning	787067	936	Not Specified	Yes	Our client generally supports Policy SS5 Neighbourhood Planning which sets out the amount of new development to take place in Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley, Overton and Whitchurch, and allocates a further 150 homes in the smaller villages. The individual sites for these new homes will be identified through neighbourhood planning. However, our client has concerns about the last sentence in both Policy SS5 and paragraph 4.54, whereby the Council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any housing shortfall through the Development Plan Document (DPD) process. Our client considers that the 150 homes allocated to the smaller villages are intended to help meet locally arising needs for housing. If no need for further housing is identified then it would be more appropriate for the Council to re-assess the need for 150 homes to be allocated in the smaller villages, rather than decide to allocate sites itself.	i) Amend last paragraph of Policy SS5 as follows: The delivery of housing will be monitored annually by the Council to ensure the housing requirement is met. If no opportunities have been identified in Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley, Overton or Whitchurch by 2017, the Council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through the DPD process. If no opportunities have been identified in the smaller villages, the Council will work with the local communities and re-assess the need to allocate 150 homes here. ii) Amend last sentence of paragraph 4.54 as follows: If no opportunities have been identified by 2017, the Council will work with the local communities to assess whether there is a need for further housing in the smaller villages and, if there is a need, what the new figure should be. Those communities which identify a need for more housing will identify sites for the new homes through neighbourhood planning.	The 150 units is part of the Local Plan's wider housing strategy to meet the housing needs of the borough over the plan period and therefore this element should remain.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Gleeson Strategic Land	Gleeson Strategic Land	N/A	787094	957	No	No	The allocation of sites through the neighbourhood planning process is commendable. However by being over-reliant on neighbourhood plans to deliver growth, and not stating the housing figures are minimum targets, the policy is unsound because: It has not been positively prepared to meet the objectively assessed development needs. It is not effective in providing the flexibility to bring sites forward through other mechanisms alongside neighbourhood plans, or in ensuring neighbourhood plans seek to allocate the required number of new homes. The provision that the Council may identify opportunities by other mechanisms if no sites are identified through neighbourhood plans by 2017 is acknowledged as a way to ensure delivery. However, this time period until 2017 is too long and risks constraining housing delivery in these settlements. This does not ensure a plan which will 'boost significantly the supply of housing', as required by the NPPF.	The policy should be worded to specifically state that sites will be able to come forward either in advance of or in tandem with neighbourhood plans, where they are suitable and deliverable and their release is justified by other material considerations. It should also be made clearer that the housing requirements for each settlement are minimum targets. This will then ensure a robust policy which will plan more effectively to meet the identified housing need for settlements outside of Basingstoke. It will reduce the reliance on the neighbourhood plan process and provide enough flexibility going forward to ensure the requirement over the plan period is met and a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land is maintained at any one time.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. The suggested wording would undermine the intent of the policy and would only come into play if a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated, in line with the NPPF. The Plan allocated sufficient sites to meet the 5 year land supply. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1114	Yes	Yes	The Borough Council and County Council as landowners support the principle of neighbourhood planning. The local planning authority has confirmed the boundary (which replicates the Parish council boundary) for the proposed Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan. Notwithstanding this confirmation, it is requested that the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan boundary does not overlap with the eventual boundary for Policy SS3.10 (Manydown) in order to be internally consistent and provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the development, which is a common approach amongst local authorities where Neighbourhood Plans are being developed. The development of the Manydown allocation (the majority of which falls outside Oakley and Deane Parish) raises wider strategic considerations which cannot effectively be resolved through a Neighbourhood Plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted. The Neighbourhood Area for Oakley was designated on the 24th July 2013 and sets out the Area for which Neighbourhood Planning will take place. If a Neighbourhood Plan is produced by the Parish Council it will need to comply with the Local Plan once it is adopted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	787495	1095	Yes	No	Middleton and Portway Estates has an interest in KING005. The provision of 13,464 new homes over the plan period will not met the requirements for market and affordable housing in the local market area. The proposed housing figure is inconsistent with and will undermine the borough's economic prospects, components of the housing supply are unsound. Kingsclere should accommodate housing growth in excess of 50 homes identified in the Local Plan and the Council's evidence to support the allocation of 50 homes is unjustified. SHLAA site KING005 is deliverable, viable and achievable and would contribute towards sustainable development in Kingsclere. Please also see attachment.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 50 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Kingsclere to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area and its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). Given the council's approach of supporting neighbourhood planning it is considered that this scale of development should be a community decision rather than a strategic one set out within the plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Catesby Kler Land	Catesby Kler Land	Turley Associates	787505	1103	Yes	No	There is no evidence to justify the approach for identifying the provision of only 150 homes across the Borough, in areas outside of those identified settlements. Spreading only 150 dwellings across the 18 year plan period would deliver only 8 dwellings per annum, representing a tiny proportion of homes for the rural area; a level of growth that in our view cannot be sufficient to sustain community facilities' and/or local services. In our view, a higher provision of growth should be spread across the rural area to meet local needs and ensure that rural communities can thrive. Wooton Hill has many characteristics common with category 3 local centres, the majority of which have been subject to Greenfield allocation within the draft Local Plan. Wooton Hill has sustainability characteristics and facilities and should take some growth to support the needs of the existing community, towards which the development of Harwood Paddock would contribute See page 12 of attached response	The Council's approach to housing distribution is unjustified and the settlement of Wooton Hill should be allocated some growth in the emerging Local Plan. This is on the basis that Wooton Hill should be allocated some growth in the emerging Local Plan. This is on the basis that Wooton Hill has sustainability characteristics and facilities comparable to Bramley, a location which has been allocated approximately 200 homes in the draft document. Furthermore, the identification of only 150 homes over the plan period for the remainder of the 'rural' Borough is unduly low and unlikely to be sufficient to support local communities.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The 150 units in 'other' areas is a suitable number of dwellings to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.24-4.27 of the Plan). The site in question has received planning permission for 49 units in October 2013.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Romanina Real Estate	Romanina Real Estate Inc.	Romanina Real Estate	787564	1123	Yes	No	The housing distribution strategy of focusing primarily on Basingstoke, with appropriate levels of growth at Whitchurch, Overton, Bramley, Kingsclere and Oakley is supported. In particular, Overton is the next most sustainable settlement in the borough after Basingstoke. However, there is no evidence that Overton Parish Council is enthusiastically and proactively progressing a neighbourhood plan to include the required allocation of 150 additional dwellings, and this will have a further detrimental impact on housing land supply in the borough. The current SHMA was produced in2007 and is demonstrably out of date. The new SHMA is not going to be completed until after consultation on the pre-submission local plan has been concluded. As such, the pre-submission local plan cannot be regarded as setting a sound housing target on this basis. Agree with HBF suggestion that the council deliver 16,146/900dpa. This would also provide the required buffer.	The proposal in the pre-submission local plan to defer the identification of land for an additional 150 dwellings at Overton to a subsequent neighbourhood planning process runs counter to urgent need to remedy and significantly boost the supply of housing locally. Indeed, it is a perverse proposal. Rather, SHLAA site OV004 - Two Gate Lane - should be allocated as part of a revised strategy to identify a higher, more robust housing target which will generally meet the borough's identified housing needs.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the borough's 5 year land supply. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach to neighbourhood planning is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Mark Schnull	Stratfield Saye Estate	Hives Planning Ltd	787607	1137	Yes	No	The identification of the level of growth for Bramley (Policy SS5 - approx. 200 homes over the plan period) is supported as being an appropriate level of growth for the settlement. However, it is felt that the site at Strawberry Fields is the only available site which could appropriately and suitably be developed and the site should specifically be allocated for the 200 dwellings as specified in Policy SS5. Policy SS5 and the approach to unrelated allocations in subsequent NPs rather than via policy maps is unsound under the terms of the NPPF Para 182. See attachment for further details.	In order to be made sound, Policy SS3 should identify land at Strawberry Fields, Bramley, as suitable for delivering 200 dwellings in accordance with the reasons set out in the attachment. The allocation should be shown on a Bramley Policy Map. References to site identification in Policy SS5 should be deleted.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the borough's 5 year land supply. Given the progress that is been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans, including at Bramley, and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach to neighbourhood planning is considered to be robust and deliverable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)	Judith Ashton Ass.	787729	1278	No	No	We question why, given the fact Oakley is a sustainable RSC, has the largest population outside Basingstoke (despite very modest growth over the past years), and the highest number of households in need of all the rural settlements (425), it does not have its own specific housing allocation in policy SS3 (like Overton and Whitchurch). It is submitted that it deserves a specific allocation of 150 dwellings in policy SS3, like Overton and Whitchurch, as well as a neighbourhood plan allocation of 200 in policy SS5. The other benefit of allocating small sites such as that proposed at Park Farm Oakley for 150 units, is that small sites can be brought forward quicker, and hence help address the councils 5 year housing land supply situation. The final paragraph of policy SS5 is unclear, and is not positive or proactive. See full rep for the full details of the argument, and read in conjunction with rep ID 1206.	Not only should policy SS3, if it is to be positively prepared and to address the housing requirements of Oakley, include a strategic allocation for 150 dwellings at Park Farm Oakley, but Policy SS5 should, if it is to be positively prepared and effective look to increase scale of development to be identified in Oakley through neighbourhood planning process to 200 units. In respect of the last paragraph of SS5, we believe the timescale proposed for the adoption of neighbourhood plans in the parishes identified in policy SS5 should be brought forward to 2015 at least to give momentum to the delivery of the neighbourhood plans.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base, and 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan). The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the borough's 5 year land supply. Given the progress that is been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans, including at Oakley, and also the inclusion of the trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach to neighbourhood planning is considered to be robust and deliverable.2017 is considered to be a suitable date in order to enable communities the real opportunity to influence their future. A trigger date of next year would restrict this opportunity.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1272			I support Policy SS5. In particular, I support the target of approximately 150 homes for Oakley. On 24 July 2013 the borough council designated the Neighbourhood Area for Oakley. The area designated is the whole of the parish of Oakley & Deane. Part of the parish lies within the land at Manydown (policy SS3.10). The borough council, as joint landowner of Manydown, has indicated that it wants to exclude the Manydown development from the Neighbourhood Area on the grounds that "the development of the Manydown land raises wider strategic considerations which cannot effectively be resolved through a neighbourhood plan". However, their concern appears to be unfounded. There is no doubt that the development of Manydown raises strategic considerations which cannot be dealt with by a Neighbourhood Plan. The designation of the whole parish as a Neighbourhood Area, and the provisions of policy SS5, are no threat to the proper strategic development of Manydown.	The LPA should keep policy SS5 as currently drafted and resist any representation by the Manydown landowners which would limit the right of Oakley & Deane Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan which covers the whole of its parish. Anything in the Local Plan which sought to impose on the Neighbourhood Plan restrictions which go beyond the requirements of the Localism Act and its associated Regulations and/or the requirements of NPPF 184 would be unjustified and inconsistent with national policy, so that the Local Plan would be unsound (NPPF 182).	Support noted. The Neighbourhood Area for Oakley was designated on the 24th July 2013 and includes the whole of the parish.	No change	N/A	N/A	Resolved. Support Noted.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	791341	884	Yes	No	The strategy to make larger settlements larger and benefit from existing infrastructure is flawed as Bramley Village has expanded more than any other area in the borough since 1984 incl. the German Road Estate with over 200 dwellings which were not needed to meet housing needs in Bramley and has put pressure on the infrastructure. There is no C road through the village. The village is a ribbon development and this prevents any enlargement of the C32. The village is bounded south by the MoD camp to the north by agricultural land. The proposed developments SS3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.3 will create significant traffic congestion on the A33. The rural roads to the north are now 'rat runs' and have become dangerous. There is no station car park. Commuter traffic creates parking issues. When the crossing is closed this causes severe congestion restricting movement through the village. There are 2 conservation areas, thus development contradicts Para 2.4 and 2.5 of the Vision and Objectives statement	Additional 200 dwellings would contribute to the wider infrastructure problems. The north east of the borough is essentially being 'in filled'. The borough's expected/encouraged immigration must be met in a custom built development providing infrastructure and services to sustain such a large influx of people. Manydown is the best and only site capable of delivering the needs of the future population without lasting detrimental affect on the existing population. Evidence suggests, and policy CNS supports, that to develop the northeast area of the borough at the proposed rate will need significant changes to and delivery of additional infrastructure. There is no plan to address the specific infrastructure issues.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	854	Not Specified	No	The plan allocates a prescribed number of dwellings to some of the smaller settlements but then surrenders responsibility for the identification of specific sites to the Neighbourhood Plan process. While this is arguably a legitimate approach, we are aware that the Borough does not have a five year supply. We would question whether it is wise, therefore, for the Council to surrender control over the delivery of its plan and whether it should allocate some sites among the smaller settlements. We are therefore wary about the Council abdicating too much responsibility because there is no guarantee that a Neighbourhood Plan will be produced at all or that they will be published and adopted in sufficient time for sites to get planning permission and then be built-out. We are concerned that the devolution of the detailed determination of sites to the parish level will present a problem for delivery.	In the context of plan making we feel it would be valuable if both these policies were amended to make it clear that the NPPF and NPPG will apply equally to neighbourhood planning as to local planning. The plan should make it clear that matters of prematurity at Neighbourhood level should not delay the bringng forward of sites within a Neighbourhood Plan area by having regard to meeting the needs of the Borough as a whole.	The Local Plan provides the framework for delivering the area's local housing target, whilst also supporting the government's localism agenda. Given the progress that has been made locally on implementing neighbourhood plans and also the inclusion of a trigger in the policy which will come into play if the necessary progress has not been made, the approach is considered to be robust and deliverable. The fact that the NPPF applies to all plan making and development applications is well understood and does not need to be reiterated in relation to the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Cllr Diane Taylor	BDBC	N/A	121755	626	Not Specified	No	p.31 states that "Oakley is a relatively large, compact village...Given the size and population of the village...an allocation of 150 homes has been made". Oakley was, in the 1950s, a small settlement with a population of approximately 500 homes. Its growth has been imposed over successive plan period until it reached its current population of over 5000. This 1000% increase represents the greatest population increase of any area of the borough, including the town centre. Its integrity as a village is now very much in question - its population is already larger than that of Whitchurch and Overton. In comparison to these two settlements, its shops and facilities are small and its schools near capacity. The concentration of housing in Oakley over the past 50 years has been remarkable and has gone far enough, especially with the roads constraints which cannot, due to the railway lines, be overcome.	Remove the requirement for 150 houses in Oakley. Invite a voluntary Neighbourhood Plan instead. Require housing of 30-40 in several other villages (e.g. Cliddesden, Sherborne St John, Ashford Hill) through neighbourhood planning.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. 150 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Oakley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period based on needs and constraints (see paras 4.35-4.37 of the Plan).The neighbourhood planning mechanism enables the Parish Council to propose a number of sites to accommodate development, which would then be voted on in the referendum. In order to allocate a site for housing through the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council would need to complete further assessments to examine the impact upon existing infrastructure, services and facilities. The policy also sets out a need for 150 units to be accommodated in other areas including smaller villages such as Cliddesden etc.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Number of designated neighbourhood areas increased to 10.	Factual update	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Mr Richard Burden	N/A	N/A	85874	533	Yes	No	Object to the number of homes to be built west of Basingstoke. There is existing traffic congestion in the area. A new link road between the Newbury Road and the B3400 would further encourage rat runners to take a short cut from junction 7 of the M3 via the North Waltham Lanes through Oakley to the Basingstoke ring road/ Reading direction.	Oakley requires a small roundabout at Pack Lane cross roads as there are highway safety issues.	A Transport Assessment has been completed which assesses the impacts of development west of Basingstoke and proposes potential solutions/junction upgrades etc. Such issues will be considered further through master planning etc. as appropriate.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	R Cheke	N/A	N/A	86092	339	Yes	No	Insufficient consideration has been given to how the plan will exacerbate traffic problems. The new development in Bramley will be isolated from the centre of Basingstoke and consequently will result in the need for additional vehicle movements. Further development in this area will put intolerable pressure on the existing road network. There is already huge pressure on the A33 and all the proposed development along both sides of the A33 in the Redlands/Chineham area would preclude future road widening. The railway crossing in Bramley already leads to tail-backs, which will become worse with traffic increases. An increase in housing in Bramley will put pressure on the fragile ecology of the area, especially on aquatic systems such as the River Loddon and its tributaries and exacerbate the likelihood of flooding along Cufaude Lane. There is no adequate primary school available in Bramley, and the new development will put additional pressure on existing school transport facilities.	The Manydown area, which was purchased specifically to cater for future housing needs in Basingstoke should be used to much greater capacity. It could take 9000 homes, thus obviating the need for development in Bramley.	The Plan's spatial strategy is considered to be sound and based upon a robust evidence base. The additional 200 units is a suitable number of dwellings for Bramley to accommodate over the plan's 15 year period, taking into account the needs of the area but its constraints (see paras 4.28-4.31 of the Plan). The policy enables the local community to decide how this housing number will be met and further assessments will need to be undertaken to examine the impact of any strategy on existing infrastructure, services and facilities, biodiversity, landscape etc. Manydown will not deliver 9,000 units over the plan period due to lead in times, delivery rates etc. and therefore overreliance on this one site will not meet the borough's housing needs.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	delete "Such development would, in general, be in addition to small-scale infilling within defined Settlement Policy Boundaries".	Consistency	Agreed	N/A
4.53	4.52	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	313	Yes	No	SS5 states that allocations would generally be "in and around defined settlement policy boundaries" and would "in general be in addition to small-scale infilling with settlement policy boundaries". The policy must define "small-scale" and "around" in the context of the housing allocation. This would provide clarity as to the number of homes required to be built in Bramley parish under policy SS6.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agreed that additional clarity is required and this has been reflected in updates to the supporting text. The reference to small - scale has been deleted from the policy.	New text: <u>Small residential developments of less than ten units (net gain of nine units or less) within the defined Settlement Policy Boundaries of the settlements listed will not qualify towards the targets outlined in the policy.</u> <u>Outside of the Settlement Policy Boundaries,</u> <u>developments of less than five units (net gain of 4 or less) will not qualify, and delete the following from the policy text: If developments of a qualifying size come forward within or adjacent to the named settlements via alternative means to neighbourhood planning, for example via a planning application, this will contribute towards the targets set out within the policy.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	Agreed	Remains outstanding.
4.54	4.53	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	191 /518	Yes	No	It is expected that the provision of a further 150 houses via neighbourhood planning will be achieved outside the Settlement Policy Boundaries, Site Allocations and Basingstoke Town. It is requested that it is stated that such new houses are to be provided in the Countryside in accordance with Policy SS6.	Proposed Amended Paragraph 4 to read; "A further 150 homes will need to be identified in the Countryside in accordance with Policy SS6 through neighbourhood plans, or other suitable means, in areas outside of those listed above."	The additional 150 units is generally expected to be provided within or adjacent to smaller settlements within the borough and the supporting text has been updated to clarify the position.	New text: <u>"An additional 150 homes are expected to be delivered through Neighbourhood Planning across the borough, outside of those settlements listed in the policy. Such developments are generally expected to be provided within or adjacent to smaller settlements within the borough. This approach is..."</u> Add sentence <u>"Developments of less than five units (net gain of 4 or less) will not qualify towards the 150 units total.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	Agreed	Remains outstanding.
Policy SS5 - Neighbourhood Planning - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New text in monitoring and implementation box: <u>Annual monitoring of new residential development which will contribute towards the targets set out in the Policy.</u>	To clarify the necessary monitoring to ensure the delivery of the policy.	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend first line to state "Development proposals for new housing ..."	To provide clarity	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Lord Camarvon	N/A	Carter Jonas	786136	564	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The broad purpose of Policy SS6 is supported. We have submitted comments on Policy CN2 and consistent with those, we propose that the word "or" is inserted between a) and b), so that the policy reads: Development proposals outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries will only be permitted where they are: a) on previously developed land, provided that: i) they do not result in an isolated form of development ii) the site is not of high environmental value: and ii) the proposed use and scale of development is appropriate to the site's context b) Or, for a rural exception site for affordable housing; or. This is necessary to ensure that a rural exception site isn't rejected for failing the policy tests a).	It is agreed that the insertion of the word "or" would be appropriate between a) and b).	Insert "or" between a) and b)	Response to rep - ensure the policy is effective	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Derek Kane	St Mary Bourne Parish Council	N/A	111301	81	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy SS6 section (e) should be removed. It opens the door to a very wide and effectively unlimited type and scale of development at locations that are, by definition, unsustainable, and have been shown to be so through the process of establishing settlement policy boundaries. If this section is to remain, the opening phrase should be amended to read: "... that have the positive support of the local parish council and, in the case of proposals that sit adjacent to a parish boundary, the support of the relevant neighbouring parish or other relevant council.	The policy is considered to be NPPF compliant in that it will permit appropriate development outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries. The criteria vi) to ix) will prevent unsustainable and out of scale development. It is felt sufficient for proposals to have the support of the Local Parish Council. This is consistent with many designated Neighbourhood Areas that follow the Parish boundary.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	498	Yes	No	Policy is too open ended. For example, criteria e) "Residential proposals that have the support of the local parish council..." does not mean that all other environmental matters have been resolved or that a development is in the right place or of the right design.	Policy should be amended to: Make only reference to exception housing and that needed for agricultural/ forestry/ rural worker need. Conversions subject to the council's existing policy text and specific reference added to consideration of impacts on the North Wessex Downs AONB, specifically where development results in harm to the character and qualities of the nationally protected landscape. Also add reference to the North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on Housing.	The policy is considered to be NPPF compliant in that criterion e) of the policy also includes points vi) to ix) which ensure that development meets other environmental and planning matters including location, scale and amenities. The policies of the plan are to be read as a whole and proposals will be judged against all relevant policies.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mrs Doreen Gascoine	Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Parish Council	N/A	542232	475	Yes	No	This section allows for a wide and, effectively, unlimited type and scale of development at locations that have been defined at unsustainable and have been shown to be unsustainable through the setting up of settlement boundaries.	Preferably, this section should be removed. If this section were to remain as part of the Local Plan the first paragraph should be amended to say "that have the positive support of the Local Parish Council and, where a proposal is adjacent to a parish boundary, the support of the neighbouring Parish, or other relevant, Council"	The policy is considered to be NPPF compliant in that it will permit appropriate development outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries. The criteria vi) to ix) will prevent unsustainable and out of scale development. It is felt sufficient for proposals to have the support of the Local Parish Council. This is consistent with many designated Neighbourhood Areas that follow the Parish boundary.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Ms Becky French	CPRE Hampshire	N/A	637125	567	Yes	No	The Local Plan is unsound (not justified) in that in relation to New Housing in the Countryside within Basingstoke and Deane Borough, it does not adopt the most appropriate strategy.	Policy SS6 - paragraph c) should read: c) For the re-use of a redundant or disused permanent building provided that: i) The building is structurally sound and suitable for conversion without substantial rebuilding, extension or alteration ii) does not result in the requirement for another building to fulfil the function of the building being converted, and ii) does not damage the fabric or character of any traditional building and in the case of a Heritage Asset, whether designated or not, the proposal will not damage the architectural, archaeological or historic interest of the Asset on its setting iv) Leads to an enhancement of the immediate setting (including taking account of the residential curtilage) A new paragraph 4.60 to be inserted as follows: "Conversions that would create new isolated homes in the countryside will be avoided unless there are special circumstances as outlined in Government Guidance" Paragraphs 4.60 - 4.68 will be renumbered 4.61-4.69	The Policy is already considered to be NPPF compliant. The plan should be read as a whole and therefore other policies protect and conserve heritage assets and address issues of safe access for all potential users. The NPPF allows for new isolated dwellings in special circumstances. One of these is the re-use of redundant or disused buildings (NPPF Para 50).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Kate Bayley	DGG Planning	N/A	638274	549	Not Specified	No	The reference at section e of Policy SS6 permitting development proposals outside of settlement boundaries where they have the support of the local parish council provided that they also meet the criteria listed at vi) to ix) is considered to be unsound. Planning applications may meet all of the four criteria listed below at vi) to ix) which are considered to be acceptable requirements, but not have the support of the local parish council. Retaining the words 'that have support of the local parish council' would give too much power to unqualified and inexperienced PCs and lead to ad hoc planning.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Officers view on the first line of criterion e) is that it is not NPPF compliant. This is to be discussed further with Councillors at the MAP.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mrs Penny Mayo	Sherbourne St John Parish Council	N/A	677508	439	Yes	No	Rural Housing infill must not substantially change the type of housing currently in the village i.e. conversion of bungalows into houses. New housing must be for those on the housing needs register with a proven local connection. Affordable housing managed by local housing associations must remain in their ownership in perpetuity.	No change suggested.	Noted. The policy is written to ensure that development will be of a scale appropriate to the site and location, and will respect the local character, which includes built form.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	1025	Not Specified	No	Requested that the provision of rural exception sites are provided in accordance with Policy CN2. The policy is to provide control over the extension of any existing built development. It is requested that the wording reflects paragraph 4.62. It is considered that section 'e' refers to the provision of new residential buildings. There is no requirement for the reference to 'support the local parish council', as it indicates that they would take the role of a 'quasi planning authority', not the consultee role which they are required to undertake. In order to provide a dwelling linked to an 'existing and viable' rural business it has to be demonstrated that the business has been viable for the previous 3 years. It is likely that the requirement for a 'worker' to live on site would have to be from the commencement of the business and it is therefore requested that the wording is altered to refer to the provision 'permanent' dwelling.	Please see attached document	The plan should be read as a whole and therefore Policy CN2 will be relevant. Ensuring the support of the local parish council demonstrates the Council's commitment to Localism and also Neighbourhood Planning. It will not always be the case that what is being sought is a permanent dwelling. In some cases there may be requests for a temporary dwelling and after a given period of time permanent permission may be sought.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	21	Yes	No	Clause e) could be open to abuse by councillors with vested interests. What is to stop a parish council arguing for a 10-house development without going through a formal neighbourhood plan. It is not clear whether a residential 'proposal' refers to a single dwelling, a development of several dwellings or both.	Either remove clause e) or reword to include more stringent provisions to prevent unwanted (by parishes as a whole) significant developments.	Clause e) refers to all residential proposals of all scales and criteria vi) to ix) ensure that it is of an appropriate scale. Such developments do not have to be delivered through a neighbourhood plan as this is only one mechanism. Ensuring the support of the local parish council demonstrates the Council's commitment to Localism and also Neighbourhood Planning	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Patrick Fox	N/A	N/A	783543	721	Yes	No	I believe the amendments proposed would make the wording more effective and more compliant with the NPPF.	Para c of SS6 should read: c) for the re-use of a redundant or disused permanent building provided that: i) the building is structurally sound and suitable for conversion without substantial rebuilding, extension or alteration; ii) does not result in the requirement for another building to fulfil the function of the building being converted; and iii) does not damage the fabric or character of any traditional building and in the case of a Heritage Asset, whether designated or not, the proposal will not damage the architectural, archaeological or historic interest of the asset or its setting iv) leads to an enhancement (including taking into account of the residential curtilage created) to the immediate setting. v) there is safe vehicular access. Postscript to state "Conversions that would create new isolated homes in the countryside will be avoided unless there are special circumstances as outlined in NPPF".	The Policy is already considered to be NPPF compliant. The plan should be read as a whole and therefore other policies protect and conserve heritage assets and address issues of safe access for all potential users. The NPPF allows for new isolated dwellings in special circumstances. One of these is the re-use of redundant or disused buildings (NPPF Para 50).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Tom Brenan	N/A	N/A	786371	710	Not Specified	No	Draft Policy SS6 (f)(xi) requires that for permission for a new dwelling linked to an existing and viable rural enterprise there is a need to demonstrate the business has been viable for 3 years. There is no provision for new enterprises which may require dwellings.	The previous Planning Policy Statement 7 Annex A Para 12 made provision for dwellings for new rural enterprises to be granted temporary permission for 3 years provided they could demonstrate a functional need to be on site and had a viable business plan. I would suggest that the Council consider something similar.	It is accepts that the suggested changes would support the creation of new business and enterprise in rural areas (NPPF Para 28) that have an essential need for an occupant to be on site. If temporary dwellings are not supported for new business, this could have an adverse impact on the rural economy and would therefore be contrary to the NPPF where all rural business should be supported through local plan policies.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Michael Harwood	N/A	N/A	786426	727	Yes	No	SS6 section (e): In Policy SS6 section (e) should be removed. It opens the door to a very wide and effectively unlimited type and scale of development at locations that are, by definition, unsustainable, and have been shown to be so through the process of establishing settlement policy boundaries.	SS6 section (e) If this section is to remain, the opening phrase should be amended to read: . . . that have the positive support of the local parish council and, in the case of proposals that sit adjacent to a parish boundary, the support of the relevant neighbouring parish or other relevant council.	The policy is considered to be NPPF compliant in that it will permit appropriate development outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries. The criteria vi) to ix) will prevent unsustainable and out of scale development. It is felt sufficient for proposals to have the support of the Local Parish Council. This is consistent with many designated Neighbourhood Areas that follow the Parish boundary.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A		Fogarty Group	N/A	786610	954	Not Specified	No	While the fact that criterion e) establishes that residential proposals outside of SPB's may be acceptable in principle, it is not considered that this support should only be extended to those schemes which have the support of the local parish council.	Criterion e) should be amended to support residential proposals in other circumstances (not just where they have the support of the parish council), such as where they can be demonstrated as being appropriately located for the form of accommodation proposed, particularly where this would help meet the housing needs of particular groups in the community. It is considered that criterion e vi and ix should acknowledge that there may be circumstances where development is well related to existing built development (but not necessarily a SPB) which could help contribute towards the creation of a sustainable community capable of meeting identified needs.	Ensuring the support of the local parish council demonstrates the Council's commitment to Localism and also Neighbourhood Planning The Policy covers the entire countryside which by definition are areas that lie outside of SPB's. By ensuring that development is not isolated can be interpreted as that which relates well to existing built development and does not need to relate to development within an SPB.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Mr Peter Lord	Highclere Parish Council	N/A	787067	949	Not Specified	Yes	Our client generally supports Policy SS6, which identifies the limited opportunities for new housing in the countryside. However, our client considers that the sentence about rural exception site schemes for affordable housing should be amended to require that the site has the support of the local community.	Proposed amendment to Policy SS6 : Amend (b) to read: "For a rural exception site for affordable housing that has the support of the local community ;	Policy SS6 b) refers to Rural Exception sites which falls under Policy CN2. The supporting text of Policy CN2 refers to such schemes to be developed with support. Please note that the plan is to be read as a whole and that proposals will be judged against all relevant policies.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert the word "or" between all criteria to provide clarity that each are individual criteria	Insert "or" between all main criteria.	To provide clarity and ensure the Policy is effective.	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Criterion e) insert after local parish council " /town councils/parish meetings,"	Factual update	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Replace the word "of" with "or" at f)	Replace the word "of" with "or" at f)	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
4.56	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	513	Yes	Yes	It is recognised that protection must be afforded to the protection of the countryside, however the NPPF Para 89 recognises that 'limited infilling in villages' is not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Proposed policies for the protection of the Basingstoke and Deane countryside should not be more stringent than government policies relating to development in the green belt.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted. It is considered that the plan provides a flexible approach to development in the countryside in accordance with the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
4.59	4.58	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	20	Yes	No	Wording seems ambiguous. Should the 'or' be 'and'. As it stands it means that a 1-for-1 replacement of a derelict dwelling is not allowed, yet a well designed new building could be better than flattening the site.	Rewording for clarity	Noted and agreed. A minor amendment has been made for clarity.	Recommend change to 4.59 to read "Buildings constructed of temporary or short-life materials, or which are derelict and in an advanced state of disrepair, are not considered suitable for re-use. A structural survey of the building to be converted may be necessary".	Response to rep - adds clarity	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
4.59	4.58	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Recommend change to 4.59 to read "Buildings constructed of temporary or short-life materials, or and, which are derelict and in an advanced state of disrepair, are not considered suitable for re-use. a structural survey of the building to be converted may be necessary" .	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
4.61	4.60	Kate Bayley	DGG Planning	N/A	638274	550	Not Specified	No	In some cases there is a right and a wrong position for a replacement dwelling, but in many cases it doesn't matter. If there is no particular logic to the location of the existing property on a site, why shouldn't a different position be proposed even if there is no 'positive environmental benefit'? It should be sufficient that there is no material harm in the new position.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted and agreed. Change made to reflect representation and ensure that the policy is effective.	Para 4.61 to read "A replacement dwelling should be positioned within the site where it would result in no material harm, including to the local landscape and amenity".	Response to Rep	The outcome of the MAP was to remove the paragraph. However, the discussion that took place was around why it is important for the dwelling to be sited on or as close to the original dwelling. Officers feel that the amendment reflects the discussion and still allows scope for refusal where the location of the replacement dwelling would be more detrimental than another location within the site or the original location. This would no longer be possible if the paragraph is removed.	Withdrawn/agreed with change
4.63	4.62	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The loss of agricultural ties for dwellings is not covered in the plan. Need brief reference in the explanatory text concerning restrictions on the lifting of agricultural ties and the need for a robust justification that the business has ceased to exist or what has changed to no longer require the dwelling for a rural worker.	Add supporting text at end of Para 4.63 "The removal of agricultural ties to dwellings in the countryside will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the business linked to the dwelling has ceased to exist or that the business has permanently changed its operation which no longer requires the linked dwelling".	To resist any potential loophole to build new dwellings in the countryside that without the tie would otherwise be refused.	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS6 - New Housing in the Countryside - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	For consistency, need to include an Implementation and monitoring box after the policies supporting text.	Insert Implementation and Monitoring box "Implementation and Monitoring The policy will be implemented by: • The determination of planning applications The policy will be monitored by: • Annual monitoring of housing completions outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries including new build, conversions, replacement dwellings and the number on previously developed land".	For consistency across all policies	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A		Bovis Homes and Pye Homes Ltd	N/A	786429	733	Yes	Yes	Support is given to Policy SS7. The drafting of Policy SS7 is more positive drawing attention to the land use planning consultation zones surrounding the AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield and the requirement for development in these areas to be managed. The basic principle underlying government policy is that the general demographic characteristics of the area surrounding the site should be preserved and in this context Tadley already exists as a well-defined local community. It has also been clearly demonstrated through the Boundary Hall appeal that the Off-Site Emergency Plan can accommodate the needs of additional population in the event of an emergency. Consequently, it is considered that Policy SS7 now reflects a more balanced approach to development proposals surrounding the AWE to consider development proposals based on their characteristics and adequacy of Off-Site Emergency Plan. As such the policy is considered to be positively prepared.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A	Elaine Vashi	Bloor Homes	N/A	786469	742	Yes	No	It is not sound because the policy wording is not specific enough to enable development to be delivered effectively. There is an identified need for housing and the risk of an incident at AWE Tadley remains very small. Tadley is a good location for a small amount of development in order to meet local housing needs. In general, we support the inclusion of a policy against which development proposals within the land use planning consultation zones around AWE. There is, however, scope to clarify how the policy will be implemented in practice. We believe that the criteria need to be more specific in terms of what type of development will be acceptable, and how each development proposal will be assessed. While we appreciate that each development proposal will be assessed on a site-by-site basis, it is necessary to provide some form of guidelines in terms of the type of development that will be acceptable within the AWE zones which set out the upper limits of development scale.	With specific reference to SS7d, the policy should also be amended to clarify how the Off Site Nuclear Emergency Plan will be assessed and how it can be adapted to accommodate new residential development. The most sensible way of ensuring that new residential development can be accommodated within the Emergency Plan would appear to be by way of a financial contribution to fund additional resources for the multi agencies that have duties under the Radiation Emergency Preparedness and Public Information Regulations (REPPPIR). This could be implemented in a similar manner to the mitigation strategies for ecological purposes in respect of Special Protection Areas (SPA).	Comments noted. This is the agreed position between the Council, ONR and other affected local planning authorities.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield - Implementation and Monitoring	Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Aldermaston and Burghfield - Implementation and Monitoring	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	This policy does not just deal with housing developments.	Amend last bullet point to read " <u>Annual monitoring of new development within the land use planning consultation zones and through discussions with the ONR and other affected neighbouring authorities</u> ".	to ensure the monitoring of the policy is effective.	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Aldermaston and Burghfield	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert hyphen in title of policy	consistency with other policies	Agreed	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	922	Not Specified	Not Specified	On housing whilst the draft talks about housing for all as an objective, seeking to restrain housing growth at Tadley due to AWE safety reasons may not be wholly realistic. It would appear that more needs to be done by the relevant authorities to calibrate the degree of risk associated with most likely disaster scenarios at AWE and provide an appropriate policy response and guidance. In this connection it is queried what research has been done to investigate how development planning manages high risk sites in other areas and what can be learnt from such investigations coupled with the long track record of good safety at AWE .	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy has been drafted in consultation with the ONR and the affected authorities to agree an up to date position. The policy as drafted reflects this position. This has been approved as policy through both the Wokingham Borough Council and West Berks Borough Council Core Strategy Examinations in public. This policy will provide a consistent approach across all affected authorities.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	373	Not Specified	No	The policy is not sound as the lack of development at Tadley results in a significant negative impact on the Sustainability Appraisal housing objective, both in terms of the provision of housing to meet local needs and to meet the wider Borough needs. Reference to SOS decision at Boundary Hall, Tadley that a significant incidence at the AWE would be remote therefore not logical to not promote development here. West Berkshire have allowed significant expansion of industrial sites west of the AWE (within the inner planning zone). More sites in Tadley should be approved as identified through the SHLAA. The LP should include a Tadley 'windfall' for a substantial proportion of this. The officers view to exclude the Tadley sites from the Local Plan is unsound.	Policy on Tadley should be reviewed and account should be taken in the available sites by windfall or other means.	The policy reflects the agreed position between the Council, ONR and other affected local planning authorities.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A	Mr Graham Ritchie	Wokingham Borough Council	N/A	625631	544	Not Specified	Yes	We support this policy.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1059	Yes	No	Tadley is the second largest settlement in the Borough with 10% of the population. The policy constraints are questionable given that the Borough has said they will consider each application on a "site by site basis". When approving development at Boundary Hall Tadley, in 2011, The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government accepted that the probability of a significant incident at AWE was extremely remote and the risk acceptable to Government. It is likely therefore that more sites will come forward and be approved. The SHLAA shows there is the potential for nearly 1,800 houses. The LP should include a Tadley "windfall" for a substantial proportion of this. The Officers' view to exclude the Tadley sites from the Local Plan is itself unsound.	Since Tadley sites are likely to come forward account should be taken in the available sites by windfall or other means.	The policy has been drafted in consultation with the ONR and the affected authorities to agree an up to date position. The policy as drafted reflects this position. This has been approved as policy through both the Wokingham Borough Council and West Berks Borough Council Core Strategy Examinations in public. Therefore this policy will provide a consistent approach across all affected authorities. Not allocating sites in Tadley does not prevent development from coming forward in consultation with the ONR. Any such development will be recorded through teh annual housing monitoring process.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Talley and Burghfield	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1187	Yes	No	Lack of development at Tadley results in a significant negative impact on the Sustainability Appraisal housing objective. This may have adverse implications on the economic objectives (particularly within Tadley). The policy is also likely to have a number of secondary impacts on the Tadley and Burghfield areas as a consequence - see representation for examples. Policy is different from that in the Pre-Submission draft Core Strategy (Feb 2012). See the Country Watch representation for detailed comments on the ONR case/ view. Council is placing undue weight on the views of the ONR, views which the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government did not accept when approving development at Boundary Hall Tadley. Also with the probability of a significant incident at AWE being extremely remote and the risk acceptable to Government, the officers view that to include the Tadley sites may render the Local Plan unsound is itself unsound.	Policy SS7 should be reviewed which in turn means that he BDBC is requested to return to the Multi-Agency Consultation process with a view to increasing flexibility within the consideration of planning applications. Council should reconsider its stance in relation to the ONR in the light of the large number of Tadley sites in the SHLAA which are held in abeyance, and to help make the Local Plan more flexible.	The policy has been drafted in consultation with the ONR and the affected authorities to agree an up to date position. The policy as drafted reflects this position. This has been approved as policy through both the Wokingham Borough Council and West Berks Borough Council Core Strategy Examinations in public. Therefore this policy will provide a consistent approach across all affected authorities.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Tadley and Burghfield	Policy SS7 Nuclear Installations - Aldermaston and Burghfield	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	143	Yes	No	The Local Plan and the policy should be retitled, and refer to Aldermaston and Burghfield throughout, rather than to Tadley and Burghfield. The land use planning consultation zones do not appear to be stated nor extendibility issues considered.	Change the title and references throughout the policy to Aldermaston and Burghfield rather than to Tadley and Burghfield for the purposes of accuracy. Include appropriate references to the land use planning consultation zones and properly consider extendibility issues.	Agree to change of title in line with representation but insert a footnote next to Aldermaston to refer to Tadley. The consultation zones may be subject to change over time and therefore it is seen more appropriate to keep these up to date and refer to them on the Council's website. Agreed that this may also have implications regarding extendibility issues and an additional wording to para 4.65 is suggested	Insert a wording into Para 4.65 " The consultation zones are shown on the proposals map with any updates available to view on the Council's website and as shown on the proposals map. <u>Consultation zones may change over the plan period, as may the ONR's advice on particular proposals, in light of new information. Insert footnote next to Aldermaston in the policy title to read "Tadley".</u>	Response to rep - ensure the policy is effective throughout the plan period.	Agreed	Withdrawn/Agreed with changes
4.65	4.64	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	144	Yes	No	Details about the consultation zones should be included here, and extendibility issues considered.	Include full details of consultation zones and extendibility issues.	The consultation zones may be subject to change over time and therefore it is considered more appropriate to keep these up to date and refer to them on the Council's website.	Insert " <u>The consultation zones are shown on the proposals map, with any updates available to view on the Council's website.</u> " at end of paragraph 4.65.	Response to representation - adds clarity	Agreed	Withdrawn/Agreed with changes
4.67	N/A	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	147	Yes	No	Any discussions with the Council should take place through a formal pre-application process.	Include reference to discussions taking place through a formal pre-application process.	Paragraph 4.66 encourages applicant to enter into discussions with the Council. It is not necessary for this to be under the formal pre-application process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn/Agreed with changes
4.66	4.65	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	153	Yes	No	The phrase 'Health and Safety Concerns' should be amended to read "whether there are likely to be any off-site emergency plan implications with regards the proposed development".	The phrase 'Health and Safety Concerns' should be amended to read "whether there are likely to be any off-site emergency plan implications with regards the proposed development".	Amendment suggested.	Replace "Health and Safety concerns" in Paragraph 4.66 to read " <u>off-site emergency plan implications</u> ".	Response to representation - adds clarity	Agreed	Withdrawn/Agreed with changes
4.68	4.67	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	127	Yes	No	The reference to approving development contrary to the ONR's advice is of concern. Whilst BDBC accepts that such cases are likely to be exceptional, it is of concern that this reference is included at all.	Remove the reference.	This responds to an appeal decision on a site known as 'Boundary Hall' where the ONR had objected, the council refused the application and at appeal the planning inspector allowed it based on the planning benefits outweighing the harm. It is considered that this was very much an exception given the history of the site and the draft Plan, as currently worded gives it a heightened emphasis.	Remove para 4.68 from "The Council will normally..."	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn/Agreed with changes
4.68	N/A	Mrs Liz Alexander	West Berks Council	N/A	638127	156	Yes	Yes	Joint monitoring is supported - appropriate processes need to be put in place between the key players.	N/A	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	948	Yes	No	Policy SS8 is broadly supported. However, objection is raised in respect of parts b) 1. Part b) of Policy SS8 makes policy provision for complementary mixed uses in the expanded town centre which includes parts of basing View and this is supported. However, the Local Plan evidence base, the Basing View Masterplan Vision (2010) and subsequent masterplanning work all indicate that the planned provision of alternative uses in suitable locations beyond the expanded town centre will make an important contribution to the achievement of regeneration objectives for Basing View. The Council intends that these objectives will be delivered through the preparation and implementation of the Basing View Supplementary Planning Document, which will provide further guidance on the location and scale of alternative sites. Residential should be included in the definition of complementary mixed uses at Footnote 3 to Policy SS8.	Part b) of Policy SS8 should be re-drafted as follows: "Support regeneration through the provision of alternative uses in suitable locations, including complementary mixed uses in the expanded town centre which includes part of Basing View". Footnote 3 to Policy SS8 should be amended to include reference to residential use. Reason: To secure the regeneration of Basing View, the Council acknowledges that it is necessary and desirable to create a flexible policy environment within which the planned provision of alternative uses in suitable location at Basing View can come forward through the preparation of the Basing View Supplementary Planning Document. The inclusion of residential use in the definition of complementary mixed uses at Footnote 3 to Policy SS8 would reflect the suitability of the location for residential use and the contribution residential use could make to the regeneration of Basing View as part of a flexible policy approach consistent with the NPPF.	Officers note the need to provide flexibility in the policy to support uses other than B1a at Basing View and agree that residential should be referenced in footnote 3. The plan must be read as a whole and development for complementary mixed uses will need to satisfy Policy EP3 (Town, District and Local Centres). The policy wording of point B) has been amended to provide greater flexibility for a mix of uses at the site.	Part (b) of the policy has been amended to state " <u>support regeneration through the provision of complementary mixed uses</u> ".	Response to rep and compliance with national policy	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	228	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Include a Tech Hub at Basing View similar to the one at Old Street in London (aka "Silicon Roundabout").	The emerging Basing View Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Document for the site will set out the types of business uses and ancillary uses that would be supported at the site.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (If changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1179	No	No	Throughout the town, various commercial space has slowly turned from manufacturing to predominantly warehousing and commercial sales units. These spaces have seen a downturn in the present economy and many are now old, unattractive and under-used. Other areas have large vacant plots that have been earmarked for more retail units. A policy of consolidating and refurbishing these areas should be pursued. This would then allow the large-scale re-designation of one or more areas of commercial land to housing built on Brownfield sites. West Ham Industrial Estate, Houndmills, Daneshill and other smaller estates are all looking tired and in need of redevelopment and a new use. This consolidation needs to be assessed further but we estimate the sites released could accommodate perhaps some 500 houses in sustainable, Brownfield sites.	Further to our proposed Amendments to SS8 and EP2 Put in place policies to actively work to consolidate the employment areas around the town to provide vibrant modern units that are fit for the present and future demand. In doing so turn over selected areas of employment land to accommodate residential development. This may yield some 500 houses on top of the expected windfall sites coming forward.	The Employment Land Review (as amended) identifies the needs for employment land over the local plan period. The document identifies that for industrial uses (including light industrial / industrial and storage and distribution land) the commercial property market is functioning well with low vacancy levels. The study also identifies that there is a need to provide more floorspace for these uses over the Local Plan period (specifically storage and distribution uses) and therefore Policy EP2 seeks to protect Allocated Strategic Employment Areas for employment uses which over the plan period should encourage land owners to invest and regenerate employment sites / areas to provide employment floorspace that meets the needs inward investors and the growth and retention of existing businesses. However, the policy also provides flexibility to enable sites, or parts of these sites, to be lost to alternative uses when set criteria can be satisfied.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	655	Not Specified	Yes	The southern part of this site falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and the Lower Brook Tributary runs along part of the A3010 in a culvert. Part of this culvert is failing. When this area is being redeveloped there will be an opportunity to investigate if the river in this area can be de-culverted to reduce flood risk and re-naturalise the watercourse.	intentionally left blank	The emerging Basing View Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Document for the site will set out site specific detail, such as landscaping proposals and open space.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A		The Basingstoke Jersey Limited Partnership	N/A	787221	1015	Not Specified	Yes	This policy makes reference to an area within the allocation at Basing View. The land to the far West has been designated as suitable for the "provision of complementary mixed uses in the expanded town centre." Although in principle we have no objection to the designation of the area for a mix of uses, we seek not highlight if retail were to be proposed on site as an appropriate town centre use. Churchill Plaza would be sequentially preferable due to its direct link to the Town Centre. Basing View is physically separated from the existing centre to the north by London Road, with Churchill Plaza being the transition between the primary shopping area (directly adjacent) and this new area. Therefore, we ask that in any application relating to allocation SS8, the impact of any future development on this site is a consideration. The policy needs to recognise the role that Churchill Plaza plays in linking the extended town centre to the primary shopping area.	intentionally left blank	Policy SS8 sets out the type of uses that will be acceptable at Basing View, including complementary mixed uses. The plan must be read as a whole and development for complementary mixed uses will need to satisfy Policy EP3 (Town, District and Local Centres)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1074	Yes	No	Policy SS8, promotes the regeneration of Basing View into a 21st century business park, "by establishing Basing View as one of the borough's primary focuses for employment through the provision of premier sustainable business/facilities (B1 use)". This strategy is justified by the Council's employment land review (ELR) (LP 4.70) and is consistent with national policy supporting town centre economic growth and identifying strategic sites (NPPF 18-21). However, encouraging a much wider range of town centre uses at Basing View, as proposed in Clause B of the policy, is not supported by the Local Plan evidence base and conflicts with national policy. Major retail or development which would serve the whole town centre is not complementary. Such uses ought to be sited in the town centre Primary Shopping Area (PSA) or in an accessible edge of centre sites well connected to the PSA. Basing View, should support the B1 business park allocation to be consistent with Policy EP1.	The following changes be made to Policy SS8(b) and footnote 3 is deleted: "Support regeneration through the provision of complementary mixed uses in the expanded Town Centre which includes part of Basing View. Provide small scale mixed uses (e.g. small scale shops, restaurants and leisure uses) hotels and serviced apartments supporting and servicing the 21st century business park."	Officers do not agree with the proposed change. A small part of the western end of Basing View will be considered as 'edge of centre' for retail uses as it falls within 300m of the Primary Shopping Area. The Western end of Basing View is also within the Basingstoke Town Centre boundary where town centre uses, other than retail, will be permitted. The remainder of the Basing View site will be considered as an edge of centre location for all town centre uses other than retail, in light of the aspirations to regenerate the site in its entirety to deliver a sustainable business location. The NPPF enables local authorities to take account of local circumstances in determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	797	Not Specified	No	Object/Support: The regeneration policy is helpful - particularly the acknowledgement of hotels as a complementary use to proposed business park in Basing View - Map 5, but there is no reason to limit the complimentary mixed uses to only that small part of the town centre expansion as shown on Map 1f.	There is no need to amend this policy in so far as our client is concerned apart from (b) which should be re-worded by deleting the words after the footnote number 3.	Officers agree with the proposed change. Policy SS8 sets out the type of uses that will be acceptable at Basing View, including complementary mixed uses. However, it is important to note that the plan must be read as a whole and development for complementary mixed uses will need to satisfy Policy EP3 (Town, District and Local Centres)	Part (b) of the policy has been amended to state <u>"support regeneration through the provision of complementary mixed uses"</u> .	Response to rep and compliance with national policy	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	criterion c) change "the" to "Make" and delete "and" at the end.	For clarity	N/A	N/A
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	959	Yes	No	Part c) of Policy SS8 requires development to utilise sustainable design and construction methods and provide on site low carbon energy generation, regardless of feasibility and viability. However, Paragraph 21 of the NPPF makes it clear that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations and paragraph 96 makes it clear that the compliance of any proposed development with a local plan requirement for decentralised energy supply should be subject to a demonstration of feasibility and viability. It is therefore apparent that Part c) of Policy SS8 as currently drafted is not justified, will undermine the effectiveness of the plan in terms of delivering its stated objective of regenerating Basing View and is not consistent with national policy.	Part c) of policy SS8 should be re-drafted to make it clear that the requirement to utilise sustainable design and construction methods and provide on site low carbon energy generation is subject to feasibility and viability. Reason: To be consistent with national policies in respect of the economy and climate change and to ensure that local plan objectives to secure the regeneration of Basing View through the provision of premier sustainable business facilities (Part a) of Policy SS8) are not undermined by other onerous policy requirements.	Officers agree that the policy should be amended to reflect that the requirements should be subject to feasibility and viability, which complements what is set out in the supporting text.	insert the phrase <u>where feasible and viable</u> in part d of policy SS8	Response to rep and compliance with national policy	Agreed and requested that the supporting text was amended to take account of other types of low carbon energy technologies	withdrawn/agreed to change
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	insert criterion d) Utilise sustainable design and construction methods and provide on-site low carbon energy generation where feasible and viable.	For consistency	N/A	N/A
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1245	Yes	No	This policy does not reflect the need for a transport strategy for Basing View. Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority would require a transport strategy for Basing View to be produced specifically addressing the impact of the increase in occupancy and land use within the site if it is to be regenerated as a 21st century business park.	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority requests the addition of an extra Clause E as follows: E) Address the potential use of non car modes Produce a balanced transport strategy addressing the potential use of non-car modes to access the site and a strategy to mitigate the impact of increased use of the site on the wider highway network	An extra clause (E) has been inserted in the policy to state: <u>'Address the potential use of non-car modes to access the site and a strategy to mitigate the impact of increased use of the site on the wider highway network'</u> . An additional paragraph of supporting text has been added (paragraph 4.75) to state: <u>4.76 The regeneration of Basing View will make a major contribution to the local economy by attracting businesses and creating new employment opportunities at the site. The Highway Authority will therefore require a Transport Strategy to accompany development proposals at the site to address the potential use of non-car modes to access the site, and, identify highway mitigation measures'</u> .	Response to rep (stat consultee)	Agreed	withdrawn/agreed with change	
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1174	No	No	The plan has no encouragement for the re-use of redundant office space, which is in areas of close proximity to employment areas, the town centre and railway station, which would continue the success of Crown Heights and Skyline Plaza. Instead policy SS8 has vague plans to re-develop these presently under used and redundant, unused office space with more office space. It is purely speculative and in our view unlikely that demand for office space will meet the reserve held by the borough. The plan is not clear how they will stimulate demand for office space to deliver the 5,000 jobs it proposes would be generated. The town has low unemployment and the need for more office space and jobs is not supported. It would be beneficial to turn over a proportion of office space to housing.	Amend SS8 and EP2 to encourage the re-use of office space for residential purposes.	Footnote 3 that relates to Policy SS8(b) has been revised to include residential in the provision of complementary uses. The Employment Land Review (as amended) identifies a need for quality grade A office accommodation in the borough (and more specifically Basingstoke Town) and Basing View provides an opportunity to replace obsolete office stock with modern office accommodation in a sustainable location (i.e. good transport links across a range of modes). Basing View will therefore make a significant contribution towards increasing the provision of quality office stock in the borough to meet identified need. Policy EP2 sets out the policy criteria for enabling the loss of employment sites within the defined employment areas. Current permitted development rights do enable the conversion of office buildings to residential subject to satisfying a range of criteria. The Basing View Masterplan will set out more detail on the types of uses that will be acceptable on the site and the type of office units that will be developed.	Footnote amended to residential (including serviced apartments), leisure uses and restaurants.	Response to representation and compliance with national policy	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS8 - Basing View	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1129	Yes	No	Whilst the redevelopment of a rundown Basing View is welcome, the attraction of a renewed Basing View is likely to displace businesses from elsewhere in the Borough, not increase the overall number. Technology has reduced the need for office space whilst increased home working (approx 500,000 more in UK over the last 5 years) will continue to reduce requirements. The Government has recognised this and relaxed the planning laws on conversion of office space to residential accommodation. The Borough should take advantage of this and use surplus office space in the borough.	Policy EP2 should the support conversion of office space to residential accommodation.	Footnote 3 that relates to Policy SS8(b) has been revised to include residential in the provision of complementary uses. The Employment Land Review (as amended) identifies a need for new office accommodation in the borough over the Local Plan period and therefore the regeneration of Basing View will make a significant contribution towards increasing provision of quality office stock in the borough to meet identified need. Policy EP2 sets out the criteria for enabling the loss of employment sites within the defined employment areas. Current permitted development rights do enable the conversion of office buildings to residential subject to satisfying a range of criteria.	Footnote amended to residential (including serviced apartments), leisure uses and restaurants.	Response to representation and compliance with national policy	Agreed	withdrawn/agreed to change
4.70	4.69	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	replace "importance" with "role" and then replace "to" with "in". Insert the word "office before "space".	For clarity	N/A	N/A
New paragraph	4.71	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert new paragraph "A small part of the western end of Basing View will be considered as 'edge of centre' for retail uses as it falls within 300m of the Primary Shopping Area. The western end of Basing View is also within the Basingstoke Town Centre Boundary where town centre uses, other than retail, will be permitted. The remainder of the Basing View site (excluding the Gresley Road Triangle) will be considered as an 'edge of centre' location for all town centre uses other than retail, in light of the aspirations to regenerate the sites in its entirety to deliver a sustainable business location.		N/A	N/A
4.73	4.73	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	insert the words "(including residential)". Update job numbers.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
4.74	4.74	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	To read "The feasibility of low carbon technologies on site, including district...." "any schemes for district heating and CHP should....".	For consistency	N/A	N/A
4.75	4.75	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	703	Yes	No	The policy does not reflect the need for a transport strategy for Basing View, which HCC would require to specifically address the impact of the increase in occupancy and land use in order to create a 21st century business park.	Include an extra clause E: 'Produce a balanced transport strategy addressing the potential use of non-car modes to access the site and a strategy to mitigate the impact of increased use of the site on the wider highway network.'	Officers recognise the need to encourage future users of the site to travel by sustainable modes and the impacts that high levels of trips by single occupancy private vehicles will have once the site is fully developed. Policy CN8 sets out the transport policy requirements that new developments will need to satisfy in the borough.	An extra clause (E) has been inserted in the policy to state: ' <u>Address the potential use of non-car modes to access the site to mitigate the impact of increased use of the site on the wider highway network.</u> ' An additional paragraph of supporting text has been added (paragraph 4.75) to state: <u>4.76 The regeneration of Basing View will make a major contribution to the local economy by attracting businesses and creating new employment opportunities at the site.</u> <u>The Highway Authority will therefore require a Transport Strategy to accompany development proposals at the site to address the potential use of non-car modes to access the site, and, identify highway mitigation measures.</u>	Response to representation	Agreed	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS9 - Basingstoke Leisure Park	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1080	Yes	No	Policy SS9 describes Basingstoke Leisure Park as the 'primary focus' for significant new and improved leisure facilities within the borough. However, leisure and entertainment uses are main town centre uses (as defined in the NPPF) and, accordingly, should be located in existing town centres wherever possible in the first instance, to be consistent with the NPPF (23-27) and Local Plan policies EP1 and EP3. Any leisure development at the established Leisure Park should complement the town centre leisure offer	The first sentence of Policy be amended and a second sentence added to: Basingstoke Town Centre will continue to be the primary focus for any major new leisure facilities in the borough. If sites are not available within the town centre, or in the edge of centre locations, leisure uses will be directed to the Leisure Park, so long as there is no significant adverse impact on the Town Centre or any other centre. Retail... Para 4.75 be amended.	The Council agrees that the policy should support a centre first approach and therefore the policy has been reworded to reflect this.	Reword Policy as follows: 'New and improved leisure facilities will be permitted at Basingstoke Leisure Park where there is no significant adverse impact on existing town or district centres within Basingstoke.....Retail development.....'	Response to representation	Agreed	Superseded with updated representation
Policy SS9 - Basingstoke Leisure Park	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1076	Yes	No	Policy SS9 describes Basingstoke Leisure Park as the 'primary focus' for significant new and improved leisure facilities within the borough. However, leisure and entertainment uses are main town centre uses (as defined in the NPPF) and, accordingly, should be located in existing town centres wherever possible in the first instance, to be consistent with the NPPF (23-27) and Local Plan policies EP1 and EP3. Any leisure development at the established Leisure Park should complement the town centre leisure offer	The first sentence of Policy be amended and a second sentence added to: Basingstoke Town Centre will continue to be the primary focus for any major new leisure facilities in the borough. If sites are not available within the town centre, or in the edge of centre locations, leisure uses will be directed to the Leisure Park, so long as there is no significant adverse impact on the Town Centre or any other centre. Retail... Para 4.75 be amended.	The Council agrees that the policy should support a centre first approach and therefore the policy has been reworded to reflect this.	Reword Policy as follows: ' <u>New and improved leisure facilities will be permitted at Basingstoke Leisure Park where there is no adverse impact on existing town or district centres within Basingstoke</u> <u>Retail development.....</u> '	Response to representation	Agreed	Superseded with updated representation
4.75	4.76	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update to paragraphs to ensure consistence with policy updates	New wording added: <u>In addition to Basingstoke Town centre, the Basingstoke Leisure Park is one of the borough's prime leisure destinations, comprising 45 acres of land owned and managed by the council.</u>	consistency with policy changes	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	421	No	No	There is no question that a station here with adequate parking provision would be good in many ways. However this station has been mooted for over 20 years without ever becoming reality. Why will it be different this time? We feel this is unsound as it may not actually be deliverable as train operators in the past have not wanted to stop at this proposed station.	Before trotting out the notion of a station again make sure train operators are able and willing to stop here. If it does go ahead plenty of space for parking must be allocated so as to avoid the mistakes made at Bramley Station.	The Council will continue to work with it's partners to deliver a new station at Chineham. The feasibility of introducing a new station will improve once the line is electrified enabling faster accelerating trains to operate on the line. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	322	Yes	No	Chineham Railway Station: there is no plan to deliver this facility and its presence in the plan is misleading.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Council will continue to work with it's partners to deliver a new station at Chineham. The feasibility of introducing a new station will improve once the line is electrified enabling faster accelerating trains to operate on the line. It is acknowledge by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the EM3 LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	423	Yes	Yes	The structure of this questionnaire is such that it is almost impossible for a layperson to respond in a meaningful manner. Many will have been deterred from doing so by the daunting challenge set. This allocation is wholeheartedly supported in principle. It is however noted that the obligation on the developers of Taylor's Farm to provide land to the east of the railtrack for station infrastructure has either expired or is about to. Accordingly, allocation of such infrastructure should be made to the west of the track and thus within the area of Razor's Farm (SS3.3)	The proposed railway station infrastructure should be largely relocated to the west of the railtrack within Razor's Farm land.	The Council acknowledge that the site for the station (secured through development) is time limited and could revert back to the landowners if the station is not delivered by 2021. Therefore the proposed station is currently available and no alternate sites have been promoted in the vicinity of the proposed station location. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	886	No	No	Site west of the railway line in Razor's Farm would be a better location for the proposed railway station. This would enable conserving and enhancing the woodland between Chineham and Taylor's Farm where the railway station and parking is at present proposed. It is noted that proposals are being considered to abandon the road link between Taylor's Farm and Chineham. The loss of this agreed link, for which construction has already been started, would have profound implications for the development of a Chineham railway station.	Allocate land for a possible railway station to the west of the railway line.	The site allocated for the station was secured through development and as a result is currently available. No alternate sites have been promoted for use as a rail station in the vicinity of the proposed station location, including draft allocation SS3.3 at Razors Farm which is being made available for residential development. We consider that the proposed station location adjacent to the established settlement of Chineham, the proposed Razors Farm allocation and in close proximity to Chineham Business Park is suitable. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Andrew McCormick	N/A	N/A	784664	229	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The need for Chineham station is fairly obvious but the council has spent the past 12 years trying to progress the development and not succeeding. A business case needs to be made: projected footfall, jobs and dwellings nearby, traffic levels on the A33, most of these are known. There should also be a commitment to involve the LEP (or its successor) and if necessary securing government or EU funding. The Basingstoke - Reading line should be in line for 25kV electrification and improvements are also needed to Basingstoke station (including reinstating the loop north of platform 5). These improvements should be taken together. Money should be made available from Central Government as part of infrastructure investment to kick-start the struggling economy.	The Council will continue to work with it's partners to deliver a new station at Chineham. The feasibility of introducing a new station will improve once the line is electrified enabling faster accelerating trains to operate on the line. It is acknowledge by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the EM3 LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Mr Nicholas Bywater	N/A	N/A	784685	267	Yes	No	Policy SS10 is desirable, but has remained unfulfilled for some 30 years, during which time Chineham has grown as far as, and now beyond, the site to which this policy relates. The site, which is sandwiched between Taylors Farm and development identified by policies SS3.3 and SS3.8, represents a green woodland 'corridor' that will be enhanced by the forthcoming realignment of Cufaude Lane, allowing it to be used as an extension to the pathway and cycle route that already runs through the centre of Chineham. The development of this corridor, for any purpose, would be contrary to the intention of Policy EM5, which seeks to protect such corridors, especially where there is a clear amenity benefit (visual and otherwise) to the local community. The size, layout (two parcels of land on either side of Cufaude Lane) and position of this site (at the top of a deep railway cutting) is sub-optimal and has not been given sufficient consideration in the context of more appropriate sites.	Policy SS10 should be reconsidered in the context of land identified by Policy SS3.3, to the west of the railway line, which would be more integrated with the Chineham Business Park and could link to the railway line at the northern end of the cutting. Policy SS10 is no longer the most appropriate use for this established woodland corridor. Its continued promotion in the Draft Plan can no longer be justified when Policy SS3.3 offers a more obvious site that could ultimately be planned and integrated more effectively with other public transport routes and more appropriate commercial development, whilst at the same time supporting Policy EM5. The location of Policy SS10 in the Plan must be reconsidered.	The site allocated for the station was secured through development and as a result is currently available. No alternate sites have been promoted for use as a rail station in the vicinity of the proposed station location, including draft allocation SS3.3 at Razors Farm which is being made available for residential development. We consider that the proposed station location adjacent to the established settlement of Chineham, the proposed Razors Farm allocation and in close proximity to Chineham Business Park is suitable. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	Mrs Jessica Tattersall	N/A	N/A	784782	491	No	Yes	Providing the long promised Chineham Railway Station is a great idea, and one that would benefit the area. The best site for this provision is Razor's Farm and as located in the Chineham Business Park would likely reduce the traffic burden on the A33.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The site allocated for the station was secured through development and as a result is currently available. No alternate sites have been promoted for use as a rail station in the vicinity of the proposed station location. We consider that the proposed station location adjacent to the established settlement of Chineham, the proposed Razors Farm allocation and in close proximity to Chineham Business Park is suitable. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	863	Not Specified	No	Funding identified of £5m noted in Appendix A for Chineham Railway Station only i.e. no additional funding identified elsewhere for other associated rail support infrastructure works required affecting other either existing or proposed HCC infrastructure assets. This is both detrimental and appears to be misleading against the policy total funding requirements.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The estimated cost of delivering a new station at Chineham is approximately £5m. It is acknowledge by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure for the borough, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it that the scheme has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	N/A	787784	1268	Yes	No	There does not appear to have been any biodiversity assessment of this site, which appears to be woodland of some type. Consequently, it is unclear how this site can have been properly considered in the Sustainability Appraisal. There is no discussion of its ecological value in para 9.18 of the Sustainability Appraisal, nor any consideration of alternatives, nor whether compensating for this loss would render the policy undeliverable. The policy seems thus to be unjustified, and that the requirements of the SEA regulations have not been met.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Biodiversity is one consideration amongst many. However, a proposal for a railway station on the site would have to satisfy policy EM4 and EM5 requirements as the Plan should be read as a whole. The site allocated for the station was secured through a development agreement and as a result is currently available. No alternate sites have been promoted for use as a rail station in the vicinity of the proposed station location, including draft allocation SS3.3 at Razors Farm which is being made available for residential development. We consider that the proposed station location adjacent to the established settlement of Chineham, the proposed Razors Farm allocation and in close proximity to Chineham Business Park is suitable. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The site is a long standing allocation as it was allocated in the two previous Local Plans. The allocation was originally made following the 1990 Hampshire Rail Improvement Study, commissioned by the County Council and the then British Rail. A biodiversity assessment was undertaken in 1992 and it confirmed the site did not meet the SINC classification criteria. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change	N/A	N/A	Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Sustainability Appraisal (inc. Strategic Environmental Assessment) of the Submission Local Plan to correct an oversight.
4.76	4.77	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Duplicate wording "...resulting in environmental, social and <u>environmental</u> benefits." Should include 'economic'.	Change second "environmental" to "economic"	typographical error	Agreed	N/A
4.76	4.77	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Include at end of Para "The site is defined on the Policies Map".	consistency	Change made after the MAP	N/A
4.77	N/A	Mrs Sara Weller	N/A	N/A	784199	107	Yes	No	These statements show the lack of commitment to delivering this vital piece of infrastructure. Yet the plans to build the houses push on regardless, thus the plan is ineffective as its promise to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered before the housing is develop is NOT being delivered.	There needs to be a firm commitment and timetable or when the additional station will be delivered. And up to that time there needs to be substantial additional work in Bramley to increase the capacity of the station there through additional parking, and also to add a footbridge given that the levels of freight traffic along this line are due to increase. The crossing is already down for anything between 10 and 15 minutes of each half hour, leading to substantial delays and environmental pollution levels as cars sit with engines idling awaiting the barriers to open.	The Council will continue to work with it's partners to deliver a new station at Chineham. The feasibility of introducing a new station will improve once the line is electrified enabling faster accelerating trains to operate on the line. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the EM3 LEP area. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	n/a	N/A	Remains Outstanding
4.77	4.77	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1247	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority would like to make the following suggested corrections that BDBC should include to make the Local Plan more effective to ensure soundness: Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority would like to provide a correction to the supporting text of the Plan. Paragraph 4.77 refers to 2016 but the franchise renewal date is now planned for 2015.	Amend the text as in paragraph 4.77 to show 2015	Agree with proposed factual change	Update date to 2015 rather than 2016	Response to representation - factual change	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy SS10 - Chineham Railway Station - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Does not currently have implementation and monitoring boxes.	Include implementation and monitoring boxes.	consistency with other policies	Agreed	N/A
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	706	Yes	No	Policy and supporting text need to be amended to refer to the correct date for re-franchising of the railway, and to clarify clause B to secure access to the car park.	Amend Clause B to read: 'Access between the railway station and the car park site can be secured'. Amend Para 4.77 to refer to 2015.	Agree that further clarity should be added.	The policy clause b) has been amended to state ' <u>Access between the railway station and the car park site can be secured</u> '.	Response to representation	Agreed	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1248	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority suggests that Policy SS11 is not sufficiently clear. Clause B should be amended to make it more effective and therefore sound.	Amend the text in Policy SS11 Clause B: B) Access between the railway station and the car park site can be secured	Agree that further clarity should be added.	The policy clause b) has been amended to state ' <u>Access between the railway station and the car park site can be secured</u> '.	Response to representation	Agreed	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	773	Not Specified	No	See 4.78 + 4.79 How can landscaping within the AONB be protected against the need for intrusive lighting in what is currently an unpopulated area?	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact provides the policy basis for protecting the character and visual quality of the area, including protecting the special qualities of the AONB.	No change	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	596	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	446	Yes	No	Policy does not include criteria to ensure care over materials, fencing and lighting.	Expand policy to make reference to care over landscaping, materials, fencing and lighting.	Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact provides the policy basis for protecting the character and visual quality of the borough and recognises the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. The Plan should be read as a whole.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mr Graham Hinder	N/A	N/A	784137	80	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	My complaint is against the extension of the railway car park north of the rail line. This track forms a natural border for Whitchurch. Break that boundary, as this proposal does in however a small a way and that natural line will have been breached. Further northward developments will follow	The allocation for a station car park is contained within the Saved policies of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (1996 - 2011). The site is located outside of the Whitchurch Settlement Policy Boundary however the SPBs will be reviewed once the Local Plan is adopted.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mrs Michelle Ashley	N/A	N/A	784775	294	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>		No change	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	R E Thompson	N/A	N/A	785516	457	Yes	No	It is with extreme disappointment that it is noted that the local plan does not contain any allowance of land for employment in Whitchurch. The previous local plan allocated 4.9ha at Ardglen, which was proposed to be accessed via a new road constructed to the north of the railways line and which also provided access to the proposed station car park. That same policy sought to provide housing at R E Thompson's existing site at Whitchurch. It is short-sighted in the extreme not to provide for further expansion of employment at Whitchurch, especially when the current consultation envisages adding 350 homes to the Town, when there are other opportunities that have not been looked at.	It is with extreme disappointment that it is noted that the local plan does not contain any allowance of land for employment in Whitchurch. The previous local plan allocated 4.9ha at Ardglen, which was proposed to be accessed via a new road constructed to the north of the railways line and which also provided access to the proposed station car park. That same policy sought to provide housing at R E Thompson's existing site at Whitchurch. It is short-sighted in the extreme not to provide for further expansion of employment at Whitchurch, especially when the current consultation envisages adding 350 homes to the Town, when there are other opportunities that have not been looked at. Since the council are proposing to carry forward the railway car park proposal to the north of the railway, this was the proposed 'way-in' to the former Ardglen allocation, it seems logical that some provision for employment land is made there.	Comments noted. The Ardglen Estate is no longer being promoted for an employment use through the Local Plan process.	No Change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car Park	N/A	Mrs Teresa Barnard	N/A	N/A	786893	908	Yes	No	This site for a station car park has been allocated for years and shows little sign of being implemented. It is clearly outside the town boundary on a greenfield site. Such development to the north of the railway line would set a precedent for further development in that area outside the town boundary. An alternative for the station car park could be the land previously allocated for employment i.e. the area of land to be removed from within the Whitchurch town boundary. This is an area, which was subject to a planning application for housing, which was refused. It therefore has potential for development. This policy cannot be justified and there is an alternative, which has not been considered in the local plan.	Consider alternative sites for the car park south of the railway line	The allocation for a station car park is contained within the Saved policies of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (1996 - 2011) and therefore the suitability of the allocation has already been established. The site is located outside of the Settlement Policy Boundary for Whitchurch although settlement policy boundaries will be reviewed upon adoption of the plan. No alternative sites have been made available. Whilst the respondent refers to an employment allocation within the Saved Local plan as a site that may be suitable, this site currently has planning permission for employment uses (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) and may therefore come forward in the future for such a use.	No Change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy SS11 - Whitchurch Railway Station Car park	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Do not have implementation and monitoring boxes.	Included implementation and monitoring box.	consistency with other policies	Agreed	N/A
4.78	4.79	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend paragraph as follows: "...at the busy Whitchurch Station. <u>The site is defined on the Policies Map.</u> "	For clarity	Post Map change.	N/A
5.1	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	631	Yes	No	This section does not recognise the natural environment as a community need which it should and it applies just as much to the urban environment as the countryside. National policy encourages this, why is not so in the Local Plan? I.e. land managed as different habitats, people having wildlife experience, education, raised awareness, fun activities, self fulfillment and simple inexpensive pleasures. IT HAS TO BE EXPLICIT IN POLICY MAKING. Should be seen as just as central to "community" as "facilities" and "leisure facilities"etc which in any case is not defined. It is also vital from the perspective of "sustainable" living. The natural environment should be embedded into everything we do in terms of enhancing community experience and understanding about natural systems and is an unrecognised yet significant source of pleasure to many people while many others are simply not even conscious of the natural world.	The Local Plan has an important role to play in underpinning sustainable communities, by facilitating necessary health, education, community facilities, access to nature and access to local housing, employment and leisure facilities. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that the borough's communities and countryside are flourishing with vibrant towns and villages providing homes and services to meet local needs.	Comments noted. The importance of public access to the natural environment is recognised through Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure. It is agreed to make reference to accessing the natural environment within Paragraph 5.1	Amend Paragraph 5.1 to read "The Local Plan has an important role to play in underpinning sustainable communities, by facilitating necessary health, education, community facilities, and access to local housing, employment, leisure facilities and the natural environment. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that the borough's communities and countryside are flourishing with vibrant towns and villages providing homes and services to meet local needs.	Response to rep.	Agreed	Remains outstanding
5.1	N/A	Mr Nigel Smith	N/A	N/A	784451	170	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.2	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tellow King Planning	641907	1005	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.2	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1205	Yes	No	This is the first of several references recognising the significance of 'locally identified housing need. Later text link this with the concept of "communities and the need for locally balanced housing stock and communities. Nowhere is there any explanation or guidance of how local community is to be interpreted. This has led to confusion and error under the previous local plan. In particular its natural for local government officers to think in terms of administrative boundaries, but such boundaries have little relationship to how residents think and behave. This source of confusion is of particular importance in house building decisions. During the period of the previous Local Plan, housing need surveys have consistently reported and been interpreted (by officers and developers) on the basis of administrative boundaries (e.g. Para 5.19 and footnote 6), even though in most cases more appropriate areas can readily be identified and surveys reported more appropriately.	A paragraph providing suitable guidance is proposed with comments on Para 5.22. A footnote here might usefully point towards the new explanatory paragraph proposed in comments on 5.22	Comments noted. Rural Housing Needs Surveys are undertaken by Rural Housing Enabler's and traditional survey at Parish Boundary level. The Borough currently has ten designated Neighbourhood Areas, all using the Parish Boundary. It is recognised that communities can cross these administrative boundaries. However, administrative boundaries are used for practicalities but there is nothing preventing areas joining together to undertake such surveys.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
5.2	N/A	Mrs Penny Waterfield	N/A	N/A	784284	111	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	My parish, and that of Tadley, is currently affected by the 3km exclusion zone emanating from AWE Aldermaston, where the Health and Safety Executive have decreed that building within this zone should be limited and virtually non-existent. Our village is becoming stagnant through this dictate, with no houses available for the young, and a rising population of elderly people who cannot downsize and make way for a newer generation. In addition, we miss the Section 106 monies which have been historically available following development, which have helped in many areas of the community. We currently have a bid for low-cost affordable housing within the area, which we would hope to be approved to make a dent in this particular stalemate.	Comments noted. It is important to note that the AWE consultation zones do not prevent all residential development and planning permission may still be granted where appropriate.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	In response to the updated viability study a change to the policy is required.	The council will require 40% affordable housing contribution on all market housing sites. On-site provision will be expected for 5 or more net residential units. In exceptional circumstances off-site provision or financial contributions of equivalent value will be accepted. Development proposals of less than 5 net residential units will be required to pay financial contributions of equivalent value towards the provision of affordable housing in the borough. The tenure split of affordable homes will be 70% rented and 30% intermediate products. In seeking affordable housing provision the council will have regard to the current viability of developments including land values and other development costs. The applicant will be required to submit an open book viability assessment where schemes do not meet the above policy requirements. In such cases the council will commission an independent review of the viability study, for which the applicant will bear the cost. Such proposals will only be acceptable where the viability case is accepted by the local planning authority and the approach contributes towards creating mixed and balanced communities.	Updated evidence base	The wording has been amended to reflect the discussion at the MAP. The addition of "exceptional circumstance" is explained above.	N/A
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Wates Development (c/o Savills)	Wates Development	Savills	133038	1200	Yes	No	To be sound, Policy CN1 will need to be considered in the context of the plan period as a whole, and whether as drafted it can adapt and respond to changing circumstances. As currently drafted, the Policy requires 40% affordable housing to be delivered on all sites of 5 or more dwellings. The policy does recognise that regard will be had to viability, including land value and other development costs. With this in mind, and to take a more flexible position over the course of the plan period, we suggest that the word 'target' be introduced into the policy preceding '40%'. This would be consistent with the approach Inspectors have adopted in respect to other councils in recent EIPs. It is of concern that the inflexibility of policy CN1 was highlighted by consultants Three Dragons within their findings recently presented to Members. Three Dragons also advised Members to incorporate more flexibility, owing to the dated nature of the evidence base.	Policy CN1 should be revised, with the term 'a target of', included within the text preceding '40%'.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1007	Yes	No	Support the requirement of 40% affordable housing on all sites of 5 or more and on site provision will be expected. Support in principle that development of less than 5 dwellings will be required to pay financial contributions. Further information on this should be included in the policy. Tenure split proportions should be flexible to change. Note paragraph 5.15 sets out tenure needs will be reviewed annually however this is not recognised in the policy itself. Updated Viability Assessment was not available for consideration for this consultation. The report to committee in July 2013 indicates an early concern around the economic viability of securing 40% affordable housing. This must be clarified and measures introduced to ensure that the policy is deliverable. Reference is made to contributions in-lieu of affordable housing provision, however no details are provided as to when off-site affordable would be acceptable. Further clarification is also needed on appropriate mix.	Further information is required on what proportion of financial contribution will be sought and on how monies will be accessed to provide affordable housing off site. Note paragraph 5.15 sets out tenure needs will be reviewed annually; however this is not recognised in the policy itself. There may be cases where the provision of off-site affordable housing can lead to the provision of numerically more or better suited affordable housing units, than if provided on site. This should be recognised within the policy. However, off-site provision should be the exception. Further details are required on contributions in-lieu and how this will be implemented and information on how monies collected through this approach will be put towards delivery of affordable housing. Policy should include more information on appropriate mix. Mix should be based on the most up to date Local Needs Assessment and on evidence held by the Housing Department and Registered Providers, such as Sentinel HA.	New up to date viability work supports the threshold of 40% on all sites, irrespective of size and that off-site provision should be of equivalent value. Therefore the Policy is being amended to reflect this change in approach. As a result there will be no further information required on financial contributions and the methodology. Paragraph 5.14 (now 5.12) states that contributions on each site will be subject to negotiation. It is felt that this is flexible enough to allow deviations where appropriate. In light of the new evidence the policy and supporting text have been amended to set out when contributions in-lieu of on-site provision is acceptable.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	321	Yes	No	I am very concerned that, without developer contributions (because they are forced to build on site affordable housing - and the HCA isn't providing the grants it used to), it may never be possible to regenerate the central areas of the Town. I would suggest that we could robustly justify "a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value" to really help improve our existing housing stock - I'm thinking the regeneration of Buckskin, South Ham and Norden - which surely ought to be the priority? Rather than leaving them as they are and just building new affordable homes elsewhere, we could deliver more affordable homes in these areas whilst improving them more generally (like Oakridge - and, more recently, part of Popley). To me, that's a win-win, as we're improving the lives of existing residents in these areas whilst also providing a net increase in affordable homes.	To that end, I'd propose taking out the criteria to enforce it always being on-site, therefore allowing the developer to then choose for either on-site provision or off-site payment. To be clear, the developer will always be providing the same amount of affordable housing - it is just a case of whether it is on site (and they build it) or regenerating an existing area (and they pay for it). Moreover, it would free up some sites (especially the greenfield sites on the east and west of the town) for some really nice, low density housing, as the homes wouldn't have to be so crammed on to the land in order to fit in the affordable element on site.	The suggested wording is not considered appropriate. Providing affordable housing on-site in response to local needs addresses the need in locations where it arises and creates balanced and mixed communities which is one aim of sustainable development.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	404	Yes	No	Concerned that the percentage of affordable housing required by the policy may render some sites unviable. However, welcomes the explanatory text in paragraph 5.10 which makes clear that where viability is an issue then the amount of affordable housing sought will be negotiated based on economic viability.	Move the explanatory text in paragraph 5.10 to part of the upper case policy text in Policy CN1.	It is not considered suitable to include paragraph 5.10 within the policy as this reflects the current situation which may change over the plan period. The policy, as worded, offers both the necessary starting point for negotiations and flexibility.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Superseded
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Miss Sarah Elliott	Homes and Communities Agency	N/A	786159	579	Yes	Yes	The level of affordable housing completions in the borough were at 27 in 2011/12. The HCA is keen to work with the Council to support an increase in affordable housing delivery, given the extent of local affordable housing need. Some of the registered providers including Sentinel have secured additional resources through the Affordable Housing Guarantee scheme to deliver new housing sites at Chapel Hill. They have started work on the Affordable Housing Programme 11-15 site at Freemantle Taverner Close and secured affordable units on Persimmons site at Merton Rise, Popley, so we are optimistic that affordable housing delivery rates will increase from 13/14 onwards given the new allocations proposed and Policy CN1, which requires 40% affordable housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A		The Manydown Company	N/A	786187	610	Yes	No	There needs to be a fuller consideration of affordable housing types and thresholds in respect to the Manydown development during later discussions on detailed Masterplanning with the LPA. The affordable housing update carried out by Three Dragons and presented to the Planning Infrastructure and Scrutiny Committee on 3rd July 2013 indicated that 40% affordable housing is not achievable. With specific reference to the draft Manydown allocation a 3,000 dwelling scenario for the edge of Basingstoke was included. It states that a scheme is viable at 35% affordable but with limited room for CIL, and that, scheme is viable at 30% with room for CIL and 75% affordable rent rather than social rent. Furthermore, it states with the 3,000 dwelling example that further modelling is required to discount values over time so values for this case study are likely to reduce.	The Council needs to run the scenarios for the specific allocations and then follow the evidence base by having a affordable housing policy that is justified by an up-to-date evidence base.	More up to date information on viability was reported to committee on 14th November 2013 and this concluded that 40% was an appropriate threshold. Detailed discussions on individual sites will take place through the masterplanning and development management processes.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	845	Yes	Yes	Welcome the fact the Council are seeking to be negotiable with their affordable housing policy, as is the case under the existing local plan saved policies. There are many cases, particularly on brownfield sites, where affordable housing imposed at such a level would make a development unviable.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	875	Not Specified	No	Gladman support the recognition by the council that requirements for tenure, size and type of affordable housing should be negotiated on a case by case basis taking into account of viability and local need. However the inclusion within the policy of the council's expectations on the size of social rented properties and the amount of Lifetime Homes is overly prescriptive and should be deleted.	The inclusion within the policy of the council's expectations on the size of social rented properties and the amount of Lifetime Homes is overly prescriptive and should be deleted.	New up to date viability work supports the threshold of 40% on all sites. The policy does not prescribe the size of social rented properties or refer to Lifetime homes.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Rep withdrawn and consider CN1 to be sound.
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A		Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1060	Yes	No	We support the provision of affordable housing in association with new housing development to help meet the needs of the local area. However, it is considered that the amount of affordable housing to be provided as part of any new development should be determined on a site by site basis, having regard to site specific circumstances concerning viability. Further it is vital that this affordable level is assessed alongside the emerging CIL schedule and proved to be viable.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The SHMA identifies that the need for affordable housing from the additional population is around 40%. Therefore this is the policy target across the borough. It is recognised that 40% may not be achievable on all sites and the Policy and supporting text is considered flexible enough to address each site on a case by case basis and the viability of schemes. New up to date viability work has been carried out alongside the emerging CIL and this supports the threshold of 40% on all sites, irrespective of size.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Superseded
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	707	Yes	No	HCC strongly supports the provision of affordable housing and notes that the last piece of evidence dates back to 2008 and more up-to-date work has yet to be published. The initial findings were presented to committee and these have not fed through to policy. Whatever the conclusions of the study, these must be reflected in the policy in order to be sound and ensure that funding for infrastructure can be provided.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	198	Yes	No	The blanket requirement of 40% affordable housing on sites of a particular minimum size regardless of location and local need is counter to localism, based on false premises and assumptions, and reflects a failure to allocate sufficient time for discussion of such crucial policies in the face of prolonged and repetitive discussion of sites and allocations. If left to stand, it would lead to market distortion, the development of the wrong types of housing in many locations, inappropriate provision for some of those in most serious housing need, and higher house building costs and resulting prices in areas already most prone to price escalation. Similar considerations apply to tenure mix. The issues are complex and a full discussion cannot be fitted into 1000 characters. Some of them are explored in comments on subsequent paragraphs.	Amend the opening paragraph to read: "In general the Council will require" Following the first paragraph insert: "On rural sites (outside settlement policy boundaries) and on sites in settlements near the borough's boundaries, the proportion and nature of affordable dwellings will be determined on the basis of recent evidence as to local need, including assessment of how and where particular types of need are best met."	The 40 percent threshold is supported by recent evidence on viability of schemes. This is a target across the borough and is seen as the starting point based on up to date evidence. Other evidence will be taken into account on a case by case basis including local housing needs. The Policy has been redrafted in light of the new evidence and as such if there is no local need for affordable a financial contribution of equivalent value will be sought to provide affordable homes in locations where there is need.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	210	Yes	Yes	I support this policy, with regard to the provision of 40% affordable housing. However given that the need for affordable housing is being used to support the overall housing numbers, viability should not be a factor. You cannot argue that housing is needed to meet affordable need then build un-affordable housing in its place.	Remove viability altogether. Regardless the final sentence makes no sense. How can you "contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities", if no affordable housing is being included. This is an obvious contradiction. We have already had one application passed where this was allowed, fortunately it was never built!	The current policy approach is considered to be NPPF compliant. Para 173 of the NPPF states that plans should be deliverable and this requires attention to viability. Sites and the scale of development in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. It is therefore necessary to ensure that the policy is flexible in this regard. The Policy has been redrafted in light of new viability evidence. This supports that off-site provision should be of equivalent value.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Nik Lyzba	Royal British Legion	N/A	786428	735	Yes	No	The council's suggested approach of requiring the provision of 40% on site for schemes of five or more units and seeking contributions in respect of schemes of four or fewer net dwellings is not supported by up-to-date evidence, the most recent viability study having taken place three years ago. There is insufficient evidence to justify a change from the existing policy in the adopted Local Plan. The change proposed would expect developers to provide viability evidence to the Council in support of development proposals which would provide less than the expected policy provision in the Draft Local Plan where the council's own evidence does not support the requirements proposed.	Further evidence needs to be provided to justify a change from the existing policy within the Adopted Local Plan and to support the proposed requirements. The current Affordable Housing Viability Report (2010) fails to do this.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Superseded
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Elaine Vashii	Bloor Homes	N/A	786469	744	Yes	No	We consider that Policy CN1 is unsound as it is not consistent with national policy or justified. The Council indicate that an updated Affordable Housing Viability Assessment is currently being undertaken, however at the time of writing this Assessment had not been made available. In its absence, it is not clear what evidence the Council are using to justify a lower target threshold of 5 units across all settlements. The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 22 July 2013 set out how the Cabinet member for Planning stated that he had made some changes to some policies as proposed in the update paper provided to Cabinet, and highlighted some of the amendments which included "Policy CN1 - Change from 30% to 40% affordable housing". There is no information available at this time to explain why Members chose to increase the percentage of affordable housing provision from 30% to 40%, or to indicate what evidence they used to justify this increase.	We consider that an updated viability report should be produced and should be the subject of a further consultation to enable the soundness of Policy CN1 to be considered in greater detail.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	N/A	N/A	Superseded
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	791	Yes	No	We consider that policy CN1 in its current form is unsound as it is not consistent with national policy or justified. The Council's Cabinet considered a draft version of the Submission Local Plan on 22nd July 2013 in which policy CN1 was drafted as:- "The borough council will require the provision of an element of affordable housing taking into account the need for affordable housing. On-site provision will be based on the following thresholds: For development sites within Basingstoke SPB or Tadley SPB of 3 or more net residential units, 30% affordable housing will be provided For development sites outside Basingstoke SPB and Tadley SPB of 3 or more net residential units, 40% affordable housing will be provided" This policy was drafted with regard to, and in accordance with the evidence base which supported the levels of affordable housing being sought in Basingstoke. The decision to increase the requirement appears to be a political decision.	To ensure this part of the local plan is sound, we consider that policy CN1 should be amended as follows:- "The Council will require the provision of affordable housing on all sites of 5 or more net residential units in line with the following:- Basingstoke: 30% Elsewhere in the Borough: 40%" We expect that an updated viability report should be produced and should be the subject of a further consultation to enable this to be considered in greater detail.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	821	Yes	No	Appendix 5, which sets out Officers responses to questions raised by Members states: "the evidence prepared by consultant's highlights that it is not viable to secure 40% affordable housing in and around Basingstoke and Tadley." (emphasis added) Despite this, Members still increased the affordable housing requirement from 30% to 40%. The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment has not been published as part of the PSLP consultation. This is a vital piece of evidence which should inform the content of the Local Plan. Its omission is contrary to the requirements of Para 158 in the NPPF. Given that the 40% requirement is not viable, the Local Plan as currently drafted is not 'justified' nor does it comply with the NPPF. This renders the whole plan 'unsound'. We reserve the right to comment further once the Affordable Housing Viability Study is available.	intentionally left blank	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	874	Not Specified	Yes	The proposed Affordable Housing policy (policy CN1) seeks a contribution of 40% on all developments over 5 dwellings subject to viability testing. Gladman believe that the affordable housing policy as currently structured is sound given the flexibility provided by the mechanism to permit viability testing considering land values and development costs. This is a realistic approach, accounting for the possibility of market change and will ensure that the overall delivery of housing is not compromised by overly aspirational policy burdens (see p.173 of the Framework).	intentionally left blank	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Rep withdrawn and consider CN1 to be sound.
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Michael Wales	N/A	N/A	784586	197	Yes	No	Provision of 'affordable housing' is insufficient.	Provision should be made to ensure a significant proportion of affordable housing is available, particularly in rural areas. I suggest that for SS3.1, 3.5 and 3.6 the affordable housing provision should be 100%. Also, planning provision to convert Bungalows to Houses should be withdrawn to ensure appropriate housing at a cost, size and usefulness for both the younger and older populations is retained. It is notable that many Bungalows have been converted / rebuilt to larger more expensive houses both changing the nature of the areas they are located in and increasing the prices, thus locking out those sections of the populations who could afford the less expensive property.	The 40 percent threshold is supported by recent evidence on viability of schemes. Schemes for 100 per cent affordable homes are supported where appropriate. The Plan should be read as a whole and the issue of housing mix is dealt with under Policy CN3.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1177	Not Specified	No	Policy CN1 requires provision of 40% affordable housing on all sites of 5 or more net residential units. The NPPF outlines in Para 173 that sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such as scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Three Dragons (the Council's affordable housing viability consultants) confirmed that housing development only becomes viable with an affordable housing target of 35% and when CIL is taken into account, with an affordable housing target of 25% to 30%. The fixed affordable housing target of 40% within Policy CN1 is therefore wholly unsound as it conflicts with paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Although Policy CN1 refers to taking into account viability we are of the view the fixed requirement as worded at present is too inflexible to take account of changing circumstances. This could have potentially serious implications for development programmes and delivery.	As a minimum too ensure housing delivery is not affected by viability and to improve certainty about policy flexibility, Policy CN1 should be amended to require provision of up to 35% affordable on all sites of 5 or more net residential units. The fact the Borough Council is looking to apply a high affordable housing target that is unviable demonstrates that the Borough Council acknowledges that it has a serious affordable housing need requirement. A more appropriate and sound mechanism for delivering it€™s objectively identified housing needs in full, as outlined in sections 4 and 6 of these representations is to increase the overall planned level of housing growth.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	928	Not Specified	Not Specified	The policy refers to the Council will require 40%.This suggests a mandatory requirement which relevant guidance eschews . Para 5.10 explains that viability and site conditions etc. need to be part of any negotiation over affordable housing provision and the policy should be redrafted accordingly. It is questioned whether it is appropriate to identify 40% as the Council's required-affordable housing quota. In interests of flexibility and each case on its merits it is suggested that this specific percentage is replaced by wording such as an appropriate percentage. It is also questioned if 5 + new housing units is a too low starting point for application of this policy.	intentionally left blank	New up to date viability work supports the threshold of 40% on all sites, irrespective of size and that the equivalent financial contribution is justified. The Policy has been amended to reflect this updated evidence.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	844	Not Specified	No	The policy requirement for 40% affordable housing on all sites of five or more dwellings is unjustified because it is not supported by the findings of the Viability Study dated June 2010. The assessment has also omitted the cost of several local plan policies and future regulatory costs. This will erode viability further. Concern that the viability assessment has not taken into account for future changes to the Building Regulations, and in particular the requirement that all new homes will need to be built to zero carbon standards in 2016.	We recommend that the Council reviews its viability modelling, taking into account the costs cited. The Council could do this alongside presenting a revised plan that considers a higher housing requirement.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1119	Yes	No	From a landowner perspective, there really needs to be a fuller consideration of affordable housing types and thresholds in respect of Manydown during later discussions on detailed Masterplanning with the LPA. The landowners will need to consider the LPA commissioned viability report, produced by consultants Three Dragons, once it is published before more detailed feedback can be provided.	A formal review of the affordable housing policy and thresholds should be undertaken once the Three Dragons report has been published and, in common with other interested parties, the Manydown landowners should have the chance to comment on the review prior to considerations at the local plan EIP.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1249	Yes	No	The County Council as a landowner strongly supports the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs. The existing affordable housing evidence base was published in 2008. However, subsequent changes to the wider economy, housing market, funding for affordable housing, carbon reduction targets and infrastructure needs means that the evidence is not sufficiently robust to formulate a fixed policy over the next fifteen years.	Whatever the final conclusion of the Three Dragons report, it is recommended that the draft policy responds to the evidence base once it is published, in order for the policy to be sound and so that adequate funding for community infrastructure can be demonstrated and secured.	Up to date viability work (reported to committee in November 2013) supports the threshold of 40% on all sites and this is reflected in the policy. A further round of consultation will be taking place, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Council has received an up to date viability report which has implications for the policy as drafted. Changes are therefore being proposed as financial contributions of equivalent value to on-site provision is justified. It is also recognised that there maybe circumstances where on-site provision is not feasible and in such cases off-site provision or financial contributions of	Amend the Policy. The council will require 40% affordable housing on all market housing sites. On-site provision will be expected for 5 or more net residential units. In exceptional circumstances off-site provision or financial contributions of equivalent value will be accepted.	new evidence and ensuring effective policy	This wording was amended following discussion at the MAP. It was noted at the MAP that financial contributions would be of equivalent value.	N/A
5.12	N/A		N/A	N/A											
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Second paragraph insert the words "of equivalent value".	new evidence	This wording was amended following discussion at the MAP. It was noted at the MAP that financial contributions would be of equivalent value.	N/A
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		first line of last paragraph delete "or seek to provide a contribution in lieu of on site affordable housing provision".	new evidence	This wording was amended following discussion at the MAP. It was noted at the MAP that financial contributions would be of equivalent value.	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
5.7	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1211	Yes	No	In order to be realistic and justified the plan has to balance the need for affordable dwellings in the context of all relevant factors. It might equally be said that there is a need to maximise delivery of market-price dwellings, since this is a key national priority and the Plan covers an area with particular high market demand; this would be similarly unbalanced. The words in the borough are redundant. The second sentence (This is on the basis that over the next five years . . . new affordable housing) is a speculative value judgement and adds no value to the Plan, which addresses policy for a much longer period.	Open the paragraph with: "The Borough has a very good track record in delivery of affordable dwellings." Amend the existing first sentence to read: "... a need to optimise the delivery of affordable housing. Remove the second sentence	Comments noted and change recommended.	Change Paragraph 5.7 to read "The council's Housing Register and the assessment of housing need undertaken as part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and subsequent work, demonstrates that there is a need to maximise the delivery of affordable housing in the borough.	Response to rep.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
5.8	N/A	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	34	No	No	Affordable housing is a mixed blessing if the occupants suffer from fuel poverty or transport poverty as a consequence of inadequate planning. Affordable housing must include HMOs otherwise a whole section of the community (single impoverished under-35s) cannot occupy the new developments.	Affordable housing should be built to "passivhaus" standards (by cross-subsidy if necessary and possible) so that the occupants need spend the minimum on heating, and it should be planned into the developments so that the occupants can get to public transport, shops and schools without having to run cars or spend money on taxis (particularly elderly and disabled residents). It is also necessary to consider single under-35s whose housing benefit forces them to live in single rooms in houses-in-multiple-occupation. Purpose-built HMOs with the highest standards of soundproofing as well as insulation and the delivery of the shared services should be a required part of the new developments. Otherwise there will be a whole section of the community that will be excluded from living there.	Small HMO's will be delivered through the private market through the change of use of new and/or existing dwellings (Use class C3) to small HMO's (Use Class C4). Larger HMO's (Use Class Sui Generis) are typically larger dwellings converted into more than 6 individual bedrooms. The market will continue to deliver such properties. This is covered under Policy EM10 and the Design and Sustainability SPD.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.9	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	200	Yes	No	The assertion is incorrect. Indeed the evidence is abundantly clear that the extent and nature of housing need varies very considerably across the borough. In rural areas and smaller settlements it is vitally important that provision of affordable housing is specifically designed to meet local need, both in terms of immediate need and the strategic development of the community. Provision of, for example, additional social rented housing in a place with little or no local demand, coupled with lack of public transport, shopping and leisure etc. facilities leads to upheaval of people in need away from their family and social connections and into areas where its difficult for them to meet their work, social and leisure needs. The (quite proper) need for all developments to contribute (including where appropriate financially) towards housing need should be uncoupled from the idea that all sites of a certain size should deliver a similar mix of housing.	Replace with: "The Council recognises that in and around smaller settlements, and in settlements close the Borough's boundaries and to neighbouring towns that act as the local main centre for many residents, provision of affordable housing needs to be carefully directed to meet real local need, including both the immediate needs of local individuals and families and the strategic development needs of the local community as a whole, including assessment of the extent to which a particular location is appropriate for particular types of provision. Accordingly, provision on sites in and adjacent to such settlements will reflect recent local evidence of need and how best to meet it. For the avoidance of doubt, where provision is not on site, all sites will be required to contribute to the overall need for affordable housing."	Comments noted. This Policy has been redrafted following new viability evidence. The redraft addresses the flexibility in where there is no local need that a financial contribution is to be sought to provide affordable homes elsewhere in the borough where they may be required.	Please see Officer change in response to the updated evidence.	Updated evidence base	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.9	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	193	Yes	No	In 5.9, the assertion of "clear evidence of high levels of need throughout the borough" is incorrect and cannot be justified. Few areas have had recent properly-directed studies of local housing need. No such studies have examined the locational implications of such factors as concealed households. Recent evidence in some areas shows very low levels of need or demand for affordable housing and in some cases no local demand for social rented housing, to the extent that empty social rented dwellings are having to be allocated to people resident in distant areas of the borough, with resulting social and family disruption. Some peripheral areas, for example adjacent to Newbury or to Andover, have little or no public transport, few local facilities and a shortage of local school places; many people 'in need' look for housing in those towns, which have extensive development programmes and a wealth of economic, leisure and retail facilities, and excellent access to public transport.	The text is incorrect and leads to a damaging conclusions, undermining the validity and effectiveness of the Plan and should be deleted.	Amended wording is suggested.	Delete from Paragraph 5.9 (5.11 in draft plan), first sentence, the word "throughout" and replace with "in".	Response to rep.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
5.11	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1014	Yes	No	Council should encourage and promote 100% affordable housing sites as another option to increase affordable housing delivery.	Paragraph should note that the Council encourages and promotes 100% affordable housing sites as another option to increase affordable housing delivery.	Comments noted. It is agreed that schemes for 100% affordable housing would be supported assuming the proposal complies with other relevant policies in the Local Plan. The insertion of wording to this effect is proposed.	Add to the end of Paragraph 5.11 "The Council will support schemes for 100 per cent affordable housing, where appropriate,".	Response to rep.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Council has received an up to date viability report which has implications for the policy as drafted. Changes are therefore being proposed as financial contributions of equivalent value to on-site provision is justified. It is also recognised that there maybe circumstances where on-site provision is not feasible and in such cases off-site provision or financial contributions of	Amend paragraph 5.12 to read "Although seeking contributions from all developments regardless of size, the policy has regard to the practicalities of provision on small sites. In exceptional circumstances and where justified, the council will accept off-site provision or a	new evidence and ensuring effective policy	This wording was amended following discussion at the MAP. It was noted at the MAP that in some	N/A
5.12	N/A		N/A	N/A											
5.13	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Paragraph 5.13 insert wording "While developments that meet the thresholds will be expected to make provision on site, for sites below the thresholds, provision will be in the form of financial contributions of equivalent value towards provision elsewhere in the local area. Where the calculation does not generate a requirement for a whole unit, the fractional contribution will also be towards provision off-site".	new evidence	This wording was amended following discussion at the MAP. It was noted at the MAP that financial contributions would be of equivalent value.	N/A
5.14	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Change first sentence to read 'The precise scale, type and form of provision on each site will be subject of negotiation.	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
5.15	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1016	Yes	No	No information is available on when the SPD will be prepared. It is important that there is not a large gap between the adoption of the Local Plan and adoption of SPDs to ensure the policy can be effective and deliverable.	To ensure the policy CN1 is sound further details are required on the SPD aspect so it is clear and deliverable, as any SPD will not go through the formal examination process.	The policy has been reviewed in light of a more recent viability assessment. This includes evidence to support an equivalent financial contribution. It will no longer be necessary to set out in an SPD detail on financial contributions. The Policy is therefore deliverable without such an SPD. Therefore remove the reference to the SPD.	Remove reference to SPD.	Updated evidence base	Agreed	Remains outstanding
5.15	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Delete paragraph 5.15.	clarification and to ensure the policy is effective.	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Delete from bullet point 2 "the financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision would be calculated when considered in the context of the other contributions south in respect of other services" and insert in its place "further detail on the operation of the Policy".	Updated evidence base	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN1 - Affordable Housing - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	201	Yes	No	A weakness of affordable housing provision under the previous LP has been sporadic and infrequent collection of housing need at local level, leading to over-reliance for strategy and policy purposes on data from the housing register. This is particularly unreliable in peripheral areas close to neighbouring main towns, where borough residents are unlikely to seek housing via BDBC. It also fails to gather qualitative information that is of particular importance in and around smaller settlements.	The implementation section should add a further bullet point: "The Council will ensure regular survey and reporting of the details of local housing need. In urban areas this will be at ward level, in rural areas at settlement level."	Local housing need information is contained with the Housing Register which is updated annually. HARAH in partnership with the Council will undertake Housing Need Surveys for rural areas who would like to bring forward a specific scheme. We are working on this further with interested local communities.	Insert reference to "the undertaking of rural housing needs surveys"	Response to rep.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	930	Not Specified	Not Specified	The policy should recognise that the proportion of market housing on a rural exception site to encourage its release will vary with viability, site conditions etc. and it is not realistic that this proportion should at all times be less than the level of affordable housing . The proportion of market housing on such site being less than the affordable element should be redrafted as an aim / general rule.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Policy takes a flexible approach to rural exception sites to allow for some market housing to enable the delivery of such sites. This approach is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF and the definition of Rural Exceptions Sites where it states that "Small numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding". This policy is therefore considered to be NPPF compliant and resists market homes in locations where they would not normally be permitted otherwise. The purpose of allowing market homes is solely to ensure viability and deliverability of an affordable housing scheme. Some sites may not be considered appropriate for development and these will be where the number of market homes exceeds the affordable element on what is considered to be a rural exception site that otherwise would not be developed. Therefore the number of market homes should never be more than the affordable element. If this is the case then other policies in the plan would apply, including CN1.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1019	Yes	No	Note there has been a change from the previous draft policy which sought that rural exceptions will provide at least 80% affordable housing, however, there appears no explanation for this change. Further information on this would be welcomed. Nonetheless we support and welcome that where viability is an issue that the affordable element should always comprise of the greater proportion of units in comparison to the market proposed. Support that this policy will be implement working in partnership with a number of parties including Registered Providers.	Provide explanation for the change from the previous draft policy which sought that rural exceptions will provide at least 80% affordable housing. Further information on this would be welcomed.	The 80% threshold was not supported by evidence. The policy was therefore reworked to provide greater flexibility to allow a number of market homes that would make a rural exception scheme viable whilst protecting sites from housing development that otherwise would not be permitted. This policy will work on a case by case basis by assessing the viability of schemes. It is expected that over the plan period as the economy changes the proportions of market to affordable will vary to reflect positive/negative economic change.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	160	Yes	Yes	English Heritage considers that criterion c) of Policy CN2 should be expanded to include any features or sites of historic interest (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policies in the Local Plan are to be read as a whole and proposals will be judged against all relevant policies. Therefore Policy EM11 will be a consideration where relevant. Refer to the officer's comment against Policy EM11 for any recommended change in response to your comment.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Rydon Homes	N/A	749508	946	No	No	Supports policy CN2 in the fact that it recognises that subject to local circumstances some market housing will be permitted to support the facilitation of affordable rural exception sites. However, the number of market houses should be equal to the level of affordable provision and there should not be an argument to keep the market housing at a level which is below the affordable housing element of the scheme. As long as an affordable need is being met and this need is over and above the preferred affordable housing requirement of 40% on-site affordable units, then the Council should recognise that a significant amount of affordable housing is being delivered as part of the rural exception site and allow for an equal share of both private and affordable housing as part of any housing scheme.	Supports policy CN2 in the general sense, but feel that it needs to be less restrictive as to the amount of market housing to be provided on site to assist the facilitation of rural exception schemes.	The policy takes a flexible approach to rural exception sites to allow for some market housing to enable the delivery of such sites. This approach is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF and the definition of Rural Exceptions Sites where it states that "Small numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding". This policy is therefore considered to be NPPF compliant and resists market homes in locations where they would not normally be permitted otherwise. The purpose of allowing market homes is solely to ensure viability and deliverability of an affordable housing scheme.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Mr Peter Lord	N/A	Sourthern Planning	787067	952	Not Specified	Yes	Our client generally supports policy CN2, which enables rural affordable housing schemes to be built to meet the needs of a particular village. However, our client considers that the policy and text should be amended to require the choice of exception site and the design of the scheme to be supported by the local community. Our client considers that the location of the exception site should be identified through an assessment involving the local parish council and local residents to identify the best site in the village for affordable housing. The parish council and local residents should also be closely involved in agreeing the design of the affordable housing scheme to ensure it fits in with the surrounding buildings and countryside.	Proposed amendments to Policy CN2 and supporting text : i) Amend Policy CN2 as follows:d) The development will be integrated into the existing community, (delete : where possible); and e) The site has the support of the local parish council and local community .ii) Add to end of paragraph 5.14: and future needs of rural communities. The site for the rural exception housing will be identified through an assessment involving the local parish council and local residents to agree the best site for the scheme. The design of the scheme should also have the support of the parish council and local community. iii) Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.15 "The Council would expect such schemes to be developed with support from the parish council and local community and the Rural Housing Enabler.	Unfortunately it is not always possible on rural exception sites to integrate new development into the existing community by virtue of their location as there is no longer a requirement that sites have to about the settlement policy boundary or existing development, and there may be other design matters that impact on this. Therefore schemes that meet an affordable housing need that are acceptable in all other policy terms should not be refused where it has not been possible to integrate it into the existing community. The supporting text of the Policy at Para 5.15 states that schemes are expected to be developed with the support of the Parish Council and Rural Housing Enabler. It is adequate to be in the supporting text. It is noted that there is no reference to the support of the local community and it is proposed to include this for clarity.	Officer's propose no change to the policy. Change proposed to Para 5.15 to include "The council would expect such schemes to be developed in engagement with the local community and with support from parish councils and the Rural Housing Enabler".	Response to Rep	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	MRS JACQUELINE MATTHEWS	Ellisfield Parish Council	N/A	784050	141	Yes	No	We believe that small affordable housing developments in ones and twos are a very good way of protecting the character of very small rural communities like ours and encourage such development. This change will greatly help that as it will allow the private development of one home on a Rural Exception Site (greenfield) to finance one affordable home. Without such an amendment the clause is "unsound" as it fails to allow this added protection and encouragement. All of our village is outside a settlement boundary. Without this latter amendment it is possible the economics will not work i.e. a one market house development may not be financially viable if it has to support the construction of 2 affordable homes and this mathematics will push in the direct of requiring larger scale developments than are desirable to protect the character of the village.	(i) delete "respect "and replace it with the stronger "not detrimentally affect" to emphasize the need for affordable housing developments to be of high visual quality and (ii)change the mathematics in the subject clause by inserting "an equal to" and so permit the building of one market home provided it finances at least one affordable home. c. The development will be in proportion with and will not detrimentally affect respect the character, form and appearance of the immediate vicinity and surrounding area; and Subject to local housing priority, local circumstances, viability and market conditions, under this policy a proportion of market housing will be permitted. In such cases, the affordable element of the development should always comprise an equal or greater proportion of units in comparison to the market units proposed. The council will only permit the minimum number of market homes required to deliver the scheme.	The Policy takes a flexible approach to rural exception sites to allow for some market housing to enable the delivery of such sites. This approach is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF and the definition of Rural Exceptions Sites where it states that "Small numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding". This policy is therefore considered to be NPPF compliant and resists market homes in locations where they would not normally be permitted otherwise. The purpose of allowing market homes is solely to ensure viability and deliverability of an affordable housing scheme. In circumstances where more market homes than affordable homes are required to make a scheme viable, this would not fall into the definition of a "rural exception site" and would constitute unacceptable development given its location. Financial viability of schemes will vary over the plan period and it is expected that there will be times when the viability of rural exceptions sites improves and requires less, if any market housing to facilitate the scheme. No change, the Policy is already considered flexible and sound.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Clr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	324	Yes	No	80-20 affordable to market on rural exception sites is not as effective as it could be.	Can the proportions be changed to 60-40 instead of 80-20? 80-20 will not be as effective as 60-40 in bringing sites forward.	The policy does not include a 80-20 split as this is not supported by evidence but rather allows suitable schemes where the affordable element is greater than the market element. The policy is therefore already in line with the comment received. It is considered that a specific threshold may, in some circumstances, adversely impact on viability and therefore greater flexibility has been incorporated into the policy to allow a number of market homes that would make a rural exception scheme viable whilst protecting sites from housing development that otherwise would not be permitted. This policy will work on a case by case basis by assessing the viability of schemes. It is expected that over the plan period as the economy changes the proportions of market to affordable will vary to reflect positive/negative economic change.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN2 - Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing	N/A	Lord Camarvon	N/A	Cater Jonas	786136	563	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	We support the wording objective of Policy CN2 and the flexible approach that it sets out to take, however we do not consider that the proposed wording achieves this and we suggest a change to it in order to achieve the maximum flexibility. The requirement that the total amount of the affordable element always exceeds the market element is unduly onerous. There may be high development costs associated with a particular site that may require the provision of a greater element of market housing to fund the development. Allowing this would be entirely consistent with the objective of the policy. Therefore the second sentence that reads "in such cases, the affordable element of the development should always comprise the greater proportion of units in comparison to the market units proposed" should be deleted.	The Policy takes a flexible approach to rural exception sites to allow for some market housing to enable the delivery of such sites. This approach is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF and the definition of Rural Exceptions Sites where it states that "Small numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding". This policy is therefore considered to be NPPF compliant and resists market homes in locations where they would not normally be permitted otherwise. The purpose of allowing market homes is solely to ensure viability and deliverability of an affordable housing scheme. Some sites may not be considered appropriate for development and these will be where the number of market homes exceeds the affordable element on what is considered to be a rural exception site that otherwise would not be developed. Therefore the number of market homes should never be more than the affordable element. If this is the case then other policies in the plan would apply, including CN1.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1181	Not Specified	No	Policy CN3 states that the majority of homes in Basingstoke urban area should be 2 and 3 bed houses, unless local circumstances indicate an alternative approach should be taken, such as where there is a need to rebalance the provision of housing types and sizes in the local area. The policy also requires development proposals to provide evidence, proportionate to the scale of development proposed, to justify the mix of housing proposed. The supporting text outlines that the policy, which includes the 2 and 3 bed houses majority requirement, has been informed by the Central Hampshire and New Forest Strategy Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMA) 2007. However, we note that the SHMA covered the period only up to 2012/13 and as such is therefore out of date.	The policy requirement that the majority of new homes should be 2 and 3 bed houses is therefore also out of date and should be deleted. The requirement to provide housing mix supporting evidence as part of any planning applications process, which takes account of local needs, will ensure that an appropriate mix of market housing is provided.	In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	931	Not Specified	Not Specified	The Policy should recognise its irrelevance to small sites. This policy should also encourage flexibly designed homes to meet the varying needs of different groups including older people and young households.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy is considered to be flexible and acknowledges this issue by requiring development proposals to provide evidence, proportionate to the scale of the development proposed, to justify the mix. Para 5.24 also specifically address this point. This is felt to sufficiently cover small sites.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr Richard Burden	N/A	N/A	85874	534	Yes	Yes	Supports criteria d) as it will help meet the housing needs of older people. Local Plan should look to allocate a site exclusively for older peoples housing. The Council should set up a task team including non-council members/ local older residents to help investigate such a scheme.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Following comments on the Pre-submission Local Plan a new Policy has been drafted 'Housing for older people / specialist housing'. This new Policy will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on the issue of housing for older people.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	850	Not Specified	No	The policy is not sound because the Council has not tested the feasibility of viability of this requirement. The policy requires that market schemes provide a mix of types and tenure of homes. No assessment has been provided to test whether the requirements are feasible. The policy is over prescriptive and quite undeliverable	The policy should be deleted.	This policy is considered to be flexible and compliant with the NPPF. The requirement is for a range of types and sizes and the applicant is able to justify the range being proposed. This will be considered on a site by site basis.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1199	Yes	No	It is not reasonable or practical for all new residential development (of more than 3 units) to meet all the policy criteria. Such an approach is unjustified and likely to be obstructive in the delivery of sustainable development, contrary to the aims of the NPPF. Clarification is required as to how the policy would work in practice. The onus is on the applicant to justify the approach undertaken to housing mix in all cases. Such an approach is unduly onerous, time consuming and will place undue burden on the applicant and the Council (through the assessment of such information). It is unclear whether these onerous requirements have been subject to viability testing to ensure the policy is effective and justified. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF indicates that the scale of policy burdens should not threaten viability, and the policy is therefore unsound on this basis. It cannot be demonstrated that this is the most appropriate policy approach.	We conclude that draft Policy is unsound and requires amendment or deletion. The policy is unduly restrictive, have not been positively prepared, will not be effective and will not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework	In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy. The flexible approach taken is not considered to be restrictive and responds to differing requirements across the borough. A strict housing mix policy would not fit all scenarios. Therefore a flexible approach allows for locally specific circumstances which is considered to enable sustainable development and balanced communities.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1215	Yes	No	To meet the Plans stated objectives requires that appropriate and timely information on housing need is available to applicants and to planners, the committee and appeal inspectors. During the previous LP period the Council has neither collected nor analysed and reported housing need in a consistent or regular way. As a result, the only information routinely available has been that from the housing register, which has provided only a current snapshot of potential demand for affordable housing (with an emphasis on social rented housing), but no evidence at all as regard the local need or most appropriate mix for market housing. Unless relevant data are available, there is no basis on which to implement the policies - all the references to local need and balance etc. in this part of the plan lose any meaningful value.	Under the policy will be implemented by: insert: undertaking regular surveys of housing need, with the collection, analysis and reporting of survey results and trends, in terms of neighbourhoods and communities, and their locally relevant housing markets	A new Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been produced. This includes looking at housing mix for market housing. In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy. The new policy should address the matters raised.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	323	Yes	No	I have big concerns about a requirement to build at least 35% small units - especially on very small scale developments of, potentially, just 3 houses.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy has moved away from specifying thresholds to encouraging the majority of homes in Basingstoke urban area to be 2 and 3 bed houses. In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	New evidence	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Miss Sarah Elliott	Homes and Communities Agency	N/A	786159	580	Yes	Yes	The HCA would like to clarify that they also welcome private rented housing as well as homes for sale, within the Local Plan. Policy CN3 on Housing Mix for Market housing makes no reference to delivery of private rented homes, which is encouraged under the NPPF. The HCA promotes Build to Rent schemes through its programme, which supports Government Policy to stimulate housing supply, whilst meeting local need and encouraging institutional investment into the private rented sector housing. The HCA is keen to work with the Council to help deliver new homes on the allocated sites, on the sites we own at Park Prewett/Trumpet Lane and through the use of our various programmes. We recognise Basingstoke's importance as a strategic location for housing growth within the M3 LEP area where provision of new homes will support economic growth.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Paragraph 5.22 addresses the need for rent and buy. It is acknowledged that the Policy itself does not refer to a range of tenures. Amendment suggested to include reference to 'mix of tenures'.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	Response to representation	Officer's to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	794	Yes	No	We support the principle of providing a range of housing types, sizes and designs to meet the varying needs of the borough. The policy states that the majority of homes in Basingstoke urban area should be 2 and 3 bed houses unless local circumstances indicate an alternative approach should be taken. Whilst there is flexibility in this approach, greater clarity should be provided as to how this policy will be applied. There is sufficient ambiguity with the word 'majority' to warrant an alternative form of wording to this policy. The policy states that the Council will require development to include a proportion of Lifetime Mobility Standard homes with an objective of achieving 15% of all new homes in the borough to this standard. Greater clarity is required to explain whether this is an objective or a requirement and whether the 15% will be applied rigidly to all developments, regardless of scale and location.	We suggest the wording of the policy to be amended to "At least 50% of homes in Basingstoke urban area.....". Further changes should be made to provide greater clarity and precision in respect of the requirement for each site to contribute towards the Lifetime Mobility Standards homes.	In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy. Reference to Lifetime Homes has now been amended.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	New evidence and information contained in the Governments consultation on Housing Standards Review.	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A		Fogarty Group	N/A	786610	951	Not Specified	No	It fails to set out a positive and justified strategy for delivering housing and care accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. The NPPF requires that authorities plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends; market trends; and the needs of different groups in the community. In additions Para 50 indicates that authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. The Council's own evidence demonstrates the need to properly plan for an ageing population. Not only does it fail to set out a positive strategy for the provision of such housing and care accommodation, but it also fails to set out a strategy for ensuring that it is provided in locations which will meet the needs of the elderly.	Be amended to include a policy which positively supports the provision of housing and care accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. The inclusion of such a policy is justified given the evidence that those over 65 will represent a significant proportion of the population increase in the borough to 2029. Should set out that through allocations or permissions that the Council will support the provision of schemes which make specific provision for housing and care accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly. The policy should encourage such development to be in locations and of a type which meet the particular needs of this group in the community.	A new policy has been drafted to cover 'housing for older people / specialist housing'. This new Policy will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on the issue of housing for older people.	See officer's suggested new policy 'Housing for older people / specialist housing'.	Response to representation, evidence and NPPF compliant.	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Partially outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	820	Yes	No	Whilst we support the aspirations of Policy CN3, the policy currently implies that the proposed housing mix on development sites must meet all four criteria set out in bullet d). It is not considered appropriate or justified to require all housing developments to provide specialist forms of accommodation to meet the needs of older people. Whilst most housing development will provide accommodation for downsizers, they are unlikely to include specialist extra care or nursing home. The policy is therefore too prescriptive and specific in its application as a generic policy to all future housing developments. It is not clear why the descriptions in bullet d) have been used and whether there is a need for certain types of accommodation.	We consider that the Local Plan should be amended to provide a stand-alone policy on specialist accommodation, which should not be applicable across the board to all future housing developments. This would provide a clearer and more robust policy enabling specialist development in its own right to be delivered and monitored and therefore meet the 'effectiveness' test of the NPPF.	This is agreed. Amendment to policy suggested. A new policy has been also been drafted to specifically address housing for older people/specialist housing.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy and suggested new policy 'Housing for older people / specialist housing'.	Response to representation evidence and NPPF compliance.	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Superseded with updated representation
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Mr Craig Barnes	Gladman Developments	N/A	786814	873	No	No	Gladman supports Basingstoke and Deane's approach to Housing Mix as outlined point's a-d in Policy CN3. The requirement to deliver the majority of new homes composed of two or three bedrooms in the Basingstoke urban area is too prescriptive and could result in the under delivery of one bed or four bed properties or higher if this isn't actively monitored. Gladman feel that this policy is in conflict with point a, of Policy CN3 and should therefore be reworded to indicate the councils preference to this in acknowledgement of the need identified in the Neighbourhood Stock Analysis and council's Older Persons Housing Survey. The objective to deliver 15% of all new homes within the borough at Lifetime Mobility Standard may prove to be unrealistic and could have an impact on the deliverability and effectiveness of the plan and the viability of schemes in Basingstoke and Deane with particular consideration of Para 173 of the NPPF.	intentionally left blank	In response to new evidence this policy has ben subsequently redrafted. The reference to 2 and 3 bed houses has been removed. It is considered that the new policy provides more flexibility. The 15% Lifetime mobility standards has been tested as part of the viability study which found cumulatively the local plan policies to be viable. Reference to Lifetime Homes has now been amended.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	New evidence and information contained in the Governments consultation on Housing Standards Review.	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	Rep withdrawn and consider Policy CN3 to be sound.
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A		Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1048	Yes	No	We propose the following addition to the second paragraph of this policy so to ensure development remains character led whilst still responding to defined dwelling size needs throughout the borough.	The majority of homes in Basingstoke urban area should be 2 and 3 bed houses, unless local circumstances indicate an alternative approach should be taken, such as where there is a need to rebalance the provision of housing types and sizes in the local area or to respond to the prevailing character of an area.	In response to new evidence this Policy has subsequently been revised and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, enabling further comments to be made on changes made to the policy.	See officer's suggested changes to the policy.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Officer's revised policy to read "Development will be permitted where the mix of market housing: a) includes a range of house size, type, price and tenure to address local requirements ; and b) is appropriate to the size, location and characteristics of the site; and c) is appropriate to the established character and density of the neighbourhood; and d) provides adaptable housing to enable people to stay in their homes as their needs change Development proposals will be required to provide evidence, proportionate to the scale of development, to justify the mix of housing proposed". The supporting text has also been updated to reflect the change in evidence and support to altered policy. Include footnote by 'house type' to give examples.	New evidence and information contained in the Governments consultation on Housing Standards Review.	Officers to circulate amended policy for comment following MAP discussion. No further comments received.	N/A
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	N/A		Mrs. Maria Miller MP	N/A	121767	459	Yes	No	intentionally left blank	The Vision refers to meeting the needs of the most vulnerable, but the plan makes no provision for making the borough more accessible to those who are disabled or have mobility impairments, and should include a policy to improve physical access to housing, public and commercial buildings and meet the transport needs of individuals. The Vision refers to responding to climate change, but the plan is not proposing to apply any additional standards over and above BREEAM / the Code.	Include policies to make provision for those with disabilities and more stringent requirements to respond to the challenges of climate change.	Policy CN3 and a new policy on housing for older persons/specialist accommodation addresses the issue of housing for people with mobility impairments. the new policy includes a criteria stating that the location of such development must be appropriate in terms of access to facilities, services and public transport. The plan has also been subjected to an Equalities Impact Assessment.	Response to representations	N/A	Partially outstanding
Policy CN3 - Housing Mix for Market Housing	Policy CN4 - Housing for Older people/Specialist housing	Mr Neil Richardson		N/A	85764	919	Not Specified	Not Specified	intentionally left blank	A large increase in the 65+ age groups is forecast during the Plan Period and it is queried whether enough has been done in terms of policy and proposals to help address these developing characteristics of the Borough's population profile. The Demographic Research Paper (June 2013) suggests the scale of growth could be modified downward if national immigration policy was tightened but this is a matter for Her Majesty's Government (HMG). The long term historical perspective of growth of this sub-region cannot be underplayed when one considers the population of the Borough has increased tenfold since the early 1960s. Coupled with the recent improvement in economic prospects nationally and locally it is reasonable to expect the Basingstoke area to continue to experience considerable growth pressures for the foreseeable future.	The changes in the borough's demographics and also the housing /employment balance, have been considered through the modelling work completed as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan to inform decisions on objectively assessed housing need. Accommodation to meet the specific needs of older people is covered by a new draft policy. Policy CN3 is also relevant.	New policy on housing for older persons/specialist accommodation	response to representations.	N/A	Remains outstanding
New Paragraph	5.19	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1021	Yes	No	It should be clear the housing stock requirement set out relates to private housing only. Support the encouragement for developments which meet the needs of the elderly and people with special needs.	Policy should include the following text: "Affordable housing mix should take account the most up to date Local Needs Assessment for an area and other evidence held by the Housing Department and Registered Providers."	The policy is specifically market housing only. The title of the policy is 'Housing mix for Market Housing'. To clarify, it is suggested to add a reference into the supporting text to cross refer to the affordable housing policy, where mix for affordable homes is covered.	Add reference to affordable housing policy within the supporting text.	Response to representation - to add clarity.	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.22	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	320	Yes	No	Self Build: Could we have a policy on self-build and how we will encourage it? This would help make a larger windfall number more robust.	Self Build: Could we have a policy on self-build and how we will encourage it? This would help make a larger windfall number more robust.	It is felt that self-build can be delivered through the policy as it is currently drafted and supported by the reference to self-build at paragraph 5.22. As self - build is a relatively new area there is no trend data or proven delivery which makes it very difficult to include in a robust case for inclusion in a windfall allowance.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.23	5.28	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1212	Yes	No	The confusion is of administrative boundaries with communities and local areas has particular importance in house building decisions. surveys of local housing need provide outcomes at parish level, which don't in any sense reflect what people in the community concerned regard as local. Similarly, many village communities close the Boroughs borders regard a main town in a different district or unitary authority as the obvious and desirable place when wanting to move closer to amenities; in such cases local need is supplied outside the borough, but surveys reporting need at parish level are interpreted as indicating what should be built within the parish, leading to an inappropriate perception of what represents housing balance. The same holds true of information gathering and reporting at ward level most wards include several (sometimes many) distinct communities.	Add a paragraph that clearly recognises this and can be used as guidance to avoid inappropriate conduct and interpretation of housing need studies and reporting. Possible draft: Identification of local need and any imbalance in the local housing stock should reflect how local communities work, rather than administrative boundaries; for example a particular community may include residents and dwellings that straddle two parish or ward boundaries, while residents seeking to downsize and / or first time home owners or renters around the edges of the Borough who also wish to move closer to amenities such as shopping, entertainment or train stations will look across district as well as parish or ward boundaries.	The reference to 'local housing need' in the last sentence of Para 5.22 is misleading. The policy and supporting text relates to market housing only. The issue of local need for affordable housing is covered under Policies CN1 and CN2. Amendment to this Para is suggested. Local housing need information is contained with the Housing Register which is updated annually. HARAH in partnership with the Council will undertake Housing Need Surveys for rural areas who would like to bring forward a specific scheme. We are working on this further with interested local communities. This policy should result in developments responding to local housing requirements as a result of the demographics and the requirements of the local population, one example could be smaller units in rural areas to enable downsizing.	Remove reference to 'local housing need' in Para 5.23 and replace with local housing requirements'	Response to representation and to provide clarity.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Policy CN5 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update policy number in light of additional policy inserted in Plan.	typographical error	Change made after MAP	N/A
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Mr Graham Smith	Test Valley Borough Council	N/A	625620	483	Not Specified	Yes	The Council supports the innovative approach taken to allocating gypsy and traveller sites.	intentionally left blank	Supported noted	No Change	n/a	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	325	Yes	No	Bramley parish has a recent history of unauthorised traveller camps and a recent retrospective planning application was refused for change of use from agricultural land to a traveller site with a fixed dwelling and several caravan pitches. Bramley Parish Council supports the view held by the majority of residents that the parish is unsuitable for either temporary or permanent pitches and camp sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted. The Local Plan does not propose any allocations for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people specifically within Bramley Parish	No Change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	161	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports criterion b) of Policy CN4 for its reference to the historic environment.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Supported noted	No change	n/a	N/A	N/A
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1216	Yes	No	The effectiveness of allocations within policies 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 cannot be understood in the absence of any timetable for release of these sites, or any indication of how many pitches are intended for any of the sites. In practice this simply defers any allocation. To date there is no evidence that the Council intends to move from theory to practice in fulfilling its responsibility to allocate sites to meet the existing identified need. As a result need is being met by a series of speculative applications on land that has been acquired by applicants for this purpose such that there is no allocation process in place. The Council appears to have abdicated responsibility for proactive allocation by putting an such effort into the long grass of sites 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11. The statement in paragraph 5.30 referring to a SPB review after adoption of this plan reinforces the same expectation, since the timing of adoption of the Plan is unknowable.	The Plan must be more specific as to how the Council intends to meet the 'recently established need to be met by 2017'. More specifically, the Council must provide evidence that it has some allocation process currently in hand, not indefinitely deferred. The 'recently established need' is in truth the existing need in 2012. Without clear evidence of shorter term, timetable action, this aspect of the Plan is unsound and simply reinforces the unplanned provision that has been the pattern of recent years and is continuing. The Plan also needs to explain how, on an on-going future basis, policies will facilitate allocation to meet needs emerging beyond 2017.	The indicative phasing plan for delivering Greenfield site allocations is set out in Policy SS3. The greenfield sites where an element of gypsy and traveller provision is required are anticipated to commence across the plan period, including within the first five years of the plan. The GTAA (2012) identifies that there is a need for 7 gypsy and traveller pitches up until 2017. As of November 2013 two permissions have been granted for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation since the publication of the GTTA, therefore the unmet need up until 2017 is currently five pitches. The GTAA will be updated in the near future to assess whether needs have changed and provide projections further forward over the local plan period.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Cllr Ranil Jayawardena	BDBC	N/A	784673	316	Yes	No	Disagree with the suggestion that we are going to allocate greenfield sites.. We should not be doing this. If there is a need for any space, we should reuse sites that have previously been used for this purpose.	Disagree with the suggestion that we are going to allocate greenfield sites... We should not be doing this. If there is a need for any space, we should reuse sites that have previously been used for this purpose.	The Council needs to demonstrate the ability to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people over the plan period. No sites have been promoted for use as Gypsy and Traveller accommodation through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and therefore officers have to conclude that there are no identified available or deliverable sites over the plan period. The inclusion of some gypsy, traveller and travelling show people accommodation within greenfield allocations will enable future needs to be met (as identified in the GTAA and future updates) and comply with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (specifically paragraphs 9b and 11).	No Change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Policy CN5 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Comma missing after 'Gypsies' in policy title	typographical error	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	N/A	786517	795	Yes	No	This policy states that the Council will allocate permanent, temporary and transit pitch/plot provision to meet the needs indicated in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. However, it should be noted that no such allocations are proposed to meet that identified need. We consider that a specific strategic allocation of a site for pitches / plots should be made in the Local Plan to ensure that provision is made to meet the objectively assessed needs of the traveller community. Failure to make such an allocation to meet the needs would bring into question the soundness of the document on the basis that it is not consistent with national policy contained within the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.	We consider that the Council should allocate a piece of land within the ownership of the Borough or County Council for immediate release to ensure that the current and short term needs can be met.	The policy identifies a number of greenfield housing allocations where an element of gypsy and traveller provision will need to be provided over the plan period. It is not considered necessary, therefore, to include a further specific allocation. The GTAA (2012) identifies that there is a need for 7 gypsy and traveller pitches up until 2017. As of November 2013 two permissions have been granted for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation since the publication of the GTTA, resulting in an unmet need of five pitches up to 2017. Applications for sites will be determined against the 7 criteria set out in the policy. The GTAA will be updated in the future to assess whether needs have changed and provide projections further forward over the local plan period.	No change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	N/A	Mr Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	791341	897	Not Specified	Not Specified	Bramley parish has a recent history of unauthorised traveller camps and a recent retrospective planning application was refused for change of use from agricultural land to a traveller site with a fixed dwelling and several caravan pitches. The Parish Council supports the view held by the majority of residents that the parish is unsuitable for either temporary or permanent pitches and camp sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comments noted. The Local Plan does not propose any allocations for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people within Bramley Parish	No Change	n/a	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN4 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	Policy CN5 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	819	Not Specified	Not Specified	There appears to be an error in the policy, as policies SS9, SS10 and SS11 do not relate to greenfield allocations. The policy should be corrected to refer to policies SS3.9, SS3.10 and SS3.11 in order to clarify that the provision of plots and/or pitches will not be required across all greenfield allocations, but only on those specifically identified to provide them.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Agree that this an error which will be corrected.	Policy updated to refer to policies <u>SS3.9, SS3.10 and SS3.11</u>	Response to representation - typographical error	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
5.32	5.44	Mrs Susan Juon	N/A	N/A	633382	261	Yes	No	5.33 suitability of site, contravention of flood risk policy, Pyotts Hill has been prioritised for development even though it has a higher flood risk than other sites	Remove Pyotts Hill from plan	The supporting text has been strengthened with regards to flooding	New wording for Para. 5.32 Contaminated sites, site close to power lines, railways lines, un-neighbourly uses, should be avoided unless the impact can be mitigated. <u>Caravans, mobile homes and park homes are highly vulnerable to flood risk. Therefore sites in Flood Zone 3 will not be permitted and sites in Zone 2 will be required to satisfy the Sequential and Exception tests.</u>	Clarification and compliance with the NPPF	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
5.32	5.44	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	657	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support the inclusion that sites will only be permitted where there is no adverse impact on the natural environment. We are pleased that paragraph 5.32 states that sites in areas at risk of flooding, contamination should be avoided unless the impact can be mitigated.	However, we would recommend some further clarification to be included as caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use, classified as highly vulnerable use, are considered inappropriate development in Flood Zone 3 in accordance with Table 3 of the technical guide to the NPPF.	The supporting text has been amended to reflect national planning policy and the comments made.	New wording for Para. 5.32 Contaminated sites, site close to power lines, railways lines, un-neighbourly uses, etc. should be avoided unless the impact can be mitigated. <u>Caravans, mobile homes and park homes are highly vulnerable to flood risk. Therefore sites in Flood Zone 3 will not be permitted and sites in Zone 2 will be required to satisfy the Sequential and Exception tests.</u>	Response to representation - clarification and compliance with the NPPF	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update policy number in light of additional policy inserted in Plan.	In light of additional policy being inserted.	N/A	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	For clarity - Move 5th paragraph to 3rd paragraph after "...integral part of a development..." and amend 5th paragraph as follows: "Contributions towards infrastructure provision and improvements, ~~across the borough~~ as set out in the council's Charging Schedule will be secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)."	Factaul update	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Neil Richardson	N/A	N/A	85764	932	Not Specified	Not Specified	Policy CN5 should make it clear that only infrastructure costs solely and directly related to the development to be permitted should be borne by the scheme. The rationale for CIL needs to be in the policy. A clear explanation of the circumstances where CIL would be sought and where a planning contribution would apply needs to be set out in the policy to avoid ambiguity, confusion and requests for payment under both regimes.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Paragraph 5.45 states that the type and amount of infrastructure sought from each development will be appropriate and reasonable and directly related to the scale of development. Section 3 of the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging (which is subject to consultation in January to February 2014) provides information on CIL and S106. The CIL will be subject to public consultation and examination by an independent Government Inspector. The Council will also update its Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Guidance document to reflect the introduction of CIL.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	686	Yes	No	Policy fails to provide the appropriate basis to ensure compliance with the approach NPPF. Paragraph 204 of the NPPF sets out the tests when planning obligations can be used to secure infrastructure and other requirements. The policy is not positively cast in the sense of encouraging development to take place with the proviso that infrastructure accompanies it in accordance with the necessary tests.	The policy should, as a minimum, be amended so that the opening paragraph states "new development may, if necessary to make it acceptable in planning terms, be required to provide and contribute towards the provision of additional services, facilities and infrastructure that is directly relevant to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it."	No change to the policy. The policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraph 156 and 157 of the NPPF. The Local Plan should not repeat the NPPF. The policy will also help to achieve Local Plan objective g). Paragraph 5.45 of the Local Plan is consistent with paragraph 204 of the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	444	Yes	No	Para 4 of policy - For roads, transport, health and social care, social provision and water infrastructure plus clear provision for education so that pupils can walk to school. Paragraph 5.43: developers will need to demonstrate that existing, planned and/or committed infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate new development proposals, and is in place before development starts.	We object to this policy as it is unclear that this infrastructure has any funding other than that which the developers will provide. Their contributions must be regarded as an unknown and uncertain quantity and one whose timescale is unlikely to keep pace with development.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	444	Yes	No	Sewerage infrastructure has not coped for years and must be improved before any houses are built. There has been a steady decline in the health of the River Loddon over the past 30 years.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	444	Yes	No	Rural broadband or lack of it is a big issue. Consistency is almost more important than speed to enable rural businesses and dwellers to backup/send files without the connection constantly dropping out. The government demands we deal with them online but some businesses have to use the local library to file sensitive forms such as VAT returns etc online. For companies on the outskirts of Basingstoke this is not acceptable.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Section 36 of the IDP (Communication and information technology) includes information on planned provision of superfast broadband and the infrastructure required to support the Local Plan. In addition, the council is actively working with BT to improve broadband coverage across the Borough.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	N/A	N/A	121767	428	Yes	No	The evidence base associated with the policy is incomplete and therefore unsound. The IDP is lacking in detail in many places and without a complete evidence base we cannot have a full understanding. The IDP identifies a gap of £285million, even with the gaps. I receive many comments about the infrastructure deficit, including junction 6, over-crowding on the trains and car parking at the station. Other promised infrastructure has not been delivered, such as Chineham railway station, a school at Taylors Farm and Rooksdown and a supermarket at Marnel Park.	To be sound, we need a complete, robust and realistic assessment of the infrastructure needed to deliver the plan and a clear understanding of how it will be funded.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Policy SS10 of the Local Plan allocates a site for Chineham Railway Station. As indicated in paragraph 4.77 of the Local Plan work is continuing with Hampshire County Council, Network Rail and the current train operator to explore opportunities to deliver the station.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	369	Not Specified	No	Infrastructure Policy CN5 - The 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)' to accompany the LP gives a list of projects needed to accompany the housing development. Policy CN5 states: New infrastructure should be provided prior to occupation of the development, or in larger schemes, prior to the occupation of the phase of the development for which it is needed. Implementation of this policy is unlikely, since figures presented in the IDP show that most major projects are not funded. Only a proportion of the money will come from developers as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which has yet to be negotiated. CN5 is not sound.	Funds for major Infrastructure project should be identified and ring fenced before development begins.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	264	Yes	No	The infrastructure within Overton causes the most concern to the parish council and is the main reason why it is felt that large scale development is not suitable for the village. Overton is already above optimum capacity. The oversubscribed railway station, the road network, the concerns about the water supply and the current antiquated sewerage system and lack of opportunity for development in the commercial heart of the village are all factors against any large scale future development. There is little parking and the primary school and secondary school in Whitchurch are already over capacity and the playgroup is located in restricted facilities within the village. There are concerns about the surgery, that the existing leisure facilities are inadequate, the lack of a new, modern village hall, burial space in the cemetery and allotment. In addition the bus service is limited especially at weekends and evening and the opinions of the existing residents are always ignored.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Policy CN5 requires new development to provide and contribute towards the provision of infrastructure. As stated in paragraph 5.35 of the Local Plan the council has prepared, in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan in support of the Local Plan setting out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan(IDP) shows that most major projects in the region North of Pyott's Hill, East of Basingstoke and Redlands, are not funded. This makes Policy CN5 unsound.	It is quite clear from the above statements that building to the East of Basingstoke and Redlands would seriously impact in a negative way to those already living in and around this area. It is also clear that Basingstoke and the South East of England should not have any further housing developments because these areas are over crowded. There is plenty of space in the rest of the country so the Government should be encouraged to develop there!	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Paragraphs 4.6-4.12 of the Local Plan explains how the housing target for the Borough has been established.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	According to Policy EM7(p91) Pyott's Hill should not be built upon because it has a greater risk of flooding than other areas.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7) and that it would not increase risk of flooding. Small areas within the site boundary are within Flood Zones 2 (medium probability) and 3 (high probability). However, the majority of the site is predominantly (80%) within Flood Zone 1 (low probability). Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this site. The County Council as a landowner has made land available at SS3.9 for approximately 450 dwellings within the plan period - see the Council's responses under policy SS3.9 regarding this matter.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	The River Loddon currently fails to meet 'good' status under the water framework directive and more houses will make it worse.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	If the Council's Planning and Infrastructure Committee consistently recommended that (SS3.9) should not be developed then why is it being developed.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The detailed Site Assessment document compared this site to other suggested sites and indicates that the authority is justified in allocating the site in policy SS3.9. The Planning and Infrastructure Committee makes recommendations rather than decisions and Full Council agreed to include the site within the Pre-submission Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	Health hazards to people living close to Incinerators. If the EA recommended removal of SS3.9 from the list describing it as "high risk", then why is it going ahead?	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Development proposals on the site will need to accord with policy SS3.9 criteria n) which reflects concerns raised in previous correspondence with the EA. The Environment Agency raised no objection to the allocation in their representations to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Shaw	N/A	N/A	441883	110	No	No	Hampshire County Council (HCC), is promoting 450 houses on SS3.9 during this local plan period as opposed to 900 as proposed by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. The site is therefore not fully available and is therefore unsound.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The County Council as a landowner has made land available at SS3.9 for approximately 450 dwellings within the plan period - see the Council's responses under policy SS3.9 regarding this matter.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Alan Fowler	N/A	N/A	602810	380	Yes	Not Specified	There are no proposals for a National Infrastructure Proposal in the Local Town Plan while there is a Basingstoke Access Plan. Small changes in road planning and provision will enable 'future proofing' of the current road / rail / coach network where future innovative concepts have common road requirements. Such concepts could include driverless cars, electric networked vehicles and the never stopping train.	BDBC should consider an extension of the existing urban transport scheme into the Local Plan in which the council considers basic planning for up and coming innovations. Road planning for 2015 to 2019 should include network integration in which road, rail and coach nodes are integrated into local and county-wide rapid transit schemes. By engaging with HCC to lead a new joint bid for monies earmarked for the National Infrastructure Proposals, the Council could ensure future proofing of current transport networks.	The Council work with the highways authority (Hampshire County Council) to deliver improvements to transport infrastructure in the borough to accommodate the additional movements generated by Local Plan growth. The Council will continue to work with Hampshire County Council and the Enterprise M3 LEP to identify funding mechanisms to deliver improvements to the local transport network.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Susan Juon	N/A	N/A	633382	260	Yes	No	No evidence that moneys for road infrastructure required to be put in place prior to occupation by householders has been adequately estimated or negotiated with any of the interested parties. A33 is currently congested, building along the A33 will prevent any future upgrade to dual carriage way.	Upgrade A33 prior to building.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council (Highways and Passenger Transport Authority) and the Highways Agency, in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. The Council Transport Assessment (September 2013) in support of the Local Plan provides initial conclusions of the overall impact of the forecast growth on the highway network and identifies and costs potential infrastructure opportunities to mitigate the impact of development at various affected junctions. These have been incorporated into the IDP with the intention that detailed specific schemes will be worked up with Hampshire County Council and subsequently used to bid for funds.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Alan Gibberd 2	N/A	N/A	637073	487	Yes	Yes	It is accepted that the level of phosphates in the effluent from the STW is six times over the guidelines set by the Water Framework Directive. Despite this, in the opinion of the Water Cycle Study the level of proposed development would not result in a drop in the rivers band status. Monitoring is reactive, not proactive. The monitoring must be strictly defined and enforced. It should also be clearly stated what the procedure should be should any deterioration be discovered and a halt to the development be required. Biological evidence shows that the river is being impacted by nutrients such as phosphates. Over many years fears have been expressed by such bodies as Thames Water and the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee (2005-6) there was an insufficient flow past the STW to dilute the effluent. The STW is currently working to the highest consent and it is impossible to improve on it with the current technology available.	The facts show that there must be considerable doubts as to the ability of the Waste Water infrastructure to protect the river environment. It is not enough to rely on the pious hope that monitoring alone will protect it. Therefore, policy CN5 is strongly supported, with its emphasis on development proposals only being permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that infrastructure can be provided and phased to support the requirements of the proposed development. However, it must be made clear that this policy will be robustly defended.	Noted. All policies will be applied in a robust manner.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	326	Yes	No	Much has been said in the response regarding infrastructure provision and the inadequacies relative to existing demands. The necessity for major infrastructure improvement through capital projects is obvious and also detailed in the infrastructure delivery plan document. However, of the 83 million pounds of financing required only 14 million is identified. This policy is therefore flawed at this time. With respect to Bramley parish it is hard to see how and where local infrastructure can be improved to even meet existing needs, as stated elsewhere in this response Bramley is constrained in its ability to make significant infrastructure changes thus making it unsuitable for further development. This overall plan fails to articulate how the significant infrastructure required support 13464 more dwellings will be delivered and when.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.'	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Mark Oszczuk	Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council	N/A	638003	217	Yes	No	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is not sound in its entirety. It is clear from the most cursory study of the figures presented that apart from the major redevelopment of the Black Dam junction complex (which in itself does not increase the capacity of the road network) most major enhancements are unfunded, insufficiently planned and unlikely to be delivered until well after occupancy of the majority of the new housing. In order to avoid this a policy of redevelopment only on Brownfield sites would have to be adopted until sufficient S106 or CIL funds had been raised to fund the necessary improvements to the infrastructure.	A clear policy of Brownfield only development must be followed to allow for CIL or S106 money to be generated to prepare the required infrastructure for the greenfield development. This is the only way of ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support the building itself and early occupation of greenfield development; The nature of the business is that houses are sold or let as they are completed not at the end of a development and the current infrastructure plan would have occupation before any infrastructure provision as the funding for this would come from the development itself	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Policies SS1 and SS4 support development on brownfield land. This approach is consistent with paragraph 17 (bullet point 8) of the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	440	No	No	The Government's publication Ambition for Cycling notes that "designing roads with cyclists in mind, and effectively managing interactions between cyclists and other traffic, is critical to improving safety and widening the appeal of cycling. An important aspect of our approach is to invest in new and enhanced infrastructure that is cycle-friendly". This concept is not evident in the Local Plan and, indeed, the transport assessment takes no account of enhancements for cyclists (nor pedestrians). The whole transport assessment is flawed and not sound by virtue of: the lack of indication how the virtual £200m shortfall in funding is likely to be addressed no realistic solutions for the recognised pressure points no meaningful consideration of public transport or other alternative solutions. There is no meaningful narrative concerning how even the current shortfall on water services infrastructure will be addressed, let alone the consequences of further pressure on the system.	The above shortcoming can only be addressed by: 1. proper consultation 2. addressing the funding shortfall 3. offering non-private car transport solutions.	Model shift from the private motor vehicle to more sustainable transport modes is supported, as set out in Policy CN8 (Transport). The Council will continue to work with the Highways Authority (Hampshire County Council) to identify pedestrian and cycle infrastructure schemes that can be delivered in the borough, such as those set out in the Basingstoke Transport Statement, Strategic Transport Investment Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Transport Assessment seeks to provide a 'worst case' scenario on the highway network for different development options in the borough based on available evidence. It is important to note the 'trip rates' for new developments assume that a proportion of journeys will be made by sustainable transport modes (e.g. walking and cycling). The Transport Assessment identifies junction improvements that could be implemented on the highway network to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan development. However, the final design (and cost of these schemes) will be determined by the highways authority following more detailed work to further develop the mitigation measures.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1023	Yes	No	Support and understand that new development will be required to provide and contribute towards the provision of additional services, facilities and infrastructure. However, it should be recognised within this policy that where viability is an issue, the provision of affordable housing will be prioritised with other factors reduced, if necessary, so affordable housing can be maximised. This is already accepted in the Councils Viability Assessment for affordable housing with no grant, but it should be applied across the board where viability is an issue. It is noted an updated Viability Report is being carried out and this will need to inform this policy further. Affordable housing should be prioritised over other aspects such as education contributions or renewable energy requirements and it should be recognised within this policy.	Policy should recognise that where viability is an issue, the provision of affordable housing will be prioritised with other factors reduced, if necessary, so affordable housing can be maximised.	As indicated in paragraph 5.5 of the Local Plan, the provision of affordable housing to meet required needs is a key priority for the council. Policy CN5 indicates that in seeking affordable housing provision the council will have regard to viability. As necessary, this can be assessed as part of the planning application process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Martine Lovell	N/A	N/A	780583	276	Yes	Yes	Support Local Plan. However, local road infrastructure in and around Basingstoke town needs to be improved.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted. Policy CN5 requires new development to provide and contribute towards the provision of infrastructure. Specific improvements required are set out in the IDP.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Roger Booth	N/A	N/A	784026	78	Yes	No	Policy CN5 is not sound. Figures presented in the IDP show that most major projects (e.g. required expansion of traffic infrastructure) are not funded and only a proportion of the money will come from developers as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).	Essential additional infrastructure (e.g. traffic capacity) should be in place before any major expansion of housing and / or commercial development is approved.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council (Highways and Passenger Transport Authority) and the Highways Agency, in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL, that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Roger Booth	N/A	N/A	784026	78	Yes	No	Inclusion of SS3.9 Pyotts Hill is unsound. It contravenes Policy EM7 as other sites have lower flood risk.	SS3.9 Pyotts Hill should be removed from the plan.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Development would need to demonstrate (in line with the NPPF and policies SS3.9 criteria g) and EM7:Managing Flood Risk) that it would not increase the risk of flooding. Small areas within the site boundary are within Flood Zones 2 (medium probability) and 3 (high probability). However, the majority of the site is predominantly (80%) within Flood Zone 1 (low probability). Houses will be located outside of the functional floodplain and high risk flood zones. The Environment Agency has raised no objection on this site.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Roger Booth	N/A	N/A	784026	78	Yes	No	The Landowner, HCC, is promoting 450 houses during the plan period as opposed to 900. The site is therefore not fully available and inclusion is unsound.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The County Council as a landowner has made land available at SS3.9 for approximately 450 dwellings within the plan period - see the Council's responses under policy SS3.9 regarding this matter.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Roger Booth	N/A	N/A	784026	78	Yes	No	Water Quality of the Loddon. The plan is unsound. Paragraph 4.10 is factually incorrect, existing proven technology to improve the quality of the effluent from Chineham STW is available and should be installed and operated before any significant increase in housing is approved. The Sherbourne St John and Sherfield on Loddon STWs do not have consent terms for their discharges which have a negative impact on the Loddon. Appropriate consent levels should be set by the EA immediately.	The Environment Agency should impose consent terms for the Sherbourne St John and Sherfield on Loddon Sewage Treatment Works and the consent terms for the Chineham STW should be tightened before any major expansion of housing and / or commercial development is approved.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.'	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Michelle Ashley	N/A	N/A	784775	295	Yes	Yes	Sound. No comments provided.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Stephen Rowles	N/A	N/A	784969	927	Yes	No	School provision: despite identifying an that an additional 1400 homes would require a new 2 form intake school there is no provision identified for a new school to the south side of Basingstoke. Beggarwood was originally supposed to include provision for a new community centre and schooling, none of which has arrived. This has resulted in a huge pressure on St Marks and Hatch Warren schools both of which are massively oversubscribed. Adding even more homes is just going to make this situation even worse. While the areas to build on are sensible this should not go ahead without the provision of a new school and a new community centre. It is not good either for the children or the environment to require parents to drive their children halfway across Basingstoke to new schools provided on the east. Doing so will make the transport problems identified even worse.	To solve this there needs to be a new community centre built as a focal point and new primary school built. This should be sited between Beggarwood and the golf course site so that both of these communities can benefit and will reduce the pressure on particularly St Marks school. It think that it is ridiculous to be planning more houses in the south of Basingstoke without providing appropriate school provision.	No change. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council Children's Services, in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Policy SS3.11 (Golf Course) includes a requirement to provide a community centre and land for a primary school.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Ken Tucker	N/A	N/A	785041	354	Yes	No	No indication is given of the adequacy of the national grid of services to accept the additional demand from new development. The upgrading of infrastructure must be completed before proposed developments are built.	Amend policy to ensure the upgrading of infrastructure be completed before proposed developments are built.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers (including the National Grid, Southern Gas and Scottish and Southern Energy) in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 34.13 of the IDP states that specific development proposals within the borough are unlikely to have a significant effect upon the National Grid's gas and electricity transmission infrastructure.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Ken Tucker	N/A	N/A	785041	696	Not Specified	No	Both as a resident of Oakley and a retired constructing civil and structural engineer my concern is that developers are responsible for ensuring the adequacy of infrastructure services for individual developments no indication is given of the adequacy of the national grid of services to access the additional capacities. Likewise who is responsible for ensuring and overseeing a successful linkage of new developments into the national grid as each one is completed for example any upgrading of Pack Lane will require the replacement of the railway bridge before additional traffic can be accommodated. What assurances have we got that whatever upgrading of existing infrastructure services is required will be completed in place before the proposed developments are built.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers (including the National Grid, Southern Gas and Scottish and Southern Energy) in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Paragraph 34.13 of the IDP states that specific development proposals within the borough are unlikely to have a significant effect upon the National Grid's gas and electricity transmission infrastructure.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	407	Yes	Yes	Welcomes policy CN5. Considers that significant highway improvements to the A33 corridor between Basingstoke and Reading are considered to be essential to maximise transport links on the Reading - Basingstoke - Heathrow axis.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Chris Quintana	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	N/A	785867	515	Yes	Yes	Supports policy CN5. Approach is fundamental to ensure that improvements in business infrastructure are secured to meet needs and keep up with technological advances, particularly in respect of coverage of high performance fibre optic broadband and mobile coverage.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Lorna Cuthill	Mapledurwell and Up Natley Parish Council	N/A	785933	524	Yes	No	Includes no definitive plans to demonstrate the intent of infrastructure delivery. Plan includes no guarantee the infrastructure will be delivered.	Policy must require that the design and finances for infrastructure are secured before developers are allowed to build and the infrastructure is guaranteed to be put in place during development.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1063	Yes	No	The 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)' to accompany the LP gives a list of projects needed to accompany the housing development. Policy CN5 states: "New infrastructure should be provided prior to occupation of the development, or in larger schemes, prior to the occupation of the phase of the development for which it is needed." SOLVE would normally support this ideal. However, implementation of this policy is unlikely, since figures presented in the IDP show that most major projects are not funded. Only a proportion of the money will come from developers as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which has yet to be negotiated. CN5 is not sound.	Funds for major Infrastructure project should be identified and ring fenced before development begins.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Section 6 (Delivery and Funding) of the IDP indicates a number of funding streams, in addition to S106 obligations and CIL), that could potentially be used to fund some of the infrastructure requirements. It should be noted that the Governments CIL guidance recognises in paragraph 14 that '...there will be uncertainty in pin pointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term.' Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	658	Not Specified	Yes	We support the policy and paragraph 5.43 which states that developers will need to demonstrate that existing, planned, and /or committed infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate new development proposals and includes water supply, surface water and foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	754	Yes	Yes	Thames Water support Policy CN5 as it requires infrastructure to be in place ahead of development and paragraph 5.36 specifically identifies water service infrastructure and sewerage. It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development. Thames Water therefore support paragraph 5.43	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	894	Not Specified	Not Specified	There is no indication of how the development of local infrastructure will be enforced - in my previous experience of a large housing project, builders can promise to build shops and play areas etc. and then simply do not. Likewise two "affordable" houses can mysteriously turn into one "executive house". It needs to be made clear in the plan that "promises" will be kept and indicate how this will be done.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. The 'Implementation and Monitoring Box' on page 68 of the Local Plan indicates how the policy will be implemented and monitored.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Teresa Barnard	N/A	N/A	786893	909	Yes	No	There is a need for infrastructure development prior to or alongside the development of new housing. Already in Whitchurch there is too much pressure on the primary school and the introduction of bussing young and vulnerable children outside the area. Similarly transport around primary/secondary schools grinds Whitchurch to a halt at the beginning and end of school times. Any increase in housing will exacerbate these problems, which need co-ordinated policies to avoid further chaos.	Given the specific existing problems in Whitchurch the immediate need for infrastructure improvements prior to the planned housing development in Whitchurch needs to be outline[d]. Otherwise the planned housing development is not deliverable when viewed alongside the negative impact on the roads in the town centre and the lack of school places in the primary and secondary schools.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers in support of the Local Plan, sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Mrs Teresa Barnard	N/A	N/A	786893	911	Yes	No	This policy is too vague. As it stands small developments could be penalised compared with larger developments. It is important that small developments on brown field sites are not made unviable by CIL. The formula used for the CIL must ensure that the development is focused on previously developed land in the first instance (Housing Delivery Policy 4.2 and Policy 4.14). As the plan is written it is not clear that this will be the case. If the levy is too high it may only be the larger developments on the green field sites for which planning permission be applied for. Uncertainty over the CIL or too high a levy may deter development on the brownfield sites and jeopardise the local plan strategy.	Add a policy that the CIL/section 106 agreements will be formulated to give preferential rates to developments on brownfield sites. This would support Policy SS4 which gives priority to development of appropriate brownfield sites.	An additional policy is not considered necessary. The draft CIL (which currently indicates a higher CIL charging rate for strategic greenfield sites) will be subject to public consultation and examination by an independent Government Inspector. This includes consideration of the evidence base upon which CIL has been derived. In this respect, it should be noted that this took into account a wide range of development scenarios, to represent the forms of development that are expected to come forward. Amongst others, this includes both greenfield and brownfield schemes in the borough at a range of sizes and densities. In addition, it should be noted that paragraph 5.45 of the Local Plan also states that the council will take into account the economic viability of development proposal.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Flavia Estates	Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1062	Not Specified	No	The need for developer contributions towards the provision of necessary infrastructure should relate, only to direct on-site mitigation with all other matters covered under the CIL schedule.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Paragraphs 5.44, 5.45 and 5.48 provide guidance on on/off-site provision and also CIL.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1288	Yes	No	I support policy CN5, however, there is not sufficient evidence to suggest that all the infrastructure needs will be covered by the development proposed. There is uncertainty over the viability of some infrastructure requirements, and the ability to deliver them within the timescales set out in the policy. There are two main areas of concern. There is the absence of commitment from HCC to the infrastructure required, which is contrary to NPFF Para 157. Furthermore, with regards to sewerage Site SS3.11 is the furthest away from the Sewage Treatment Works in Chineham. It has been agreed with Thames Water that the existing sewers through Basingstoke would be unable to cope with additional effluent. The IDP makes no attempt to estimate the cost of the sewerage infrastructure, which makes it impossible to judge whether CN5 and the Plan are effective.	Take the following action in order to establish that Policy CN5 can be deliverable in practice at an acceptable cost so that the plan is deliverable and hence effective, and to ensure compliance with the requirement to co-operate in NPFF 157. Undertake further discussions with HCC (as highways authority) to obtain their agreement in principle to the mitigation proposed in the TA and their confirmation that the work could be done within the timescales proposed in the fourth paragraph of Policy CN5. Undertake further discussions with the EA and the water companies to agree, in outline, acceptable solutions to the wastewater requirements for the Golf Course and Manydown and to agree indicative costs.	The Council have worked and will continue, where necessary, to work closely with the HCC (as Highways Authority), Environment Agency and the water companies. The Duty to Cooperate Statement for the Pre-Submission Local Plan (August 2013) indicates on page 3 that further meetings and discussions are taking place with neighbouring authorities and Statutory Bodies. The outcome of these will be reflected in the final Statement of Compliance in support of the Submission version of the Local Plan. See the response to the Thames Water representation on policy SS3 concerning the number of proposed housing sites and sewerage capacity (the sewer pipes which transfer wastewater flows to sewage treatment works). Development proposals at Manydown and Basingstoke Golf Course will need to ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewage and surface water drainage (policy SS3.10 criteria i) and SS3.11 criteria j)).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Factual update - Amend third paragraph as follows and text to form new paragraph: "Where off-site measures are proposed they should meet identified needs, and CIL will be the primary mechanism to secure the necessary financial or equivalent contribution. Site specific mitigation measures will be secured by planning obligations will be required to secure the necessary financial or equivalent contribution."	Factual update	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Factual update - Amend 4th paragraph as follows: "...This will be secured by appropriate planning conditions, and S106 planning obligations, including bonds, where necessary, and the council's procedures with respect to the use of CIL revenue."	Factual update	Councillors partially agreed with suggested Officer change. However, rather than the officer change "...and the council's approach of spending CIL revenue." councillors suggested the following wording "...and the council's procedures with respect to the use of CIL revenue."	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure	Mr Alistair Craig	N/A	N/A	173028	387	Yes	No	The policy refers to Appendix 3, when it should refer to Appendix 2.	Amend the final sentence to: 'A summary of standards applied on development are set out in Appendix 2'	This is a typographical error and the sentence should refer to Appendix 4.	Amend final sentence of paragraph as follows "A summary of <u>green space, sport and recreation</u> standards applied on development are set out in Appendix 34."	Response to representation.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed to change
5.35	5.47	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Councillors requested that the word 'future' be deleted from the start of the first sentence of the paragraph. The word is superfluous.	The word 'future' is superfluous .	Agreed	N/A
5.36	5.48	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Add at bullet point "education" the following " including skills and training initiatives"	In light of reps to economic chapter and policies	N/A	N/A
5.36	5.48	Mrs Susan Juon	N/A	N/A	633382	268	Yes	No	Sustainable communities need a centre, no evidence that schools or community centres or doctors surgeries will be provided in these new communities. Developers have promised before but we know that it never happens.	legally binding requirement on developers to provide schools, shops, doctors surgeries, road and public transport infra structure in place prior to occupation by householders	No change as the Policy is already considered sound. Policy CN5 requires new development to provide and contribute towards the provision of infrastructure. As stated in paragraph 5.35 of the Local Plan the council has prepared, in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan in support of the Local Plan setting out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.36	5.48	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	22	Yes	No	The supporting infrastructure delivery plan shows many infrastructure projects in the red category. Historically development has often proceeded ahead of required infrastructure. While the policy and aims are sound, there needs to be more detail of the processes to be used to achieve the policy.	More details of timing and processes to ensure policy compliant in the IDP but give some highlights of specifics here.	No change. The IDP in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.36	5.48	Mr John Davies	N/A	N/A	786712	828	Yes	No	Basingstoke Deanery is the umbrella organisation for over 20 Anglican churches in Basingstoke and Deane. We welcome and strongly support the general content of the Local Plan with reservations of detail. Policy CN5 covers the arrangements for the provision and expansion of cemeteries. Many Anglican churches within the borough have active cemeteries, some of which have capacity for expansion. Burial within these cemeteries is available to deceased of all faiths or none based on a residential qualification. The managing body of the Church of England cemetery is the Parochial Church Council. Reference to these organisation should be included in the IDP.	The managing body of the Church of England cemetery is the Parochial Church Council. Reference to these organisation should be included in the IDP under section 29.	The Council will add reference to these organisations.	Add reference under Section 29 of the IDP to "Parochial Church Council".	Response to rep.	Agreed.	Withdrawn/agreed to change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
5.36	5.48	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	939	Not Specified	Not Specified	Schools: what assurance are there that these will actually be built? The Beggarwood estate has space set aside for a new primary school, but it turned out to be too little, so was re-assigned for housing. My suggestion would be to allow a buffer around the proposed school sites. This buffer land could only be used for housing after the school was built and found to be sufficient. Secondary Schools: currently, there are 3 schools very close together (Brighton Hill, Cranbourne, and Western Way). One of these should be re-located to further out, e.g. on or near the Golf Course new estate. This would reduce the travel distances from the South end of Basingstoke, and would reduce the traffic on the Brighton Hill roundabout.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change. The IDP, prepared in consultation with service providers including Hampshire County Council Children's Services, in support of the Local Plan sets out the infrastructure needs associated with development growth, together with how and when these items are to be delivered and funded. Paragraph 5.45, 5.48 and 5.49 of the Local Plan provide information on how infrastructure will be secured. Where a specific requirement for a school has been identified, this has been included within the relevant site allocation policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.37	5.49	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	611	Yes	No	Perhaps green space should be amended to natural green space but it should be included and defined as infrastructure in terms of CNS. NPPF 113 highlights the importance of international, national and local sites and it recognises the need to enhance biodiversity within the planning system so natural green space should be spelled out as a discrete infrastructure deliverable in the same way that other infrastructure components are. In the IDP many expensive community facilities are "necessary" but sites for people and nature, at low cost are not! Natural green space is vital infrastructure for people as well and we have a responsibility to future generations to pass on a healthier natural environment. New development should include discrete financial provision in the IDP for managed natural green spaces.	Infrastructure to include; provision of natural green spaces dedicated primarily for wildlife but also for people to experience, learn about and enjoy.	No change as the Policy is already considered sound and is consistent with the NPPF. The plan should be read as whole, including policy EM4 (Biodiversity and nature conservation) and EM5 (Green infrastructure). Paragraph 5.18 of the IDP identifies accessible natural green space as a core component of infrastructure. Section 26 of the IDP covers green space provision.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.37	5.49	Mrs Susan Juon	N/A	N/A	633382	262	Yes	No	Water quality of the river Loddon does not meet 'good' standard required by WFD, sewerage system is currently not coping with phosphate levels.	Upgrade sewerage infrastructure before new housing development.	No change as the Policy is already considered sound. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.40	5.52	Mrs Susan Juon	N/A	N/A	633382	263	Yes	No	There is no evidence of how the council intends to pursue the need for superfast broad band across the Borough, in some areas existing householders are still waiting for this benefit.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The council does not agree. Section 36 of the IDP (Communication and information technology) includes information on planned provision of superfast broadband and the infrastructure required to support the Local Plan. In addition, the council is actively working with BT to improve coverage across the Borough.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.41	5.53	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	38	Yes	No	Policies for broadband access need to extend to the design of individual houses.	The houses should be designed to include "smart metering" and the possibility of remote control of utilities by absent occupants. This should allow fuel use to be minimised. Also some thought should be given to purpose-built units for disabled people to incorporate mechanisation/remote control of household equipment e.g. power supplies for stair lifts (if stair lifts are unavoidable); remote control of blinds/curtains, movement-sensitive lighting in key areas, and "panic" systems for summoning help	No change as the Local Plan policies are already considered sound . Any house should have access to broadband if there is the facility in that particular area. Policy CN3 (Housing mix for market housing) states that the council will require development to include a proportion of homes to be designed to Lifetime Mobility Standards. Also policy EM10 (Delivering high quality development) requires all development proposals to be accessible to all and are adaptable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.41	5.53	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Councillors requested the following amendment to the first sentence of the paragraph: "Where high-voltage-power lines cross the a development..."	The requirement to put overhead cabling underground (wherever possible) should apply to all power lines and not just high voltage power lines.	Agreed	N/A
5.41	5.53	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Move 2nd sentence of paragraph to between paragraphs 5.44 and 5.45. The 2nd sentence becomes a new paragraph.	Sentences in paragraph 5.41 do not sit well together. Amendment will improve the flow of the supporting text to policy CNS.	Agreed	N/A
5.41	5.53	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Move 3rd sentence of paragraph to between paragraphs 5.43 and 5.44. The 3rd sentence becomes a new paragraph.	Sentences in paragraph 5.41 do not sit well together. Amendment will improve the flow of the supporting text to policy CNS.	Agreed	N/A
5.43	5.55	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	673	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support the policy and paragraph 5.43 which states that developers will need to demonstrate that existing, planned, and /or committed infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate new development proposals and includes water supply, surface water and foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.43	5.55	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	899	Not Specified	Not Specified	Water Supply and sewerage are not adequately addressed in the Plan with paragraph 5.43 simply stating that developers need to "demonstrate" that there is sufficient water supply etc. Surely this should be done by the Council, before any area is selected for development? Similarly, "Necessary improvements to sewerage water treatment infrastructure will be programmed by the water companies and need to be completed prior to occupation of the development" - again this should be done before any housing development is allowed (so that we know the water companies have the funding to do so), otherwise in both cases, we could end up with inadequate supply / removal facilities for an estate which is now fait accompli, and which will already negatively impact those of us already living here. Prove water supply before selecting sites and build water infrastructure before laying a single brick.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
5.48	5.62	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend second sentence as follows: "...A charging schedule setting out CIL rates will be published is being prepared and once adopted will be used..."	Factual change.	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure - Implementation and Monitoring	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure - Implementation and Monitoring	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Factual change and for clarity - Amend third bullet point as follows: "The council's future CIL Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 List which will determine the infrastructure provided through this mechanism and the level of contribution required on a per square metre basis.	Factual change.	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN5 - Infrastructure - Implementation and Monitoring	Policy CN6 - Infrastructure - Implementation and Monitoring	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend first bullet point as follows 'annual monitoring and updates to the IDP and Regulation 123 list.	Factual change.	N/A	N/A
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	Policy CN7 - Essential Services	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update policy number in light of additional policy inserted in Plan.	In light of additional policy being inserted.	Change made after MAP	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco	N/A	85986	691	Yes	No	It should be made explicit that this policy relates only to development proposals directly affecting i.e. through redevelopment or change of use, the specific local or essential services affected. On the basis that paragraph 70 of the NPPF is relied upon to support Policy CN6, the Impact Assessment to the Framework makes clear that paragraph 70 is aimed at the loss by development of change of use of valued local facilities. As a recent Inspector's decision has confirmed, in the context of local shops, "it would be illogical to introduce a form of impact test through paragraph 70 when such a provision is explicitly excluded for local parades by the definition of Town Centre" (planning appeal decision APP/H1705/A/12/2182975: Former Smiths Industries Aerospace Ltd, Winchester Road, Basingstoke. Thus the policy cannot be used to, for example, resist the grant of planning permission for development elsewhere. This should be made explicit.	The second paragraph of Policy CN6 should be recast so that it states "development proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of local services and facilities that meet community needs and support well-being will only be permitted where it can clearly demonstrate...."	No change as the policy is already considered sound and there is nothing in the policy which explicitly conflicts with the appeal decision in question. Whilst the appeal decision referred to in the representation is noted, it is considered that this issue is a development management matter, and that appeal decisions already form a material consideration in terms of how to interpret this policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1024	Yes	No	Part c) should refer specifically to affordable housing.	Part (c) should refer specifically to affordable housing, as given the high need for affordable housing in the area, its provision will be a community benefit that would meet a local need.	There is the flexibility to consider affordable housing under this clause, however, to specifically include affordable housing would be overly specific and could potentially undermine the goals of the policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	708	Yes	No	HCC will need to place more reliance on service delivery through reinvesting the proceeds of sales for surplus assets, and CN6 should provide for this to ensure it can meet the evolving needs of the community. Request that section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 is acknowledged re: school playing fields. This is justified and effective as it goes beyond traditional planning and allows for flexibility in line with 2.10 of PINS guidance on LDFs (2009)	Add the following to CN6: 'Should the Local Education Authority receive approval for the disposal of surplus school land from the Secretary of State under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, the reinvestment of any proceeds from the sale of the land in education and / or sporting services, as required by the Act, will be regarded as satisfying the objectives of the policy.'	No change as the policy is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording would make the policy overly specific. Furthermore, there is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined by HCC, subject to appropriate justification.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	mrs jean wilde	N/A	N/A	784652	355	Not Specified	Not Specified	Can the powers that be kindly have regard to traffic flows, educational and medical needs and all other essentials of community life?	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy (and CN7) have regard to medical and educational needs. In addition, policy CN5 covers community infrastructure where it pertains to new development. CN8 covers transport issues.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	792	Not Specified	Yes	Support: This policy will allow the provision of new facilities and allows the replacement of existing facilities if "the proposal will provide sufficient community benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing facility, meeting evidence of a local need". Essential services include facilities for outdoor sport.	There is no need to change this policy in so far as our client is concerned.	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1250	Yes	No	In response to constraints on central government funding, the County Council will need to place even greater reliance on its ability to deliver service improvements through reinvesting the proceeds of sale from rationalised and surplus property assets. It is hoped that Policy CN6 will continue to provide the County Council with the necessary flexibility to respond to new and changing ways of providing its essential services that are more appropriate to the evolving needs of the community. However, to provide greater certainty and clarity, the County Council requests that the role of Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 is acknowledged when it seeks the development of surplus school playing fields as a means of financing recreational and educational improvements.	This is justified and effective because it goes beyond traditional land use planning by integrating policies for development with programmes from other organisations that influence the nature and functioning of places. It also allows a flexible response to changing circumstances regarding the delivery of essential education services, and is in accordance with paragraph 2.10 of The Planning Inspectorate's 'Local Development Frameworks: Examining Development Plan Documents: Soundness Guidance' (2009). The following should be included as supporting text to Policy CN6: Should the Local Education Authority receive approval for the disposal of surplus school land from the Secretary of State under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, the reinvestment of any proceeds from the sale of the land in education and/or sporting services, as required by that Act, will be regarded as satisfying the objectives of this policy.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording would make the policy overly specific. Furthermore, there is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined by HCC, subject to appropriate justification.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	Policy CN7 - Essential Services	Member	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Title proposed to be changed to 'Essential facilities and services'. The rest of the terminology in the policy has also been made consistent with this.	Felt that the term 'essential services' didn't properly reflect the nature and range of subjects covered by the policy. The rest of the wording throughout the policy have been amended to reflect the change in terminology.	N/A	N/A
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	Policy CN7 - Essential Services	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Phrase local facilities and services changed to 'essential services' to achieve consistency in wording throughout the policy and between CN6 and CN7	For consistency	Officer now recommends changing this to 'essential facilities and services', throughout the policy	N/A
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	Policy CN7 - Essential Services	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference to 'defined' settlement removed, and replaced with settlements to enable provision of essential services in settlements without SPBs.	To ensure effective policy	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN6 - Essential Services	Policy CN7 - Essential Services	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	23	Yes	No	The final sentence is a bit vague. Clause 5.52 states the need to maintain good services, especially outside of Basingstoke. Rural communities need high speed broadband etc. but the final sentence of this plan suggests that the council will only work with a local community if they have a neighbourhood plan.	Expand on the final sentence to lend more support for rural communities.	It is considered that the wording could be modified to make it clearer that the council will work with local communities in a general sense, not just through neighbourhood planning.	The council will work positively with local communities and support proposals to retain, improve or re-use essential facilities and services, including those set out in Neighbourhood Plans or Community Right to Build Orders, along with appropriate supporting development which may make such provision economically viable.	Response to representations	Agreed	Remains outstanding
5.50	5.64	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The word 'including' changed to 'by facilitating' to ensure consistency within the policy	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
5.50	5.64	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	References to leisure removed and references to facilities and services changed to 'essential services' in order to achieve consistency in wording throughout the policy and between CN6 and CN7	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
5.50	5.64	Officer in response to members	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Addition of the following to the list of bullets: • opportunities for meetings and social engagement by members of the community • ensuring that local communities are able to meet their day to day needs.	It is proposed to include these two criteria in order to provide more clarity regarding the definition of essential facilities and services, and to inform the relationship between CN6 and CN7.	N/A	N/A
5.51	5.65	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	References to facilities and services changed to 'essential services' to achieve consistency in wording throughout the policy and between CN6 and CN7	For consistency	Officer now recommends changing this to 'essential facilities and services', throughout the policy	N/A
5.52	5.66	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Added in the words necessary, desirable and viable: whilst also protecting essential services from redevelopment or change of use unless it is no longer necessary, practical, desirable or viable to retain them, or it can be demonstrated that they are no longer needed. change made in order to bring the supporting text in line with the policy text.	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
5.52	5.66	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cemeteries given its own place on the list, for clarity.	For clarity	Agreed	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
5.52	5.66	Officer in response to members	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation removed from CN6 but remain in CN7.	Felt that outdoor sport and recreation facilities are already more appropriately covered by CN7.	N/A	N/A
5.52	5.66	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert bullet to state 'community buildings including community centres and village halls'.	see comment under Policy CN7	Agreed	N/A
5.53	5.66	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Included the following requirement within the supporting text: <u>The views of the local community on any loss must be sought as part of the assessment potential to retain the essential service in question.</u> This is in order to achieve greater consistency with CN7.	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
5.54	5.68	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference to 'defined' settlement removed, and replaced with settlements to align with policy change. Also slight re-drafting in order to reflect the reference to 'settlements' as opposed to 'defined settlements'.	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
5.55	5.69	Member change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	overall' replaced with 'the required level of support...	In order to more accurately reflect the requirements for utilising the mechanisms in question.	N/A	N/A
5.55	5.69	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend text to read 'in addition to this policy, the council will work proactively with local communities, including through neighbourhood planning and the community right to build, to help local communities plan and deliver services that meet local needs where there is the required level of support from local residents'.	For clarification	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Policy CN8 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update policy number in light of additional policy inserted in Plan.	Updated in light of additional policy being inserted.	Change made after MAP	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Policy CN8 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Requirement changed to requirements	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Policy CN8 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	In the locality' added in order to adds more focus to local aspect of such facilities.	Adds more focus	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	614	Yes	No	Natural green space not included. NE Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) recommends all, wherever they live, has accessible natural green space at least 2 h, no more than 300 metres 5 mins walk. Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 11 any changes could have impact e.g. habitat unless "development" redefined to include open/green space currently excluded. does not set environmental/biodiversity assessment criteria for "development" to be considered. Current impact analyses inadequate. constrains to "currently or last used". Not relevant, may be unused but valuable habitat! Saunders Field people not know Borough owned! Also inaccessible. No land map - missing evidence open/green/natural greenspace is culturally important has habitat/wildlife value, appreciated locally and town. Communities of interest maybe local & Borough wide such as habitats/species that could be enhanced. wrong that facilities take precedence over open/green/natural greenspace	"Development" and "facilities" too vague/redefine clearly, include natural green space. Proposals will be permitted, following consultation with the communities affected, local and Borough wide, Remove "currently or last used" Amend a) ...maintain existing facilities and open/green spaces valued by.....; Amend b) add open/green spaces Amend c) facilities and open/green space that ... co-location of community, leisure, culture facilities, open/green and natural green spaces and... Proposals Borough owned land and valued facilities including inaccessible, currently or last used. g) add: open/green/natural green spaces h) add: meeting evidence of a local or community wide need. As a minimum, assessment/impact analysis must assess the quantity and quality of existing facilities including habitats/biodiversity, need and value to the local and wider community. Views of local and where appropriate borough wide community on any loss must be sought.	Natural green space is covered in detail by Policy EM5 (Green Infrastructure), and therefore there is no need to change this policy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	N/A	86400	408	Yes	Yes	We support the document and find it to be sound, from our point of view, with regard to Policy CN7 which contains all the elements to protect and enhance your community, leisure and cultural facilities. This policy reflects one of the 12 Core Planning Principles in the National Planning Policy Framework at item 17 which is to take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. The protection of theatres is essential if future generations are to have the opportunity to experience the joys of drama, dance, music and opera. Theatre buildings contribute to the quality of the built environment especially in a town centre, and to the wider historic setting.	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1027	Yes	No	Part c) should refer specifically to affordable housing.	Part (h) should refer specifically to affordable housing, as given the high need for affordable housing in the area, its provision will be a community benefit that would meet a local need.	There is the flexibility to consider affordable housing under clause h) if it can be demonstrated that this meets the policy requirement, however, to specifically include affordable housing would be overly specific and could potentially undermine the goals of the policy.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	712	Yes	No	HCC will need to place more reliance on service delivery through reinvesting the proceeds of sales for surplus assets. The 'loss' of a facility may be the means to fund an improved facility. It is hoped that CN7 (e-h) will continue to provide HCC with the flexibility to respond to new ways of providing facilities. Request that section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 is acknowledged re: school playing fields. This is justified and effective as it goes beyond traditional planning and allows for flexibility in line with 2.10 of PINS guidance on LDFs (2009). This has taken place with the plans in Havant (DM1) and New Forest District (Para 2.30).	Add the following to CN7: 'Should the Local Education Authority receive approval for the disposal of surplus school land from the Secretary of State under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, the reinvestment of any proceeds from the sale of the land in education and / or sporting services, as required by the Act, will be regarded as satisfying the objectives of the policy'.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording would make the policy overly specific. Furthermore, there is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined by HCC, subject to appropriate justification.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1217	Yes	No	Yet another misleading reference to Neighbourhood Plans/Orders including Community Right to Build Orders,	Replace "including" with "or"	Community Right to Build Orders are a type of Neighbourhood Planning Order and therefore the wording is correct. Additional wording has been added to the plan to clarify Community Right to Build Orders.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	County Development Manager Sacha Nicholas	Hampshire Football Association Headquarters	N/A	784801	352	Not Specified	Yes	Interested in seeing how the planned housing developments will affect the level of sports provision in the Borough and whether that will lead to increased investment in supporting facilities. Supporting the overcrowding of sports halls in the borough then increased Football Artificial pitches could be of great benefit. Fantastic investment in sports facilities across the Borough over the last few years and hope that can continue. We are also keen to ensure that costs of facilities are kept at an affordable price for the local community.	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Mr Nik Lyzba	N/A	N/A	786428	736	Yes	No	In our view this policy is unsound, as it is not supported by an adequate or up-to-date evidence base and has been drawn too widely. The policy provides no reliable basis for an assessment of the "value" of an existing use or facility, nor does it provide any basis for an assessment as to how a judgement would be made on whether a facility is "surplus to requirement" or the weight which would be given to other material planning considerations. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires that "Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities. This information should be used to determine the required provision. The council's LRNA is 5 years old, and forms no reasonable basis to assess need, and is not up-to-date.	An up-to-date assessment of facilities should be undertaken which would address the defects which have been identified in the policy.	The Policy is considered to be sound and based on a robust evidence base. The date of the LRNA is noted and the Council is due to commission an updated assessment in coming months.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Basingstoke Sports Council	Basingstoke Sports Council	N/A	786463	741	Yes	Yes	As a result of the Olympic legacy, participant numbers have increased for a variety of sports, putting subsequent pressure on facilities, coaches and officials. There is an increased requirement for more time in sports halls for sports such as Martial Arts, Badminton, Table Tennis. These halls either don't exist or are school halls which are not easily available. Although a comprehensive report was initially produced by Kit Campbell, it is now over five years old and some areas are in need of a review, especially regarding the recommendations made. There was a survey of available facilities made some time ago with recommendations and priority requirements due by July 2012 but this has not been circulated. Manydown has been noted as having great potential for future sporting facilities but no actual proposals have been identified. No consideration in relation to localism and future commissioning and partnership requirements. Need to refer to previous strategic plan 2011-25.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Policy is considered to be sound and based on a robust evidence base. The date of the LRNA is noted and the Council is due to commission an updated assessment in coming months which will pick up new usage trends etc. Site specific proposals will be identified through the masterplanning and planning application processes.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	790	Not Specified	Yes	Support: This duplicates CN6. Again, this is a policy that is worded flexibly and could be interpreted either way. It requires a need assessment to accompany any application and for local views to be sought. This wording is less dogmatic than that found in the draft Core Strategy and so for this stage of the plan the policy is supported.	There is no need to amend this policy so far as our client is concerned.	The representation supports the policy so no need to make any change.	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1251	Yes	No	In response to constraints on central government funding, the County Council will need to place even greater reliance on its ability to deliver service improvements through reinvesting the proceeds of sale from rationalised and surplus property assets. The "loss" of an existing community facility may be the means to fund an improved facility or service. It is hoped that Policy CN7 (e-h) will continue to provide the County Council with the necessary flexibility to respond to new and changing ways of providing community facilities that are more appropriate to the evolving needs of the community. However, to provide greater certainty and clarity, the County Council requests that the role of Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 is acknowledged when it seeks the development of surplus school playing fields as a means of financing recreational and educational improvements.	The following should be included as supporting text to Policy CN7: In the circumstance where the Education Authority has received approval for the disposal of surplus school playing fields from the Secretary of State, in accordance with Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, an exception will be made to this policy where equivalent or greater community benefits are provided.	No change as the policy and its supporting text is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording is overly specific. There is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined, subject to appropriate justification.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy CN7 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Policy CN8 - Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	Mr John Davies	N/A	N/A	786712	829	Yes	No	We welcome and strongly support the general content of the Local Plan with reservations of detail. Though Policy CN7 includes a requirement to 'work positively with communities' no mention is made of local voluntary organisations, such as these have considerable interests in the promotion, development and operation of community centres and facilities. They already have practical operating experience at several sites within the borough. New communities built from scratch can take considerable time to coalesce. The involvement of existing local voluntary organisations will facilitate faster and more effective community development. The implied exclusion of voluntary organisations could deny access to a significant pool of local management expertise and volunteers in community facilities promotion and operation. This makes Policy CN7 unsound.	Policy should include a requirement to consult and work with local voluntary organisations. The council will work positively with communities and other local voluntary organisations to support proposals to develop, retain, improve or re-use community, leisure or cultural facilities set out in Neighbourhood Plans/Orders incl. Community Right to Built Orders, along with the appropriate supporting development which may make such provision economically viable.	Whilst local voluntary groups would be covered by the reference to the community, in order to ensure clarity, it is recommended that the text in the policy is amended in accordance with that set out in the representation.	The council will work positively with communities, <u>including local voluntary organisations</u> , and support proposals to develop, retain, improve or re-use community, leisure or cultural facilities, including those set out in Neighbourhood Plans/Orders including Community Right to Build Orders, along with the appropriate supporting development which may make such provision economically viable.	Response to representation and to provide more clarity	Agreed	Remains outstanding
New para	5.70	Officer change in response to members	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	[New Para] Facilities and services which are essential for underpinning community life and ensuring that members of the community are able to meet their day to day needs are addressed by policy CN6. Whereas, facilities and services which enrich and ensure the vitality of communities are protected, supported and facilitated by CN7.	New section included in order to try and clarify relationship between the policies.	N/A	N/A
5.57	5.72	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The phrase, '(the list(s) below is not exhaustive)' is added, in order to provide greater clarity and ensure that as many facilities as possible are covered.	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
5.57	5.72	Officer change in response to members	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Community buildings including community centres village halls' moved from CN7 into CN6	More appropriate that this should be covered by CN6 instead of CN7	N/A	N/A
5.59	5.74	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	619	Yes	No	Habitats and natural green space should be included to be recognised as a cultural, environmental and educational necessity. To claim that the "borough is relatively well provided for..." in terms of habitats in multi-functional green space or as natural green space needs evidence of non designated as well as designated sites and there is none offered. Where are maps, hectarage, condition and management? In fact the very opposite is arguably the case. The Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Strategy does not demonstrate that the position will change and this is a cause for great concern as priorities and investment strategies assign little importance to natural green space which is in fact requiring of low - page 13 amounts of finance to deliver a great deal in environmental terms when compared to the high cost of capital required for built facilities and equipment.	Add: The Borough acknowledges that there is a significant deficit in land and appropriate management for multi-functional and natural green space habitats for species across the Borough contributing to a high level of community ignorance about the natural environment and wildlife and high numbers of declining or extinct species that requires remediation in the form of better habitats on multi-functional green space and more land set aside as natural green space. Provide habitat maps, hecterages, networks, condition and management status to support assertion that "borough is relatively well provided for...". Acknowledge the loss of habitats causes loss of species and that there are habitat needs to be fulfilled.	The policy supports the retention of some green spaces, whilst CN6 protects others, and EM5 (Green Infrastructure) sets out detailed measures to provide and protect green spaces. In addition, EM1 protects landscapes and EM4 biodiversity. Therefore, it is considered that when taken as a whole the plan addresses the concerns raised and no change is required.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
5.62	5.77	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paragraph re-ordered, though the meaning has not been changed, in order to make the sentence easier to understand. Now reads as follows: <i>It is envisaged that community facilities will combine several functions and form a vital focus for social and recreational activities. The policy supports the principle of co-locating facilities, although transport and accessibility implications will be carefully reviewed when considering such proposals. Supporting the co-location of community facilities and services at sites of local and district significance includes supporting and strengthening the voluntary and community sector network of organisations in order to maximise the use and viability of community buildings.</i> (post MAP version)	For ease of reading.	No objection raised, though slight re-wording proposed in the light of member comments.	N/A
5.63	5.78	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Last sentence refers to "the relevant standards are set out in more detail in Appendix 3." This should be changed to Appendix 4.	Inserted new paragraph to read "The green space, sport and recreation standards are set out in more detail in Appendix 4" - for clarification	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
Policy CN8 - Transport	Policy CN9 - Transport	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update policy number in light of additional policy inserted in Plan.	Updated in light of additional policy being inserted.	Change made after MAP	N/A
Policy CN8 - Transport	Policy CN9 - Transport	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1183	Not Specified	No	Requirement e) of Policy CN8 states that development will only be acceptable if it "does not have an adverse impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway networks." This is inconsistent with and contrary to Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe ." As Paragraph 151 of the NPPF states, Local Plans "should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in this Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development" .	intentionally left blank	Criteria e) amended to reflect the NPPF more closely	Wording of criteria e) amended to state: <u>Does not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway networks</u>	Response to representation - compliance with the National Planning Policy	Clr Cubbitt questioned the use of the word severe. Officers highlighted the appropriate section in the NPPF which talks about severe traffic impacts and recommended that the word severe is used in the policy.	Withdrawn/agreed to change
Policy CN8 - Transport	Policy CN9 - Transport	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	698	Yes	No	Policy is wholly inconsistent with the NPPF (particularly paragraph 32). The Hampshire County Council document relied on is out-of-date in the context of the NPPF. The final paragraph and criteria e-j) need to be fundamentally reviewed. It is inappropriate and ineffective to require "maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes" rather choices should be provided that encourage modal shift. In terms criterion f) the approach at paragraph 204 of the NPPF in terms of appropriateness of planning obligations needs to be applied. Parking standards referenced in criteria h) are out of date. They should not be included in Local Plan policy as otherwise their status is at risk of being promoted as a development plan policy. In terms of criterion i), the status of the SPD should not be elevated. Criterion j) will only be applicable on certain sites where such a coordinated approach is demonstrated as being appropriate. It cannot apply to "all development proposals."	Policy needs to be entirely recast to make it consistent and appropriate with paragraphs 29 to 41 of the NPPF. Policy must not be based upon a pre NPPF document produced by Hampshire County Council.	Criteria e) has been revised to be NPPF compliant. It is proposed that the adopted Parking Standards are updated once the Local Plan is adopted. Criteria h) provides flexibility for these updates to be undertaken without the need to review the Local Plan. Further guidance on criteria j) has been included in the supporting text.	Wording of criteria e) amended to state: <u>Does not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway networks.</u> Additional supporting text added to provide clarity on what Criteria j) requires.	Response to representation - NPPF compliance and clarity	Clr Cubbitt questioned the use of the word severe. Officers highlighted the appropriate section in the NPPF which talks about severe traffic impacts and recommended that the word severe is used in the policy.	Partial Outstanding (criteria j updated in Submission Plan to address rep)
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	774	Not Specified	No	The assertion that development will only occur which do not result in inappropriate traffic generation has not been borne out by past experience and is not something BDBC can deliver as they are not the Highway Authority. There is no mention of current bottlenecks that need resolution, let alone any result from what is proposed.	intentionally left blank	The Borough Council has worked with the highways authority (HCC) to develop the brief for the Local Plan Transport Assessment in addition to engaging with the highway authority on the scale and distribution of growth proposed in the Local Plan. The Local Plan Transport Assessment identifies the baseline traffic conditions along a defined highway network which acknowledges that there are currently areas of congestion during the peak hours.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	370	Not Specified	No	This policy is not sound when judged against the 'tests of soundness' regarding SS3.9 East Of Basingstoke (see our response to this policy) a. 'Must be positively prepared to meet development and infrastructure requirements' SS3.9, SS3.7, SS3.3 and SS3.4 are all developments creating additional traffic to the North and East of Basingstoke but the levels of funding required to deal with this are not identified. This is not positive preparation nor can it be justified. Without the required level of funding, these developments exasperate existing road network problems on the A33 and surrounding. bi. 'Justified' must be robust and credible' Policy CN8 Transport cannot be justified without the necessary funding source being identified for infrastructure. c. 'Effective' must be deliverable' Without the necessary funding being identified for infrastructure, Policy CN8 Transport cannot be deliverable on this basis.	Ensure funding is in place before development starts. Western Relief Road Policy SS3.10 (n & o) The route for this should be secured within the Manydown Masterplan and during this Local Plan period.	See response above (rep. 65)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	254	Yes	No	The main focus for additional housing seems to be that Overton has a railway station which is a mile out of the village (on an unadopted road) and therefore most people drive. It should be noted that there is little formal parking - most is provided in a free temporary car park at the behest of De La Rue. In addition trains, particularly at peak times are already full, with people getting on at Overton having to stand. To build houses in a village on the basis that most people will work out of the area (probably London) seems unsustainable both from an environmental and a community point of view.	intentionally left blank	Overton is considered to be a sustainable location with good connectivity by public transport (rail and bus services) to key destinations.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	65	No	No	Traffic on the already overloaded A33 would increase beyond its capacity. Developments SS3.9 and SS2.6 will prevent future upgrading of the A33 to dual carriageway. All traffic from SS2.3 and SS3.2 will pass through residential and business areas, on roads never intended to cater for the likely levels of traffic volumes, onto the overloaded A33. All necessary measures to alleviate these difficulties must be specified before allocation and must be in place before development. There is no adequate road heading north in the borough except the A34. From Basingstoke urban area all three ð€A' routes leading north, A339, A340 and A33 are single carriageway roads already at overcapacity. The A33 is an important route between the M3 and the M4 at Reading as well as a heavily used local route. The draft Plan as submitted would seriously restrict further upgrading of this important road if S3.7and S3.9 are developed as suggested. Â	All necessary measures to alleviate these difficulties must be specified before allocation and must be in place before development.	The Transport Assessment (TA) identifies junction mitigation measures that may be required on the Strategic Highway Network (including the A33 Corridor) by 2029 to mitigate the local plan allocations. The IDP identifies the strategic transport infrastructure that is required in the borough over the Plan period. The Council will work with the Highways Authority to deliver improvements to the transport network to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan development. It is important to note that the NPPF requires that 'all development generating significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement (TS) or TA. Plans and decisions should take account of whether.... improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual or cumulative impacts of the development are severe'. Any TA or TS submitted by applicants to support applications will need to demonstrate that the impacts of the development on the highway network can be mitigated. The Highways Authority will review the planning application TA and work with the applicants to deliver appropriate mitigation measures on the highway network.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mrs Clare Coyle	N/A	N/A	784661	223	Yes	No	The traffic report that supports the Local Plan states that, in theory, the A33 is under capacity and would remain so post-development. This does not reflect the reality of day-to-day experiences, particularly during the rush hour (it is worth noting that the data used predates the opening of the Tesco Distribution Centre in Reading which has increased the number of lorries using the road). The reality of the road is that it is already so busy that any incident from an accident to a slow moving farm vehicle causes a significant tailback. Not only does this cause delays but it also leads to people using single track country lanes as cut through. Given the level of commuting between Basingstoke and Reading it is difficult to believe that the A33 will not experience a significant increase in traffic volume wherever the new developments are located.	The current road is not fit for purpose as a trunk road and any increase in traffic will cause real problems for people trying to turn out onto the road. The number of accidents, already at an unacceptably high level, will increase and there will be more pollution and noise. Improving the junctions on the A33, which is the only mitigation planned, will do nothing to mitigate the increase in traffic volume on the road. It puts road users at risk - not just drivers but also pedestrians and cyclists. The road has no cycle path through Stratfield Turgis and the pavement stops before reaching the Wellington Arms hotel. One school bus route requires children to cross the road during the rush hour and then wait beside a constant flow of traffic. One footpath is unusable during the rush hour as it exits straight onto the road. The Local Plan needs to address these risks in order to be sound.	See response above (rep. 65)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1143	Yes	No	There are proposals for a western relief road/by pass. SOLVE supports the provision of roads both from the A339 to B3400 and a western by-pass, or a€ link' as defined in the Transport Study issue 4, linking this to the M3 at junction7. Future construction is too long and may be 16 years away. The route for this should be secured within the Manydown Masterplan and during this Local Plan period.	The route for this should be secured within the Manydown Masterplan and during this Local Plan period.	The Local Plan Transport Assessment indicates that full western link road is not required during the Local Plan period (2011-2029), however a new highway link between the B3400 and A339 is proposed. Given that 'robust evidence' is required by the NPPF (Para 41) to secure (identify and protect) routes which would be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice, we do not have sufficient justification to safeguard the route for a highway link between the B3400 and M3 J7 / A30 as suggested.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	818	Yes	No	Bullet D in CN8, as currently worded, does not comply with Para 32 of the NPPF, which states that "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impact of development are severe". The policy is not compliant with the NPPF and is therefore unsound.	Bullet d) should be reworded as follows: "Do no result in a severe impact on the local highway network or compromise highway safety."	The policy seeks to prevent developments that generate inappropriate traffic across the borough. The policy is a 'catch all' policy' to reflect the fact that a significant area of the borough is rural and that in some locations smaller schemes could result in inappropriate development and cause safety highway issues. Case officers and Highways DC staff will therefore assess each application and form a judgement on whether the development complies with the policy.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	327	Yes	No	Traffic on the already overloaded A33 would increase far beyond its current capacity which is evidenced in the 2014-2019 transport assessment report. All traffic from SS3.3 and SS3.8 will pass through residential and business areas, on roads never intended to cater for the likely levels of traffic volumes, onto the overloaded A33. All necessary measures to alleviate these difficulties must be specified before allocation and must be in place before development. There is no adequate road heading north in the borough except the A34. From Basingstoke all of the three 'A' routes leading north, A339, A340 and A33 are single carriageway roads already at overcapacity. The draft plan would seriously restrict further upgrading of the A33. The A33 and A339 have previously been considered in need of upgrading. It is noted that proposals are being considered to abandon the road link between Taylor's Farm and Chineham. The loss of this agreed link, would have profound implications	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	See response above (rep. 65)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1031	Yes	No	Support the encouragement of sustainable modes of transport. Part d) is too restrictive, once the traffic generated does not compromise highway safety then there should be no issue.	Part d) should be amended to "... does not compromise highway safety". However, if part d) is retained in its current wording further explanation on what would constitute 'inappropriate traffic generation' would be required.	The policy seeks to prevent developments that generate inappropriate traffic across the borough. The policy is a 'catch all' policy' to reflect the fact that a significant area of the borough is rural and that in some locations smaller schemes could result in inappropriate development and cause safety highway issues. Case officers and Highways DC staff will therefore assess each application and form a judgement on whether the development complies with the policy.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	24	Yes	Yes	A good set of policies but which need to be carefully monitored vs developer's pressures.	You have some problems with the website version of this policy.	Support Noted	No change	n/a	n/a	N/A
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mr Andrew Reeves-Hall	N/A	N/A	438050	531	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	n/a	n/a	N/A
Policy CN8 - Transport	N/A	Mrs Penelope Mayo	Stratfield Saye Parish Council	N/A	542330	417	Yes	No	Local Plan makes inadequate provision for road improvements to an already overloaded road system in the area - specifically the A33 which is at capacity. Additional large scale development will generate new traffic causing congestion and compromising highway safety.	All evidence base documents need to be reviewed and updated to reflect the current situation.	See response above (rep. 65)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
Policy CN8 - Transport	Policy CN9 - Transport	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	963	Yes	No	Objection is raised to Part e) of Policy CN8, which states that development will only be acceptable if it "does not have an adverse impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway network". This is unsound for the following reasons: it is inconsistent with and contrary to national policy, which states that "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe" (Paragraph 32, NPPF) There is a significant and material difference between the national test of acceptability and the proposed local test. No justification, such as one based on local circumstances, has been given for this. The test of adverse impact is unduly restrictive and has the potential to render large parts of the draft local plan ineffective in that it could frustrate the delivery of sustainable development which is required to meet the objectively assessed needs of the area for new homes and jobs.	1. Part e) of Policy CN8 should be drafted to reflect and comply with Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.	Criteria e) amended to reflect the NPPF more closely	Wording of criteria e) amended to state: ~~Does not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway networks~~	Response to representation and compliance with the NPPF	CLr Cubbitt questioned the use of the word severe. Officers highlighted the appropriate section in the NPPF, which talks about severe traffic impacts and recommended that the word severe is used in the policy.	Withdrawn/agreed to change
5.65	5.81	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	delete the words "and Local Development Framework Documents"	Update terminology	Change made after MAP	N/A
5.68	5.84	Mr Stephen Harris	N/A	N/A	787082	938	Not Specified	Not Specified	It is good to see provision being made for cycling and walking. However, very little is planned to address the many current barriers to cycling within Basingstoke, particularly crossing the centre of the town. Significant amounts of money are being assigned to upgrade the current road junctions to cope with the additional traffic, but no provision to make improvements for cyclists	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Borough Council is working with Hampshire County Council to improve cycle infrastructure within Basingstoke Town. The Basingstoke District Statement identifies a number of schemes that could be delivered over the Local Plan period.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
5.71	5.87	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1032	Yes	No	No information is available on when the new Parking Standards SPD will be prepared. It is important that there is not a large gap between the adoption of the Local Plan and adoption of SPDs to ensure the policy can be effective and deliverable.	To ensure the policy CN8 is sound further details are required on the SPD aspect so it is clear and deliverable, as any SPD will not go through the formal examination process.	The new Parking Standards SPD will be prepared once the Local Plan has been adopted and will go through the normal adoption procedures including consultation.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding
5.72	5.88	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	35	No	No	While national policy is a bit on-and-off, it is generally in favour of electric vehicles. Provision for these should be included locally. This includes cars and disabled-scooters/buggies.	Fast charging points in communal places, and access to mains electricity in residential parking areas, should be designed into the new developments. Also there should be provision of accommodation, with charging points, for electric disabled-scooters/buggies, either within the (purpose-built) homes of non-ambulant people or handy for them, and designed to be secure against theft and vandalism. It might be possible to combine the charging points with solar and/or wind power generators to minimise the cost of mains electricity use in vehicle charging.	The Council is supportive of electric vehicles which is demonstrated by the fact we have secured government funding to install the first EV rapid charger in Basingstoke town centre. The Council will encourage developers to install a level of provision that is appropriate at the time of application and to reflect market conditions.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
New Paragraph	5.92	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	966	Yes	No	A preliminary objection is also raised to Part j) of Policy CN8, on the basis that whilst it is accepted that development proposals should not prejudice the future development or design of adjoining sites in a physical sense (for example, by preventing access to an adjoining site), the reference to "comprehensive scheme that does not prejudice future development" is vague / imprecise and its scope and purpose is unclear. As a result, it is capable of wide or misinterpretation and has the potential to frustrate or impede necessary development. This possibility is reinforced by the absence in the supporting text of any explanation of the scope and purpose of Part j) and how it will be applied. Therefore, Part j) of Policy CN8 requires re-drafting and the supporting text should set out clearly the reasons for the requirement and how it will be applied.	It is proposed that Part j) of Policy CN8 should be re-drafted to reflect Paragraph 32 of the NPPF and to read as follows: "j) provides safe and suitable access to the site for all people and does not prejudice the achievement of the same objective on adjoining sites".	Officers agree that the greater explanation is required to support the text.	The following supporting text has been inserted to clarify the objectives of the policy: 'The policy seeks to make certain that all development proposals are designed to ensure that future development of suitable adjacent development site(s) could be accommodated from a transport and access perspective. Therefore, the Council's assessment and evaluation of planning applications will consider how development schemes safeguard future development of suitable adjoining sites'.	Response to representation	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed to change
6.1	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	25	Yes	Yes	This is a good opening statement and the subsequent sections do seem to put environmental considerations on an equal footing with social and economic, unlike early versions of the NPPF which seemed to downplay environmental considerations. The subsequent sections add precise detail.	intentionally left blank	Comments noted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.1	N/A	Mr Martin Heath	N/A	N/A	631343	233	No	No	The Council has not met its Statement of Community Involvement. The SCI cannot be found on the Council's website and link to it in the Local Plan Statement of Procedure document does not work. On the point of climate there has been little community involvement. A recent meeting (Housing and Environment Oversight Committee) that was to discuss the Council's climate change strategy was cancelled at short notice. There is no up to date copy of the climate change strategy available on the councils website This is a strategy that has not been updated for a number of years. The plan does not comply with national policy on renewable and low carbon energy eg Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy (July 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government) The Council did hold a climate change workshop but the results were never published. The plan does not reflect the Sustainable Community Strategy and has not been updated for a number of years.	The district has one of the highest per capita carbon emissions in the country and this is growing. The plan does not address how a low carbon solution will be developed. The evidence base used a single report published in 2010; which has not been updated (The North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study (2010)). Most of the conclusions of the report have been ignored. There is no evidence that the climate change policy and plan is the most appropriate strategy and there is no evidence that alternative strategies have been evaluated. The plan is not consistent with national priorities and policies on climate change eg NPPF para 97 to recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources and to design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development. Plan is not effective as it contains no specific or measurable targets that could monitored.	The Council's SCI can be found on the council's website at http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/browse/environment-and-planning/planning/emerging-local-plan/statement-of-community-involvement.htm. The link to the SCI in the Statement of Procedure will be updated. The Climate Change Strategy is on the council's website and is updated as suitable. As stated in paragraph 1.8 of the Pre Submission Local Plan, the Plan has been prepared to sit within a framework of other local documents including the Sustainable Community Strategy. Paragraph 2.3 of the Pre Submission Local Plan also adds that the Vision for the Local Plan is shared with the Sustainable Community Strategy. The Pre Submission Local Plan has taken account of the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Local Carbon Development Study. As set out in policy EM8 and its supporting text, development proposals should take account of the opportunities shown on the Energy Opportunities Plan - which itself is set out in the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Local Carbon Development Study. A new criteria will be added to Policy EM10 as follows: Minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design. Also, a new paragraph will be added in order to reflect and explain the additional criteria. These amendments will ensure greater conformity with paras 94 - 97 of the NPPF. As noted on page 99, policy EM8 will be monitored through the annual collection of information on the installation of renewable and local carbon technology.	Update the link to the SCI on page 4 of the Statement of Procedure. A new criteria will be added to Policy EM10 as follows: Minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design. Also, a new paragraph will be added in order to reflect and explain the additional criteria. These amendments will ensure greater conformity with paras 94 - 97 of the NPPF.	To amend error in the Statement of Procedure.	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.1	N/A	Mr Malcolm Macinnes	N/A	N/A	85807	399	Yes	No	The plan is not "sound" as it does nothing for the environment.	The following commitments are required in order to render the plan sound: environmental (includes economic) sustainability ongoing air, water and soil quality assessment, mitigation and conservation safeguard and enabled access for all transport modes of walking, cycling, vehicles, rail and waterway, in any development all developments to have a mandatory impartial EIA any development to pay the application fee to the council to include all surveys and assessments which the council will then pay to tendered providers as per the Localism Act, council members policy statements to be shown to have been overridden by the NPPF, no development on water sources, streams, rivers, waterways, ponds, lakes, forests, woodlands, meadows, allotments, parks, recreational green spaces, rare plant and animal habitats if no space remains after the above then go elsewhere council held assets for the community must not be sold onto privateers without tangible community benefit.	The Pre Submission Local Plan includes 12 policies within Chapter 6 which cover matters on environmental management and climate change. Environment and sustainability is a key factor of the Local Plan vision, objectives and Spatial Strategy. The Pre Submission Local Plan has also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (inc. Strategic Environmental Assessment). The process of Environmental Impact Assessment is governed by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. These regulations apply the EU directive (usually referred to as the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive) to the planning system in England. The regulations only apply to certain types of development and/or projects. Application fees are set by central government. Policy EM7 (Managing flood risk), and national guidance includes extensive guidance on development and flood risk. Policy EM4 and EM5 cover biodiversity and green infrastructure matters. The sites allocated in the Pre Submission Local Plan have been included as part of the most sustainable strategy when considered against the alternatives and are considered to be a suitable location for housing.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.1	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	630	Yes	No	No objective summary assessment of environ. assets/deficits, management/condition. A history of uncompensated loss means we should recognise need and have vision and ambition. Over 300 species in Borough deemed to be at risk or lost. At County level 50% of ancient woodland lost in 70 years, nationally only 2.5% of land with ancient wood and 2% of wildflower rich grass. Wetlands and river systems built on or in poor condition. No recognition here or the IDP of attrition from decades of growth or an action plan for improved & replacement habitats. Wildlife low priority while vast sums from habitat depletion goes to expensive to buy/maintain facilities/services at unsustainable levels ignoring even the value to people for health/wellbeing and knowledge, clean air ie carbon sequestration, clean water, healthy soils and services e.g.pollination. Imbalance of spending between environment, society and economy.	The Local Plan aims to protect such assets while supporting proposals which seek to protect, enhance, reconnect and expand such habitats, including the regeneration of some built up areas. The Borough can help to safeguard and restore several nationally important declining habitats targeted for protection, enhancement and restoration and over 300 important species of flora and fauna that need to be restored to sustainable populations. New habitats on new sites are required and committed to here and quantified in the IDF.Existing multi-functional and natural green space needs a fair allocation of funds to improve habitats even though this may mean less is available to expensive facilities, equipment and services and that communities should be required to contribute to their community infrastructure.	Appendix 2 of the SA (Inc. SEA) Report of the Local Plan includes baseline environmental data. The baseline data provides an evidence base which has supported the appraisal (and development of) the Local Plan. It also provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of the Local Plan, and provides the evidence to help identify sustainability issues. Paragraph 2.6 also summarises the issues that need to be addressed in order to achieve the Local Plan vision. One issue is the important biodiversity assets across the borough which need protection, and enhancement. Amendments will be made to policy EM4 - see the council's response to Pre Submission Comment ID: 1275 (Natural England) and 575 (Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust). These amendments will put greater emphasis on ensuring no net loss of biodiversity as a result of development and where possible, providing net gains in biodiversity. This accords with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. As noted in paragraph 6.20 of the Pre Submission Local Plan, Policy EM4 provides a framework for conserving and enhancing the borough's existing biodiversity assets while enabling opportunities to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Further information on how this will be achieved can be found in paragraphs 6.21 to 6.27. Development proposals will need to accord with the council's adopted green space standards (Appendix 4 of the Pre Submission Local Plan). The IDP includes guidance on how new green infrastructure (such as green spaces) will be funded.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.1	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	N/A	N/A	787784	1274	Yes	No	Para 6.1 says " An overall ambition of the Local Plan is to protect our existing environmental assets whilst meeting the area's social and economic needs. " This is not consistent with the emphasis on enhancement in the NPPF, (paras 9 and 114) and is hence unsound	This could be addressed by amending this wording to: " An overall ambition of the Local Plan is to protect enhance our existing environmental assets whilst meeting"	The amendments is not required as the last sentence of the paragraph already refers to 'enhance'. It states "The Local Plan aims to protect such assets while supporting proposals which seek to conserve, restore or enhance such environments..."	No change.	N/A	N/A	Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to paragraph 6.1 of the Submission Local Plan. Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection.
6.6	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	N/A	N/A	784488	1218	Yes	No	The paragraph says that "the types of green infrastructure and their benefits are not evenly distributed"• The meaning and significance of this is unclear. Natural England defines "green infrastructure" as "Green infrastructure includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, river and canal corridors allotments and private gardens". There is no conceivable way in which this set of things could be "evenly distributed" nor is it clear why there might be a need for even distribution "natural countryside characteristics (woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, river and canal corridors)" need to be protected and sustained, not "distributed"?	Remove meaningless text so that the sentence reads: However, maximum benefits are not...	Paragraph 6.6 provides a useful background to the policies included within chapter 6 of the Local Plan. As explained further in paragraph 6.32, "There are, however, inequalities in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility of green space across the borough with certain areas having a deficiency of open space.". The requested deletion of text is therefore not required.	No change.	Remains outstanding	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	634	Yes	No	Should reference open grasslands in e) and as a specific consideration respect the need for connective viable and sustainable habitats that enable flora and fauna to move through the landscape to colonise or repopulate and to allow for the affects of changing weather patterns. Roads are a significant inhibitor change and new roads or road changes should seek opportunities to reconnect habitats	amend e. Trees, hedgerows, water features such as rivers, ancient woodland, grasslands and other landscape elements and features; new h. Roads and other infrastructure can be a significant inhibitor of movement and new infrastructure or changes to infrastructure such as roads should be assessed for opportunities to reconnect habitats or improve connectivity. new i. Ensure viable and sustainable connective habitats enable flora and fauna to move through and between the wider landscape and urban areas to colonise or recolonise and to adjust to changes in weather patterns.	Reference to grasslands is not required as criteria e) already refers to "other landscape features".	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	776	Not Specified	No	The assertion that development will only occur where they are sympathetic to the character and visual quality of the area is not borne out by past BDBC practice. There is no mention of any contour line policy to be sympathetic to the Worting Downs to the south and south west of Basingstoke town or within the Manydown proposal. Overtons past experience in this regard is also not good.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change as the policy is considered sound and consistent with paragraphs 109 and 113 of the NPPF. The policy will be implemented and monitored as per the points identified in the implementation and monitoring box. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policy SS3.10 criteria h) requires development proposals on the Manydown site to "respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape and also the setting and form of existing development. Visual intrusion into the wider landscape should be limited..."	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	435	Yes	No	While we agree with paragraphs a to g and with the last 2 sentences of 6.9 we are very concerned that 6.11 will be used to negate these provisions.	A definite commitment should be given to environmental considerations. If these policies have no teeth they are useless	Note support for criteria a to g and the last 2 sentences of paragraph 6.9. No change to paragraph 6.11 as it is already considered consistent with the proportionate approach referred to throughout the NPPF. The proportionate approach is also used throughout the Local Plan including within policies CN3, EM4 and EM11. The inclusion of a 'proportionate approach' in paragraph 6.11 does not undermine policy EM1. The policy will ensure that development proposals protect and enhance valued landscapes as required by paragraph 109 of the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Mr Graham Smith	Test Valley Borough Council	N/A	625620	484	Not Specified	Yes	The Council supports this policy, particularly references to minimising impacts on the character of the River Test.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support Noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	Policy EM1 - Landscape	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend title by deleting "impact"	Clarity	N/A	N/A
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	Policy EM1 - Landscape	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria e) as follows: "Trees, <u>ancient woodland</u> , hedgerows, water features such as rivers, ~~ancient woodland~~ and other landscape elements and features."	For clarity: 'Ancient woodland' moved to follow on from 'trees'. 'Water features' changed to 'water bodies' for terminology reasons. 'Elements' deleted as unnecessary when 'features' is also included.	Councillors partially agreed with the suggested officer change. However, rather than 'water bodies' councillors requested the text reverts back to 'water features'.	N/A
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	Policy EM1 - Landscape	Ms Becky French	CPRE Hampshire	N/A	637125	1238	Yes	No	Fully supports the protection/ conservation and enhancement of the Borough's high quality natural environment, which includes landscape, and a strong policy objective to this effect is set out in the Spatial Objectives and Spatial Strategy. Policy EM1 deals only with landscape impact of new development and relies essentially on assessment made by the developer and does not provide a Policy to reflect and support the Spatial Objectives and Spatial Strategy or comply with the NPPF. Reference in the text to a strategy and action plan for dealing with landscape and biodiversity issues set out in a document called Living Landscapes is not sufficient. A Policy providing positively policy for protection/ conservation and where possible enhancement is required if Spatial Objectives and Spatial Strategy are to be achieved Accordingly, the Local Plan is unsound (not justified) in that it does not adopt the most appropriate strategy for protection and enhancement of the landscape.	CPRE Hampshire has suggested changes to Policy EM1 required to render the Local Plan sound. These are set out in CPRE's representation on policy EM1.	Support for the Spatial Objectives and Spatial Strategy is noted. The policy is already considered sound as it requires development proposals to respect and enhance landscape. The policy is consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. However, some of the suggested changes will add to the soundness of the policy and consistency with the NPPF. Delete "impact" from the policy title as suggested for internal consistency between the Local Plan policy titles. The new suggested paragraph at the start of the sentence is not required as paragraph 6.9 covers this sufficiently. The suggested wording at the end of the second paragraph is not required as the current paragraph already refers to "...respect, enhance and not be detrimental...". Criteria e) refers to 'other landscape features' which could include ditches, ponds, ancient sunken lanes, ancient tracks. The inclusion of these additional features is therefore not necessary. For completeness, add an additional criteria after criteria e) of policy EM1 regarding "intrinsically dark landscapes". Criteria f) refers to 'historic' so this word is not required in criteria e) as well. The suggested criteria regarding areas of high tranquillity is not required. Areas of high tranquillity could be a particular quality of a landscape or could be associated with the scenic quality and therefore this issue would be covered by criteria a) and b) of the policy. The suggested wording at the end of the penultimate paragraph of the policy regarding AONB's is not required as this repeats paragraph 115 of the NPPF. The new paragraph suggested at the end of the policy is not required as it repeats paragraph 116 of the NPPF. The policy also currently states that development proposals in the AONB will be determined in accordance with the NPPF. The suggested paragraph at the end of the policy is a statement and is not required within the policy. The Council work positively with landowners and others where necessary and appropriate.	Delete 'Impact' from the policy title. Amend criteria a) as follows: "The particular qualities identified within the ~~current council's~~ Landscape Character Assessment...". Add new criteria after criteria e) as follows: <u>intrinsically dark landscapes</u> ."	In response to representation. Suggested changes will add to the soundness of the policy and consistency with the NPPF.	Agreed.	Supports some of the amendments made to Policy EM1. Considers Policy to be sound
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	247	Yes	No	Here, and in several other policies, the draft Plan makes sense if applied to a relatively large scale development but is onerous if applied to a small development, for example a one-off dwelling in the centre of a village. In such small cases, the Development Management process has shown many examples of, for example, consultation responses from a landscape officer (a) delaying the process because the Council's limited specialist resources are asked to comment on far too many minor cases and (b) providing the applicant (who may be a householder) with a last-minute aspect of policy to which the applicant needs to respond within an unacceptable deadline. Development Control committee records show a clear pattern of overturning recommendations for refusal on the basis that a 'landscape' reason has been overstated, misjudged or appears irrelevant to the setting. This is clearly against national policy that LPAs must assist applicants; instead it puts hurdles in their way.	Amend the opening sentence to read: "Developments in the countryside and developments on urban or rural sites that are considered as having a high landscape sensitivity will only be permitted" Note that in non-countryside cases this rightly places on the LPA rather than applicant the burden of determining whether a site is sufficiently sensitive from a landscape perspective as to require the 'appropriate assessment'. It prevents the LPA from inflicting on householders and other small development applicants the onerous burden of determining how their proposals relate, if at all, to the long list of potential issues set out in the policy, and means that 'last minute' landscape-related objections no longer delay applications or cause them to be brought needlessly to committee.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraphs 109 and 113 of the NPPF. Paragraph 6.11 indicates that the proportionate approach will be applied depending on the nature and scale of proposals. The Council's Landscape Character Assessment and Appendix 14 (Countryside Design Summary) of the Design and Sustainability SPD provides information to applicants on the borough's distinct landscape character areas and summarises the key characteristics, qualities and issues associated with each area.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	659	Not Specified	Yes	We support the inclusion that the character of the borough's rivers and tributaries, including the River Loddon and Test should be safeguarded.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	N/A	Mrs Linda Oxford	N/A	N/A	786899	915	Not Specified	Not Specified	The area of Basingstoke from the edge of Kempshott towards Oakley and beyond, has been designated an AONB, (Area of outstanding natural beauty), and the planning department and decision makers have a responsibility to this and subsequent generations to maintain and enhance the aesthetic beauty and ecological diversity of this land. This area is also designated high grade agricultural land and to lose it would be tragic, short sighted and would not make economical sense.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Only two allocations in the plan fall within the North Wessex Downs AONB, both at Whitchurch, and the relevant policies include criteria to respond positively to the special landscape characteristics of the area. As stated in policy EM1, development proposals within the AONB will be determined against national planning policy and criteria set out in the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan. Development proposals on the edge of the AONB will need to respond positively to the AONB.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM1 - Landscape Impact	Policy EM1 - Landscape	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1266	Yes	No	Policy EM1 is unsound in that it will not be effective. It says "Development proposals must respect, enhance and not be detrimental to the landscape likely to be affected", but is unlikely to be effective as there is no requirement to compensate for any residual landscape or visual impact. Policy EM1 says "Development proposals in the AONB..." Landscape monitoring (EM1). It is very unclear which of the "objectives and action plans of the relevant strategies and plans set out in the supporting text of the policy", the policy will be monitored against. As such it is very unclear whether the monitoring of this policy is justified or effective.	We therefore suggest the following text is added at the end of the penultimate paragraph: "Where adverse impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, compensatory environmental enhancements will be made to offset the residual landscape and visual impacts". To be effective, this policy should be amended to read "Development proposals in the AONB or its setting...", as this encompasses those applications in the setting of the AONB.	The suggested text for inclusion at the end of the penultimate paragraph in the policy is not required. The policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraphs 109, 113 and 115 of the NPPF. Development proposals will be assessed on their own merits and against the Local Plan as a whole. The suggested wording is already also sufficiently covered by paragraph 152 of the NPPF. The Local Plan generally avoids repeating guidance that is already in the NPPF. Add suggested text ("...or its setting") to the last sentence in the policy. This change will add to the policies effectiveness.	Amend last sentence of policy as follows: "Development proposals in the AONB or its setting..."	In response to representation.	Agreed.	Natural England agree with the suggested amendment to policy EM1. Following discussions with Natural England their representation regarding residual landscpae impact remains outstanding. Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Submission Local Plan policy EM1 implementation and monitoring box. Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection eith regards to monitoring.
6.10	N/A	Ms Becky French (CPRE)	CPRE Hampshire	N/A	637125	1240	Yes	No	Paragraph states that the Council has in place a strategy and action plan for dealing with landscape and biodiversity issues set out in Living Landscapes (2010), but no support is given for this within the Policies within the Local Plan. Paragraph refers to other relevant documents including community produced Village Design Statements, Neighbourhood Plan and Orders, Countryside Design Summary, and the North Wessex Downs Management Plan adopted by the local authorities within the AONB, but does not refer to Community Landscape Character Assessments.	Changes to Para 6.10: "... Other relevant documents include community produced Village Design Statements, Neighbourhood Plan and Orders, Countryside Design Summary, Community Landscape Character Assessments and the North Wessex Downs Management Plan adopted by the local authorities within the AONB." Add the following new paragraph: "The Council will put in place a process to identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason."	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Paragraph 6.10 is a supporting paragraph to policy EM1. Reference to "Community Landscape Character Assessments" is not required as the council is not aware of any such assessments that have been produced by a community in the borough. The new suggested paragraph is not required as the Local Plan should be read as a whole including policy EM4, EM5 and EM10. This will ensure areas of tranquillity, which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise, will be protected. The suggested paragraph is also a statement and not a policy/ support text to a policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.11	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	248	Yes	No	Para 6.11 contradicts rather than clarifying the wording of the policy and is of no help to an applicant for a small development - this is against national guidance. Two aspects make it essential that the issue is addressed in the policy wording: 1. In pre-app consultation the LPA invariably (and quite reasonably) hedges its bets with a statement to the effect that this is advice only and the Authority will only determine its position on receiving an application. This leaves the applicant with uncertainty as to whether and if so how his site will be assessed from a landscape perspective. 2. Experience is that the LPA always invites a "Landscape" consultation response, regardless of the location or nature of a site. Wherever practicable (as it is in this case) the policy should be clear and not leave applicants subject to arbitrary and unpredictable judgements from the LPA as to whether an assessment is needed.	The policy wording should be changed as recommended. An explanatory paragraph might helpfully be used to further assist applicants; "In pre-application consultation the Council will indicate, with reasons, whether it regards the site concerned as sensitive from a landscape perspective; whether a landscape assessment will be required; and if so the scope of such assessment." This would make the policy fully compliant with the requirement to assist applicants and to streamline the planning process, for the benefit of both applicants and the LPA.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with the NPPF. Paragraph 6.11 indicates that a proportionate approach will be applied reflecting the nature and scale of proposals. The proportionate approach is referred to throughout the NPPF and is also used throughout the Local Plan including within policies CN3, EM4 and EM11. As per paragraph 189 of the NPPF the council encourages its pre-application service. However, the council cannot require a developer/ applicant engages with them before submitting a planning application. Where pre-application advice is given the council's commitment, as indicated on its website, will be to respond proportionately to the level of information submitted. Planning officers will provide accurate and objective advice in good faith, based on the information provided, but without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application by either officers or members of the Development Control Committee.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mrs Angela Freeman	N/A	N/A	781458	32	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Julian Crawley	N/A	N/A	783708	113	Yes	No	Many congratulations to BDBC for proposing the Strategic Gaps - however these need to last longer than the previous version. The concern is that the current Basingstoke - Sherborne St John gap has been defined immediately following the approval of further development of a greenfield site which specifically narrows the current gap. A minimum life-time should be defined - not just until the next round of development applications The Basingstoke - Sherborne St John Strategic Gap is insufficient; it should extend to the west of the A340 - across to the A339.	A minimum life-time of 30 years should be designated for Strategic Gaps. The Basingstoke - Sherborne St John Strategic Gap should be extended to the west of the A340 - to the A339.	Support is noted. The emerging Local Plan covers the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination. In response to the comments from Sherborne St John Parish Council (comment ID: 433) the Basingstoke to Sherborne St John Strategic Gap has been extended to the west of the village to include land north of Elm Road (South west of the village) and the land adjoining Rooksdown including Weybrook Park golf course.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Cllr Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	211	No	No	While I support the principle of strategic gaps to protect all the villages indicated, implicit in this is the principle that this will prevent any future growth of Basingstoke after 2029 as these gaps effectively encircle the town. Unless these villages are to become islands within greater Basingstoke there will be little scope for future expansion which is inevitable unless growth is constrained now. As previously stated, under the Manydown policy, the reduction in the area to create the Oakley strategic gap makes development at the proposed rate unviable.	Reduce the size of the Oakley strategic gap, or reduce the overall housing numbers.	Support is noted. The emerging Local Plan covers the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination. In relation to the comments on the Manydown policy please see the response to policy SS3.10.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Dr Roger Walters	N/A	N/A	784665	240	Yes	No	Previous experience suggests that such gaps have been ignored when it has been deemed to be necessary to develop greenfield sites on agricultural land outside existing settlement boundaries so it is likely that such proposed gaps are mere window dressing. If such gaps are to be effective ways of preserving the distinctive rural character of the villages and the means of providing ease of access to the countryside surrounding the urban sprawl that characterises much of the development of Basingstoke over a period of 50 years the gaps will need to be larger than currently envisaged and unalterable for a substantial period of time.	Clarification of the legal status of such gaps. Clarification of the areas to be included in such gaps and the setting of a minimum period of time (at least 30 years) before any part of such an area could be re-designated	No change. The emerging Local Plan will cover the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination. Development in the strategic gaps will only be permitted where it accords with policy criteria. Once the Local Plan is adopted the policy will be given due consideration for decision making on planning applications.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	311	Yes	No	The local plan gives protection to the settlements of Oakley, Sherborne St John, Old Basing and Bramley/Sherfield on Loddon but specifying strategic gaps does not give similar protection to Dummer and North Waltham. A strategic gap would protect the settlements and the local rural environment.	A strategic gap including Hounsme Fields and Peak Copse should be created.	No change. A strategic gap between Dummer and North Waltham is not required as it will not act as a 'strategic' gap. Although North Waltham and Dummer are relatively close together, no land allocations within the Local Plan will reduce the distance between settlements further.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr John Darker	N/A	N/A	637650	332	Yes	Yes	Support policy EM2.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	394	Yes	No	Whilst the County Council as landowner supports the principle of the development of the Cufaude Farm site, there is concern that the proposed allocation boundary is not justified by evidence and risks under-delivery of housing and supporting infrastructure (not effective). The SHLAA related to the entirety of HCC's ownership 22.5 ha. In February 2013 the draft allocation was for 390 dwellings, primary school and public open space. However, since then the allocation boundary has been reduced by around 30% to 22.6 ha, with a strategic gap introduced between Bramley and Basingstoke, although the land use requirements in terms of development capacity have remained the same. Without modification this would result in the under-delivery of the housing target for the site, and/or prejudice provision of the primary school site. The designation of the strategic gap does not relate to landscape sensitivity or visual impact and has no clear rationale.	It is recommended that there are adjustments to the allocation boundary and strategic gap boundary under policy EM2 based on known constraints, an assessed land budget and high level masterplanning work undertaken to date (please see attached map). The proposed modification will achieve a development that both achieves the identified development capacity and enable a development appropriate to the context and internally consistent with other clauses within policy SS3.8.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, strategic gaps have not been defined to protect the countryside or landscape, they prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements. The boundaries are justified, following physical features.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Cllr Martin Biermann	BDBC	N/A	638570	436	No	No	The in part last-minute, urge for formal "strategic gaps" is obsessive. The passion to maintain the character of some villages and settlements is well understood and supported. However, if Basingstoke is to grow further in the years ahead, adherence to gaps of any serious dimension will result in a series of doughnuts around the urban settlement, making the latter extremely tortuous to comprehensively develop. A satisfactory level of protection for character settlements has been achieved in - for example - Old Basing, despite close proximity between "ancient" and newer developments. Chineham and Taylors Farm have even maintained individuality by virtue of principally wooded infrastructure merely a few metres wide. If Razor's Farm were developed, the gap between Bramley parish and Basingstoke Town would be obliterated.	The above shortcomings could be addressed by rationally defining Strategic Gaps as "devices to - as far as possible and where desirable - protect the character and individuality of existing settlements".	No change. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, strategic gaps have been defined to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements. The emerging Local Plan will cover the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination. The Local Plan will allocate sufficient land to meet the Borough's housing target for the plan period.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	496	Yes	No	Those working on the Neighbourhood Plan have identified the need for a residential development on the west side of the village to cater for those wishing to get onto the housing ladder and for those seeking to down size from larger properties in the village and the plan as drawn does not allow any space for a development of this nature.	Sherfield-on-Loddon Parish Council requests that the edge of the strategic gap, and indeed the settlement policy boundary, should run roughly north-south from the rear of 15 Bullsdown Close in the north to Goddards Lane in the south.	No change. The amendment is not necessary as the criteria c) of the policy permits development where it is proposed through a Neighbourhood Plan. The Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan has yet to be drafted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	537	Yes	No	The strategic gap as currently defined between Bramley and Basingstoke encroaches into the Cufaude Lane development site and would prevent the effective delivery of this site in order to allow for the aspirations of policy SS3.8 to be fully met.	The strategic gap between Bramley and Basingstoke needs to be re-drawn in order to remove the northern parts of the Cufaude Lane site, and hence allow them to be included in the SS3.8 policy allocation boundary in order to ensure that the aspirations of this policy can realistically be met. Re-drawing this boundary will not undermine the function of the gap, especially as the site boundary can be reinforced with suitable landscape treatment.	Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, strategic gaps have not been defined to protect the countryside or landscape, they prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements. The boundaries are justified, following physical features.	No change.	N/A	N/A	withdrawn
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Messrs A.B & M.E Gosden & Sons	N/A	N/A	786104	555	Yes	No	Policy does not seek to meet future development and infrastructure requirements. The extent of the Strategic Gap between Basingstoke/ Chineham - Bramley/ Sherfield-on-Loddon is (as defined in Policy Map 7d) is excessive. Do not object to the principle of the strategic gap between Bramley and Sherfield-on-Loddon but the gap should not include the area to the south of Sherfield-on-Loddon. The Strategic Gap as currently defined is not justified and needs to be amended.	Basingstoke/ Chineham - Bramley/ Sherfield-on-Loddon Strategic Map should be amended as indicated the attached plan. The gap should not include the area to the south of Sherfield-on-Loddon.	No change. The suggested change will undermine the aim of the policy which is to prevent coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	572	Yes	Yes	Welcomes the policy.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mrs Gail Tomblin	N/A	N/A	638019	585	Yes	No		Strategic gap policy EM2 Strategic gap Chineham - Bramley/Sherfield on Loddon (map 7d) has identified an area partway through the Cufaude Farm site SS3.8 , to create a buffer to Bramley and by encompassing the military camp, a buffer to Sherfield -on-Loddon. This policy follows a line on the southern edge of the existing properties' curtilages - thus allowing development right up to the very housing that this policy suggests it will protect. The northern boundary should be moved further south to facilitate this policy or if not, exclude all the existing abutting properties so that they might be developed as part of this area's transformation at their owner's choice and then create a genuine gap which does not abut housing.	No change. Strategic gap boundaries have generally been defined up to the edge of the Settlement Policy Boundary/ the back of existing property curtilages. The boundaries are justified as they follow physical features. The policy includes flexibility for development in gaps subject to satisfying criteria a), b) and c).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	The Manydown Company Ltd	The Manydown Company Ltd	N/A	786187	598	Yes	No	The need for Policy EM2 and Strategic Gaps is questionable. The land does not fall within the Green Belt and consequently the principle of "coalescence" does not apply; the consideration should be landscape not land use. The purpose of the Local Plan is to allow the Local Planning Authority to control the direction of growth as is appropriate, this policy places restriction on the Local Planning Authority to do so. The protection of sensitive landscape locations is adequately provided for within other policies in the Local Plan namely SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning), SS6 (New Housing in the Countryside), CN2 (Rural Exceptions for Affordable Housing) and EM1 (Landscape Impact). Insufficient evidence to justify allocating the extent of land defined for the Basingstoke and Oakley Strategic Gap in Policy Map 7a.	Consider amending or deleting Policy EM2and Policy Map 7a.	No change. The policy is required as it defines the strategic gap areas. The other policies in the plan do not define the strategic gaps. This approach is consistent with paragraph 17 (bullet point 1) of the NPPF as it provides a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. The strategic gaps defined are the areas in the borough where there is greatest risk of coalescence.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Cllr Diane Taylor	BDBC	N/A	121755	625	Not Specified	No	The strategic gaps are very welcome, though this policy does not go far enough to provide any secure and lasting protection for the specified villages. For Oakley in particular, only an eastern gap is designated. This should be extended to cover areas to the north and south. This policy does not extend beyond the plan period, and so as such is little more than a statement of sites in the plan. For the integrity of our villages to be protected the plan should be much more robust, as stated in section 9 of the NPPF.	Reword as follows: "in order to prevent coalescence of built up areas and to maintain the separate identity of settlements, the generally open and undeveloped nature of the following gaps, as defined in the policy maps will be protected in perpetuity: Basingstoke-Oakley etc... exclude a) and b) include in the maps areas to the north and south of Oakley.	Support is noted. No change to the policy wording. The emerging Local Plan will cover the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination. Regarding extensions to the Basingstoke - Oakley Strategic Gap, see the response to comment ID: 477 which agrees to make amendments to the Strategic Gap.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A, Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Elaine Vashi	Bloor Homes	N/A	786469	746	Yes	No	Map 7e defines the extent of the Baughurst - Tadley Strategic Gap. Land at Smith's Field, Droxford Crescent/New Road, Tadley is included within the Strategic Gap. The inclusion of this site within the Strategic Gap is not justified and we object to its inclusion in the Gap for the reasons set out below. Within the LCS, Study Area TA04 is identified as having "medium" overall landscape capacity. The LCS concludes that: "This is a modified landscape which has only localised impacts on the adjacent area. There is the potential for mitigation within this area which would have limited impact on the character. There is the potential for development here although its layout would need to take into account the more elevated parts of the area and would be limited to the southern part of the area. The narrow part of the character area in the north-west corner provides an important buffer between Baughurst/Tadley and would need to be retained to prevent coalescence of the two settlements"	The boundary of the Baughurst - Tadley Strategic Gap should be amended to exclude Land at Smith's Field to follow a more logical and defensible boundary to the north of the site, as illustrated by the plan appended to our representations.	No change. The suggested change will undermine the aim of the policy which is to prevent coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A, Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	J Lloyd	N/A	N/A	786495	763	Yes	No	Objects to inclusion of Policy EM2 . Strategic gaps are no longer recognised in planning policy. This view if supported by a recent Appeal (APP/H1705/A/12/2188125 & 2188137) for land north of Marnel Park, Popley in Basingstoke which was allowed on 11September 2013 by the Secretary of State. No evidence to justify the policy in the plan. Policy is inconsistent with the NPPF. Defined settlement boundaries should be sufficient to protect the land between settlements and to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 114. Objects to the boundaries of the proposed strategic for Basingstoke/ Chineham "Bramley/ Sherfield-on-Loddon as identified on Policy Map 7d.	The deletion of the policy will ensure that the Local Plan meets the tests of soundness. Land adjoining Upper Cufaude Farm on the north side of Cufaude Lane (that is bounded by a railway line along the north-eastern boundary with woodland beyond) should be removed from the strategic gap. Land is better related to the proposed housing allocation at Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8).	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	768	Not Specified	No	Object in principle to the creation of the new Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap. The is not justified or required. The gap duplicates existing national and local countryside and ecology designations. There is no need to artificially constrain Basingstoke with strategic gap which would act as a Green Belt preventing use of this land even if shown to be environmentally acceptable through further study or discussions with the Environment Agency. This makes the policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the NPPF.	This objection would be overcome by deleting the area shown on Map 7b as a strategic gap.	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. The strategic gaps defined are the areas in the borough where there is greatest risk of coalescence. The deletion of the Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap will undermine this approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	779	Not Specified	No	Map 7b This is not justified or required. Duplicates existing national and local countryside and ecology designations. There is no need to artificially constrain Basingstoke with a strategic gap which would act as a Green Belt preventing use of this land even if shown to be environmentally acceptable through further study or discussions with the Environment Agency. This makes the policy/map unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the Framework.	This objection would be overcome by deleting the area shown on Map 7b as a strategic gap.	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. The strategic gaps defined are the areas in the borough where there is greatest risk of coalescence. The deletion of the Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap will undermine this approach.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	793	Not Specified	No	EM2 Strategic gap How can they be mentioned and protected when in some of the areas quoted the intention is to develop so much of the undeveloped land separately communities?	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. As noted in paragraph 6.12 of the Local Plan, it is noted that the land allocations within this plan will in some instances reduce the distance between settlements. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Ms Naomi Sykes	N/A	N/A	786620	810	Yes	No	Objects to inclusion of Policy EM2 . Strategic gaps are no longer recognised in planning policy. This view if supported by a recent Appeal (APP/H1705/A/12/2188125 & 2188137) for land north of Marnel Park, Popley in Basingstoke which was allowed on 11September 2013 by the Secretary of State. No evidence to justify the policy in the plan. Policy is inconsistent with the NPPF. Defined settlement boundaries should be sufficient to protect the land between settlements and to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 114. Objects to the boundaries of the proposed strategic for Basingstoke/ Chineham - Bramley/ Sheffield-on-Loddon as identified on Policy Map 7d.	The deletion of the policy will ensure that the Local Plan meets the tests of soundness. Land adjoining Upper Cufaude Farm on the north side of Cufaude Lane (that is bounded by a railway line along the north-eastern boundary with woodland beyond) should be removed from the strategic gap. Land is better related to the proposed housing allocation at Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8).	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Robert Fish	N/A	N/A	786623	813	Yes	No	Object to inclusion of Policy EM2 . Strategic gaps are no longer recognised in planning policy. This view if supported by a recent Appeal (APP/H1705/A/12/2188125 & 2188137) for land north of Marnel Park, Popley in Basingstoke which was allowed on 11September 2013 by the Secretary of State. No evidence to justify the policy in the plan. Policy is inconsistent with the NPPF. Defined settlement boundaries should be sufficient to protect the land between settlements and to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 114. Objects to the boundaries of the proposed strategic for Basingstoke/ Chineham - Bramley/ Sheffield-on-Loddon as identified on Policy Map 7d.	The deletion of the policy will ensure that the Local Plan meets the tests of soundness. Land adjoining Upper Cufaude Farm on the north side of Cufaude Lane (that is bounded by a railway line along the north-eastern boundary with woodland beyond) should be removed from the strategic gap. Land is better related to the proposed housing allocation at Cufaude Farm (policy SS3.8).	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. Based on analysis of the site capacity, it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the 390 units within the site allocation boundaries. This allows for 2 ha for the school and a density of 30 dwelling per hectare. The analysis conducted also takes into account the main site constraints and open space provision in accordance with the council's requirements. Therefore, there is no need to consider the inclusion of additional land within the allocation area. Also the additional land should not be included as site assessment work on the land adjacent to Upper Cufaude Farm House has concluded that the proposed envelopment of Upper Cufaude Farmhouse would cause substantial harm which could not be satisfactorily mitigated against.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	849	Yes	Yes	Policy EM2 sets and accompanying policy maps 7a and 7b set out the proposed strategic gap allocations between Basingstoke and Oakley, and Basingstoke and Old Basing. Supports the allocation of a strategic gap between Basingstoke and the eastern boundary of Oakley (Policy Map 7a). Any development to the east of Oakley would diminish the gap between the settlements and would harm the separate identity of the settlements. Supports the allocation of a strategic gap between Basingstoke and Old Basing (Policy Map 7b). Agrees that the gap should end on the western side of Basing Road which is entirely appropriate.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr RD Glover	N/A	N/A	786857	878	Not Specified	No	Part of the plan relates to strategic gaps between Basingstoke and its surrounding villages. To date the council has been less successful in what it has achieved, as Popley and Sherborne St John virtually touch, Chineham and Basing are co-joined, the gap between Chineham and Sheffield is so small as to be virtually ignored. The villages have all complained about this by the requests have been ignored. The provisions in the proposed plans for strategic gaps is woefully lacking. Currently the only village left with a reasonable gap is Oakley to Kempshott and Worting. It is patently clear that the boundary line follows a potential route for a later addition. It is also clearly the reason for such an oddly placed boundary between potential further development and the Oakley strategic gap. Diminishing current gaps will perpetuate mistakes made with other villages.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change. The strategic gaps defined are the areas in the borough where there is greatest risk of coalescence.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Brendan Shaw	N/A	N/A	786880	901	Not Specified	Not Specified	Oakley does not wish to become another suburb of Basingstoke - this is the (understandable) view of most if not all Oakley residents that I have talked to. Building some 3000+ houses on Manydown (and a link road leading into the strategic gap) will inevitably lead to the coalescence of Oakley and the west side of Basingstoke. We need to preserve the separation of local settlements, not just on paper but in reality.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	No change. The defined Basingstoke-Oakley Strategic Gap will prevent the coalescence of the settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	1035	Yes	No	The policy is not sound as the lack of development at Tadley results in a significant negative impact on the SA housing objective, both in terms of the provision of housing to meet local needs and to meet the wider borough needs. The policy will also have secondary impacts on the Tadley and Burghfield areas as a consequence. It is considered that BDBC are placing undue weight on the views of the ONR. There is the potential for some 1800 houses at Tadley and some sites should be included in the Local Plan. The Parish Council object to this strategic gap, which is not strategic as its only purpose is to prevent development, and request its removal. Please see attachment for full response.	There is the potential for some 1800 houses at Tadley and some sites should be included in the Local Plan.	The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. No sites have been allocated in Tadley. Paragraph 3.1 of the Local Plan explains that "the growth of Tadley is constrained given its location within the inner consultation zone of the Atomic Weapons Establishment and, as such, the needs arising here will be met elsewhere in the borough." Paragraph 4.4 further explains that "to maintain an effective emergency plan in relation to the AWE, no strategic allocations for development within or around Tadley are proposed (Policy SS7 refers)."	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1058	Yes	No	The Borough Council and HCC as landowners note that the policy covers an extensive part of the Manydown estate. The landowners recognise that an appropriate "gap" between Oakley and Basingstoke to prevent coalescence can be maintained in a manner that would also not prejudice the objectives for Manydown during and after the Plan period. Additional flexibility in the policy wording is sought to accommodate infrastructure relating to adjacent allocations, for example green infrastructure. In its current form the policy is unsound because it could hinder the delivery of the emerging housing allocations, which is internally inconsistent. As a wider point, it is considered that strategic gap boundaries should be appropriately drawn to enable an effective approach to neighbourhood planning. As currently drafted, the strategic gap boundaries significantly constrain options for local communities to develop meaningful options, which is also internally inconsistent with other Plan objectives.	Refer to infrastructure requirements being acceptable uses within strategic gaps, to support other policies within the draft Plan, and ensure that strategic gap boundaries are appropriately drawn to enable neighbourhood planning to consider spatial options effectively.	See the response to representations on policy SS3.10. Also see the response to comment ID: 477 which agrees to make amendments to the Strategic Gap.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Cllr John Izett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1115	Yes	No	The Borough Council and HCC as landowners note that the policy covers an extensive part of the Manydown estate. The landowners recognise that an appropriate "gap" between Oakley and Basingstoke to prevent coalescence can be maintained in a manner that would also not prejudice the objectives for Manydown during and after the Plan period. Additional flexibility in the policy wording is sought to accommodate infrastructure relating to adjacent allocations, for example green infrastructure. In its current form the policy is unsound because it could hinder the delivery of the emerging housing allocations, which is internally inconsistent. As a wider point, it is considered that strategic gap boundaries should be appropriately drawn to enable an effective approach to neighbourhood planning. As currently drafted, the strategic gap boundaries significantly constrain options for local communities to develop meaningful options, which is also internally inconsistent with other Plan objectives.	Refer to infrastructure requirements being acceptable uses within strategic gaps, to support other policies within the draft Plan, and ensure that strategic gap boundaries are appropriately drawn to enable neighbourhood planning to consider spatial options effectively.	The policy includes flexibility for development in gaps subject to satisfying criteria a), b) and c). See the response to representations on policy SS3.10. Also see the response to comment ID: 477 which agrees to make amendments to the Strategic Gap.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1131	No	No	The strategic gaps are an essential element in the recognition and continuation of a settlement and community and the avoidance of coalescence. A much smaller Gap is proposed in this plan compared with previous versions, which excludes all the land the Borough is proposing for the present phase of Manydown development but is land in joint ownership that may be proposed in the future (and indeed is proposed in the landowners report by Tibbalds). Gap Policy EM2 is ineffective in that it merely protects a piece of land which has no immediate proposals for development in the Plan and gives that protection only for the life of the plan. The "Strategic Gap" policy is ineffective in that it gives no real protection and is a term lacking clear definition or recognition. Further to the designation of the gap, the proposed gap (Policy Map 7a) only extends to the east of Oakley. The gap should be extended around the village to the north and south to a similar extent as to the east.	Extension of the area of the Oakley/Basingstoke gap to the north and south of the village to protect it from encroachment from Basingstoke or expansion of the village that erodes the Gap. Re-Designation of all "Strategic Gap" land as "Green Belt" (as defined in NPPF) with the LPA recognising the Gaps to be permanent in nature and given the protection and support from the NPPF policy on Green Belt land. This to be irrespective of what happens in this plan with the Manydown proposal, for policy EM2 to assure the residents of Oakley in any way of the intentions of the Borough Council in maintaining a gap for the village. The Gap needs to be secured by a policy that will give permanent protection for the land. As the Borough jointly own the land and such purchase was for the good planning of the land, such "good planning" should be to place a permanent covenant on the land to restrict development in the future as is the case with the land around Wotton St Lawrence.	No change. Defining Green Belt land in the location suggested would not satisfy paragraph 82 of the NPPF. This is because a Strategic Gap policy would be sufficiently effective in preventing the coalescence of settlements and maintaining the separate identity of settlements. The emerging Local Plan will cover the period to the year 2029. A new Local Plan will be produced to cover beyond 2029. In preparing the Local Plan beyond 2029, all policies in the adopted Local Plan (2011-2029) will be subject to review, consultation and examination.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurish Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1160	No	No	object to the proposed strategic gap between Basingstoke and Oakley. Unconvinced of the permanence of the designation. The decision to designate the remainder of the landholding as a strategic gap is premature as the LPA has not undertaken an assessment of objectively assessed needs. Therefore have concerns as to whether or not the allocation actually marks the only phase of development at Manydown. Proposal might not be necessary. It is not deliverable or flexible since it lacks any degree of permanence in the long term. Proposed designation is premature and therefore inconsistent with national policy. The plan is not legally compliant given the absence of an appropriate level of cooperation with neighbouring authorities (namely Test Valley, East Hampshire and Winchester).	Review this particular strategic gap.	See the response to representations on policy SS3.10. Also see the response to comment ID: 477 which agrees to make amendments to the Strategic Gap.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps	N/A	Councillor Rob Golding	BDBC	N/A	787795	1292	Not Specified	No	The proposed SPB shown on Map 7a is inconsistent with the proposed SPB in Map 1a. As a result the north eastern corner of the proposed Basingstoke-Oakley strategic gap does not extend as far as the SPB proposed in Map 1a. There is no evidence to justify omitting the rectangular cut out at the north east corner of the strategic gap. There is no need to reduce the gap to allow for development after 2029 as a revised gap could be introduced for the post-2029 plan once there is evidence of the borough's needs beyond the current plan period. The proposed addition to EM2 would render the Basingstoke-Oakley gap meaningless. It would also treat the council as joint landowner of Manydown more favourably than the owners of the land in all the other strategic gaps. I support Policy EM2 as proposed in the Pre-Submission Local Plan.	The northern section of the eastern boundary of the proposed Basingstoke-Oakley gap should be redrawn so that it is a straight line which coincides with the western boundary of the Basingstoke SPB proposed in Map 1a. The gap should NOT be reduced in response to the proposed representations by the Manydown landowners. Policy EM2 should NOT be amended in the way proposed by the Manydown landowners. There would be no objection to clarifying the supporting text by removing the words "small scale" from the start of paragraph 6.14.	See the response to representations on policy SS3.10. Also see the response to comment ID: 477 which agrees to make amendments to the Strategic Gap. The Proposed Settlement Policy Boundary defined in Map 1a should have been the boundary defined on Map 7a.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM3 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	574	Yes	Yes	Supports this policy and its requirements.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM3 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	N/A	Mr Graham Ritchie	Wokingham Borough Council	N/A	625631	545	Not Specified	Yes	Support the policy.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.18	N/A	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	36	Yes	No	I don't see a mention of preventing fire (raising or spreading) on the heathlands.	The council could work with developers and community educators and the police and fire agencies to reduce the risk of fire and make it easier for citizens to put out or report heath fires. Ensuring a sound scheme for bulky waste disposal to discourage fly tipping should help. Involving local people more in fire prevention and extinguishing might reduce the incidence of arson and carelessness.	No change as the policy is considered sound. Paragraph 6.16 states that policy EM3 seeks to avoid the impact of urbanisation on the habitat through increased population within close proximity to the SPA. As indicated in section 3.3 of the draft Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment for the Local Plan (2013), urbanisation issues include such things as fly tipping and increased incidents of fire.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1275	Yes	No	Policy EM4 makes no reference to irreplaceable habitats, (c.f. NPPF Para 118). The policy is thus not consistent with the NPPF. Policy EM4 (and other policies) makes no reference to geodiversity, contrary to the NPPF (paras 109 and 117), and is hence unsound. We advise that policy EM4 will not be effective, due to the vagueness of wording in two areas. Biodiversity monitoring (EM4). It is very unclear which of the " objectives and action plans of the relevant strategies and plans set out in the supporting text of the policy ", the policy will be monitored against. As such it is very unclear whether the monitoring of this policy is justified or effective.	We advise that to address this, an additional line is added after point d) saying " There will be no loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees " We suggest that this can be addressed by changing policy wording in EM4 and supporting text, but given the variety of ways the council may wish to address this point, we do not feel it appropriate to suggest specific wording. This point is made in Para 9.31 of the Sustainability Appraisal (albeit with reference to policy EM1). We advise that to be sound the following changes should be made. "f) Provide a combination of on or off-site provision linked to new development in accordance with council standards;" and "g) Focus mitigation and compensation measures on identified Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and Biodiversity Priority Areas."	Delete part of criteria d) and add as new criterion under criteria d). New criteria to include reference to 'irreplaceable habitats'. Reference to ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees is not required and the policy currently refers to key habitat types. Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre confirmed that there are no defined Local Geological Sites in the Borough. However, will add reference to 'geodiversity' within the policy title and also to the end of paragraph 3 of the policy. 'Geodiversity' is explained in Appendix 3 (Glossary). Paragraph 26 of the council's Living Landscape Strategy identifies ancient woodland as a key habitat type. Amendments to criteria f) and g) are not required - see the Officer changes to the last paragraph and criteria e), f) and g).	Delete the following from criteria d): "or lead to loss or deterioration of a key habitat type, or harm the integrity of linkages between such sites and habitats." Add ";, and" at the end of criteria d). Add two new criteria under criteria d) as follows: "There will be no loss or deterioration of a key habitat type, including irreplaceable habitats; and" "There will be no harm to the integrity of linkages between designated sites and key habitats." Amend policy title as follows: "Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation." Amend paragraph 3 of the policy as follows "...implications for biodiversity and geodiversity."	In response to representation and to add to compliance with paragraph 117 of the NPPF.	Agreed. Made additional changes post MAP to add clarity as follows: criteria e) "There will be ~~Lead to~~ no loss or deterioration of a key habitat type, including irreplaceable habitats. Added new criteria (after e)) as follows "There will be no harm to the integrity of linkages between such designated sites and habitats." Added "...and geodiversity" to the end of paragraph 3. Deleted "mitigation and compensation" from criteria h). The "or" at the end of criteria d) has been replaced with "and". Members queried how geodiversity is relevant to the Borough. Paragraphs 6.4, 6.7 and 6.41 explain the	Natural England agree with changes. Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Submission Local Plan policy EM4 implementation and monitoring box. Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection.
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paragraph 1, including criteria a) to d) and the additional criteria e) and f) and the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph of the policy becomes criteria 1 of the policy.	To tighten the cascade of the policy.	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/1/14 to tighten the cascade of the policy.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend last paragraph of policy, including criteria e), f) and g) as follows: "In order to secure opportunities for biodiversity improvement, relevant development proposals will be required to include proportionate measures to contribute, where possible, to a net gain in biodiversity, through creation, restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features including measures that help to link key habitats. This can be provided through: a) On-site and/ or off-site provision linked to new development in accordance with the council's adopted green space standards; and be b) Focussed on identified Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and Biodiversity Priority Areas as identified in the council's Green Infrastructure Strategy (and subsequent updates) where appropriate. The final paragraph of the policy becomes criteria 4. e), f) and g) become part of criteria 4 and re-listed a) and b).	To add clarity and to tighten the cascade of the policy.	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/1/14 to tighten the cascade of the policy.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Delete the following from the 2nd paragraph of the policy: " ~~...In such cases, as a last resort, compensatory measures will be secured to ensure no net loss of biodiversity.~~ ".	As a result of changes in response to comment: 575.	Post MAP change.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The following text becomes criteria 2: "Development proposals will only be permitted if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development can be avoided or adequately mitigated. Where development proposals do not comply with this they will only be permitted if it has been clearly demonstrated that there is an overriding public need for the proposal which outweighs the need to safeguard biodiversity and there is no satisfactory alternative with less or no harmful impacts. In such cases, as a last resort, compensatory measures will be secured to ensure no net loss of biodiversity."	To tighten the cascade of the policy.	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/1/14 to tighten the cascade of the policy.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	575	Yes	No	Welcomes the policy and its requirements. However, there are concerns that this and other local plan policy are not fully consistent with the requirements of the NPPF. Policy contains no mention of avoidance of impacts. This goes against the requirements of NPPF where in section 152 it states "significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and where possible alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued". Welcomes policy EM4 criteria d). However, the requirements of policy EM4 are not fully reflected in other Local Plan policies i.e. policies SS3 do not fully reflect this requirement, for example Policy SS3.1 criteria h).	There needs to be consistency in all the policies (in particular SS3 policies) to reflect the requirements of Policy EM4. The avoidance of impacts should be included in policy EM4 and reflected throughout the Local Plan.	Add text to ensure consistency with paragraph 118 of the NPPF.		In response to representation and to add to consistency with paragraph 118 NPPF.	Partially agreed by Members. Members considered that the term "significant harm" was too strong. The term "significant harm" accords with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. No change required. Criteria 2) was reworked further post MAP in discussion with the council's Biodiversity Officer. .	Agreed with change.
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The following text becomes criteria 3: ". Applications for development must include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity and geodiversity."	To tighten the cascade of the policy.	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/1/14 to tighten the cascade of the policy.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend 4. to read "In order to secure opportunities for biodiversity improvement, relevant development proposals will be required to include proportionate measures to contribute, where possible, to a net gain in biodiversity, through creation, restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features including measures that help to link key habitats. This can be provided through."	In response to representations	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/1/14. Labour Members requested that "off-site" be removed. Off-site has not been removed but the paragraph now reads on-site and/ or off-site.	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1034	Yes	No	Support the objective to secure opportunities for biodiversity improvement. However, policy should be made more flexible. Where biodiversity measures are sought, this should not be to the detriment of the delivery of affordable because of viability issues. In this event, biodiversity measures should be managed or other requirements reduced. It is not clear what the "Council Standards" are which are referred to in criteria (f).	Policy should state that measures will be required 'where practical', this will make the policy more flexible. This flexibility should apply to physical constraints of a site but also to proposals. To ensure the policy is sound further clarification is required on 'council standards' referred to in criteria f).	Additional flexibility is not required as criteria e) already includes the words 'where possible'. Development proposals and their required mitigation, where required, will be determined on their own merits. The council standards are those within appendix 4 (adopted green space standards). Amend criteria f) accordingly.	Amend criteria f) as follows: "...in accordance with council's adopted green space standards".	In response to representation and for clarity.	Agreed. Removed "in appendix 4) post MAP.	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	635	Yes	No	NPPF113 Borough does not have sound "criteria based policies for ancient woodland..... will be judged. One example, trees can grow to 30/40 metres when houses built. NPPF117 Does not promote preservation, restoration, re-creation of priority habitats. NPPF118 no explicit protection and enhancement of ancient woodland and inadequate provision in existing SPD's. NPPF113 No recognition for habitat and biodiversity condition criteria.NERC Act S41lists Habitats/Species of Importance. A habitat may be poor but species rich if managed.S41 + the Borough/County list of "species of concern"/BAP species should inform. Local species and populations valued by communities. Evaluate food capacity & conditions for sustainable populations e.g. invertebrate food for larvae/adults. Huge loss of habitat from development/industrial farming. BOA's/BPA's focus but do not exclude habitat/species needs in valuable urban areas where people. Birdsfoot Trefoil may not be rare but in short supply. Material!	Add: Policy that requires a default minimum 50 metre buffer for ancient woodland unless there are overriding arguments for less. Add. Policy that derives habitat need from evidence on habitat extent, condition and management. amend: Policy EM4 - Habitats. Bio.... amend a) There will ... status of key habitats and species including those identified in S41 of the NERC Act, the Borough list of species of concern or any that are found in addition to that list, County priority species and; new d) communities do not lose access to uncommon species associated with their area new e) There will be no harm to habitats identified as necessary for connecting or improving the viability of landscapes or landscape features necessary to create and maintain viable and sustainable populations of flora and fauna. amend g) and areas of deficit, high value and important connectivity in other areas. new h) The availability of food capable of supporting viable populations	No change. The council's Landscape and Biodiversity SPD requires a minimum buffer of 20 metres. The council's SPD was subject to public consultation. This is above Natural England's minimum standard of 15m as set out in their Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland. Wherever possible through negotiation, the council will seek standards above the minimum 20 metres buffer. The amendments to the criteria and new suggested criteria are not required as the policy is already considered consistent with the NPPF. The additional criteria suggested will be more suited for inclusion within a SPD. Once the Local Plan is adopted, the council will need to update its Biodiversity and Landscape SPD to reflect the new policies. Any new or updated SPD will be subject to public consultation.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	N/A	N/A	121767	429	Yes	No	Policy is too narrowly focussed on the protection of designated sites and does not address the need to conserve and enhance biodiversity outside of protected areas. The policy contains too many derogations and mitigation measures, which on a piecemeal basis are likely to end with a net loss to biodiversity. The Plan should be more ambitious and work proactively with the HWT and other local groups to enhance the biodiversity of sites whether or not they are designated.	The policy needs to take a more holistic approach to biodiversity and nature conservation and ensure that it is considered as a mainstream objective.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The policy provides a framework for conserving and enhancing the borough's existing biodiversity assets including those designated at a European (criteria a)), national (criteria b)) and local level (criteria c)) but also non designated habitats and features (criteria d)).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1220	Yes	No	As with EM1, the all-embracing nature of the wording places an undue burden on a very high proportion of applicants. Most of the developed areas of the borough (which is where a majority of planning applications are made in terms of numbers of applications not number of dwellings etc.) presents no potential for impact on biodiversity. The requirement that "applications for development must include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity" sets the impossible task of proving a negative.	The policy should be amended to read: "on greenfield sites, sites in or adjacent to the countryside or open space, and sites that include or are adjacent to biodiversity designated sites, applications for development must include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity."	No change the policy is already considered sound. The policy applies to all development proposals and includes sufficient flexibility as demonstrated through the paragraph "Applications for development must include adequate and proportionate information..." The council's adopted Landscape and Biodiversity SPD includes guidance for applicants. The SPD includes checklists in Appendix 8 that lists the matters to be considered.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	661	Not Specified	Yes	We support the overall aim to provide a net gain in biodiversity and that there will be no adverse impact on the conservation status of key species and designated sites.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM4 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	Policy EM4 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend criteria f) as follows: "...on-site and/ or off-site provision..."	To add clarity.	In response to comments made at the MAP on 9/11/14. Labour Members requested that "off-site" be removed. Off-site has not been removed but the paragraph now reads on-site and/ or off-site.	N/A
6.22	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend paragraph as follows: "The council has will set meaningful, time-bound targets for habitat creation and restoration within the council's Green Infrastructure Strategy, and where appropriate, will seek..."	Factual update as Green Infrastructure (July 2013) is now adopted.	Agreed	N/A
6.23	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	637	Yes	No	There should be a presumption against damage to a habitat where that habitat is long established or rare or where there is no evidence that translocation of habitat or species will work. While it is possible to recreate some habitats there is a great likelihood that species will be lost forever, including ones not yet understood. The JNCC stated in a report in 2003 referenced in the Bolnore Village Enquiry page 139 that "The translocation of habitats is considered by the statutory conservation agencies not to be an acceptable alternative to in situ conservation. The statutory conservation agencies will continue to make the strongest possible case against trans locating habitats from within SSSIs and from ancient habitats (or other areas with significant biodiversity interest) elsewhere." See also page 138 paras 8.221 to 8.224 ending with this from English Nature with regard to acid grassland turf "The suggested translocation of soils is not a substitute for in situ conservation."	Amend 6.23 Ancient habitats including those listed as Habitats of Principal Importance whether ancient woodlands, grasslands, wetlands etc are now so rare that there should be a presumption against development or change. England has only 2.5% of land covered with ancient woodland and about the same with old grasslands. To say that it is ever necessary to develop such small remaining areas of land under any circumstances when 97.5% of land is available should be regarded as unacceptable not least because there is not always the evidence to say what additional species may be lost but there certainly is not the evidence to say why it does not matter.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The policy provides a framework for conserving and enhancing the borough's existing biodiversity assets including those designated at a European (criteria a)), national (criteria b)) and local level (criteria d) and also undesignated key habitats. In response to comment ID 1275, amended the title of the policy as follows "Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation." and also amend paragraph 3 of the policy as follows "...Implications for biodiversity and geodiversity."	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
6.23	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend paragraph as follows for clarity: "Where it has been clearly demonstrated there is no satisfactory alternative to a development proposal including allocated sites, where there could be harm to biodiversity interest, the risks..."	To add clarity.	Post MAP change.	N/A
6.24	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	638	Yes	No	As for 6.23 there is too great an emphasis on offsite provision and not enough recognition for all types of habitats of principal importance that are rare and especially where they are ancient. There is so little left and there is so much that has been damaged already we should say no. In addition only surveys of flora and fauna at least 2 or 3 times in a full year will come anywhere near to determining the true value of a site	see 6.23. Habitats of Principal Importance are now so rare that development will not normally be permitted and not without comprehensive surveys of flora and fauna.	No change. See response to comment ID575 and additional text that has been added to the policy as a result. The additional text refers to avoid significant harm to biodiversity which accords with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. The policy also requires applications for development to include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity and geodiversity (see response to comment ID1275). As indicated in paragraph 6.20 the policy provides a framework for conserving and enhancing the borough's existing biodiversity assets while enabling opportunities to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
6.24	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Add the following text to the paragraph: "...within areas of open space linked to new development (see the council's adopted green space standards), and/ or off-site provision..." Also, amend 4th sentence of paragraph as follows: "...translocation schemes if where success is likely to be higher..."	To add clarity.	Added post MAP to add clarity. Members requested changes be made to the policy to add clarity. Labour Members requested that "off-site" removed Off-site has not been removed but the paragraph now reads on-site and/ or off-site. Additional change post MAP was made to change "where" to "if".	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
6.24	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1276	Yes	No	Para 6.23 discusses compensation measures. Frequently it is assumed that a replacement ratio of 1:1 is adequate for compensation. However, compensation measures will typically not achieve the objective of ensuring no net loss to biodiversity, if this ratio is applied, due to the time lag in achieving a similar habitat quality, and the risks that the compensatory measure will fail to deliver adequate quality. We advise that the policy will not be effective (and is hence unsound)	Unless appropriate wording such as " In determining the level of compensation, factors including delivery risk and time lags between loss of habitat and recreation of similar quality habitat will be considered ." is added.	Add suggested wording to the end of paragraph 6.24. Change will add to the effectiveness of the policy.	Add the following text to the end of paragraph 6.24: " <u>In determining the level of compensation to ensure no net loss of biodiversity, or where possible a net gain, factors including delivery risk and time lags between loss of habitat and the creation of similar quality habitat will be considered.</u> "	In response to representation and to add to the effectiveness of the policy.	Members felt the additional wording did not reflect the what the representation was trying to get at. The wording added is the wording suggested by Natural England. Some additional wording/ amendments have been made post MAP to add emphasis as follows: ""In determining the level of compensation to ensure no net loss of biodiversity, or where possible a net gain, factors including delivery risk and time lags between loss of habitat and the recreation of similar quality habitat will be considered."	Agree with change.
6.26	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend paragraph as follows: "The locations of nationally designated sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (i.e. SSSIs) are identified on the Policies Map. <u>Locally designated sites (such as SINCs and LNRs) are identified within the council's Living Landscapes natural environment strategy.</u> ~~→~~ and priority areas for habitat creation and restoration are identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy. <u>Locally designated sites (SINCS) are designated, amended and/or deleted on an annual basis.</u> "	For clarity and to provide information to the reader.	Amendments taken to MAPs were partially agreed. Additional amendments made Post MAP to clarify that LNRs are designated locally. Text amended as follows post MAP: "The locations of nationally designated sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (i.e. SSSIs) are identified on the Policies Map, locally designated sites (such as SINCs and LNRs) are identified within the council's Living Landscapes natural environment strategy. Priority areas for habitat creation and restoration are identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy. Locally designated sites (SINCS) are	N/A
6.27	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	639	Yes	No	As mentioned earlier it is not just the rare species of flora and fauna or habitats but the food capacity and size of population we need in order to build and sustain viable populations, which may be quite small in a local context but may be large elsewhere. Are we to say that a small grassland or even recent woodland with important but not rare food species can be developed when we do not know what species of invertebrate use it or how many, or have no estimation of how much habitat of that type is available, the spread of population or understand the fragmentation and other impacts of its removal on flora and fauna genetic diversity? We need evidence on habitat availability and condition so that meaningful judgements can be made.	Any change may need to be made elsewhere. We need a checklist of factors such as total amount of habitat and quality, connectivity, species success or decline in the Borough to assess any consequences of development before any decision in principle is taken. Local circumstances as well as national designations should be recognised to be important determinants of whether development is justified or not.	No change. The policy requires applications for development to include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity and geodiversity. Local and national designations are material considerations in decision making.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
6.28	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	641	Yes	No	The statement is unclear about what a potential developer would be required to provide and that needs to be defined but to be as smart as possible factors should include; the type of habitat(s) (which implies possible flora and fauna), flora and relevant fauna surveys, local knowledge of flora and fauna, existing or possible connectivity importance. It would then be possible to deduce species that would likely colonise. To do surveys comprehensively of even flora requires at least 2 visits in one year. The alternative is to survey all significant species. That is unlikely unless there are exceptional circumstances but it is the only way accurate data can be collected.	Define list of criteria to use to make a site assessment as suggested above. Add. The LPA will request flora and fauna information of the applicant and from local sources and also assess the biodiversity value and opportunities of the site.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The Council expects all ecological surveys and impact assessment work to be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist(s). Ecological surveys/assessments and impact assessment are expected to follow the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and other appropriate best practice guidance. The council's adopted Landscape and Biodiversity SPD includes guidance for applicants on the assessment work that is required. The SPD includes checklists in Appendix 8 that lists the matters to be considered.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
6.28	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	270	Yes	No	As with the policy this is too sweeping and is irrelevant to many if not most smaller scale and householder development, placing an inappropriate burden on applicants and adding unnecessary weight, delay and cost to the planning process. How is a typical applicant to know what constitutes 'adequate and proportionate information' in this specialist context? If, as in many cases, the LPA responds asking for further information, then sometimes for yet further information, how is the applicant to understand at what point to rest?	Since the paragraph more or less repeats wording in the policy itself, it appears to add no value and can safely be removed. Failing this, it should be amended to read; "For sites identified through the policy, applications"	Delete first sentence of paragraph 6.28.	Delete first sentence of paragraph 6.28: " ~~Applications for development must include adequate and proportionate information to enable a proper assessment of the implications for biodiversity.~~ "	In response to representation and to delete repetition between policy and supporting text.	Agreed.	Agreed with change.
6.28	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1221	Yes	No	Should not apply to all applications. Places an impossible burden on the resident who wants to extend his dwelling in an urban street how can he or she know what is meant by 'adequate and proportionate information'. Under the previous Local Plan there has been a particular problem in relation to bat surveys and this should be addressed under EM4. Minor planning applications are unduly delayed when the Council determines, long after an application has been submitted, the need for a bat survey. Because such surveys have a seasonal aspect this can cause very long delays as well as unforeseen costs for applicants. The Council should undertake that advice on the need for a bat survey will be provided at pre-app stage. As well as removing a serious problem for applicants his will assist the Council to meet the requirement to positively assist applicants and to meet targets for determining applications.	Assuming the change to EM4 is agreed, this could be amended to read: for sites covered by the policy, applications for development must include Add a paragraph: "for minor developments, including householder applications, the Council will advise, at pre-application advice stage, whether or not the application will give rise to the need for a bat survey."	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with the NPPF. As per paragraph 189 of the NPPF the council encourages its pre-application service however the council cannot require a developer/ applicant engages with them before submitting a planning application. Where pre-application advice is given the council's commitment, as indicated on its website, will be to respond proportionately to the level of information submitted. Planning officers will provide accurate and objective advice in good faith, based on the information provided, but without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application by either officers or members of the Development Control Committee. Planning applications are also determined on their own merits.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	642	Yes	No	Ensure recognition for the role of natural green space habitats	Amend. The Council will seek to protect, enhance and expand public open space including multi-functional and natural green space. Amend. Consideration will be given to an off-site financial contribution towards the enhancement of existing facilities including multi-functional and natural green space. Add g) there has been community consultation appropriate to the impact of the proposed development on the local or wider community.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The word expand is not required in the 3rd paragraph. As noted in paragraph 6.31 of the Local Plan the council will work in partnership to provide, protect, maintain and enhance the borough's network of green space. The suggested amendment to the last paragraph of the policy to include "existing facilities including multi-functional and natural green spaces..." is not required as the supporting text to the policy at paragraph 6.29 provides examples of multi-functional green space. The suggested amendment to criteria g) is not required - planning applications are subject to a public consultation period.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1196	Yes	No	" Implementation and Monitoring" p88 states that implementation etc., will be specifically through Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS). An important and basic part of GIS concerns the two Biodiversity Priority Areas (BPA) rivers Loddon and Test shown on plans 26 & 27, which are to be researched and assessed as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA). Object to that part of river Loddon in Plan 26 east of Policy SS3.9 because the northern boundary of the BPA is drawn far too tightly against the river, and the Catchment area should include the currently undeveloped part of the watershed starting at Park Pale and A33. While SS3.9 is geographically within the Loddon catchment it is not within the BOA. It is, however close to the boundary of the BPA and as such will play an important function in supporting the native habitats of the BPA. The inclusion of SS3.9 in this valley will compromise the proposals for green infrastructure.	1. Amend Plan 26 of the Green Infrastructure Strategy by including the land North of the river Loddon up to Park Pale and A33 as part of the catchment area. 2. Amend the North boundary of the hatched BPA research area of river Loddon further North, eastwards towards Park Pale.	The amendments relate to the GI Strategy rather than the Local Plan and therefore have been redirected to the appropriate team	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1036	Yes	No	It should be recognised in criteria (f) where open space is underused, re-provision on a smaller scale but more usable, accessible and of a higher quality is beneficial, particularly in regeneration projects. This should be recognised as exceptional circumstances for loss of open space as it contributes more widely to improving quality of life. Criteria (f) should specifically refer to 100% affordable housing as a benefit that will outweigh the loss of green space, as it will go towards meeting local need.	Amend criteria d) to recognise that where open space is underused, re-provision on a smaller scale but more usable, accessible and of a higher quality is beneficial, particularly in regeneration projects. Amend criteria (f) to specifically refer to 100% affordable housing as a benefit that will outweigh the loss of green space.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraph 74 of the NPPF. Specific reference to "100% affordable housing" is not required. Development proposals will be assessed on their own merits.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	715	Yes	No	HCC will need to place more reliance on service delivery through reinvesting the proceeds of sales for surplus assets. In terms of school playing fields, the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 requires the Secretary of State must give prior approval for such disposals, and the proceeds to be re-invested in sports / educational facilities. In addition to like for like replacement, there are other ways of replacing playing fields and often feasible to offset the loss through agreement to allow sports and recreational facilities within school grounds to be used by the local community. Request that the 1998 Act is acknowledged re: school playing fields. This is justified and effective as it goes beyond traditional planning and allows for flexibility in line with 2.10 of PINS guidance on LDFs (2009). This has taken place with the plans in Havant (DM1) and New Forest District (Para 2.30).	Add the following to EM5: 'Should the Local Education Authority receive approval for the disposal of surplus school land from the Secretary of State under Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, the reinvestment of any proceeds from the sale of the land in education and / or sporting services, as required by the Act, will be regarded as satisfying the objectives of the policy'.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording would make the policy overly specific. Furthermore, there is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined by HCC, subject to appropriate justification.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	273	Yes	No	The policy is too sweeping and generalise. As written it requires all applicants for all types of developments to have read, studied and understood the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy; to know in detail the 'green infrastructure network' (although in many areas this has not been clearly defined or categorised); to estimate or guess what is meant by 'undue pressure' on the network; and to estimate or guess what would represent 'full mitigation' of such pressure. Most if not all of these matters are subjective in their nature, leaving it open to the LPA and its advisors to set requirements that cannot with any certainty be predicted by even a professional developer. It flies in the face of reason and natural justice, let alone national guidance for the Council to set such broad and ill-defined requirements for all developments.	The policy having clearly been drafted with large scale developments mainly in mind, the following paragraph should be added as the final paragraph of the policy: "Through pre-application consultation, the Council will advise applicants whether, in the Council's view and with reasons, the proposed development is likely to impact on or give rise to requirements for green infrastructure, the extent of such impacts or requirements, and how best the development can avoid or mitigate impacts or make the appropriate provision." Note that this is what already happens in the case of large scale applications. In the case of many small scale applications all the Council need do is to confirm 'no impact or requirement', thereby streamlining the process and removing uncertainty for applicants and the LPA. Unfairly, in the case of one-off applications, any requirements are left to be uncovered later in the process, occasioning delays and costs for LPA and applicant.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. As per paragraph 189 of the NPPF the council encourages its pre-application service however the council cannot require a developer/ applicant engages with them before submitting a planning application. Where pre-application advice is given the council's commitment, as indicated on its website, will be to respond proportionately to the level of information submitted. Planning officers will provide accurate and objective advice in good faith, based on the information provided, but without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application by either officers or members of the Development Control Committee. Planning applications are also determined on their own merits.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	HCC	N/A	786148	594	Yes	Yes	The contribution of the historic environment to green infrastructure could usefully be more explicitly addressed than in Para 6.31, which has an unfortunate implication of historic environment making a contribution only in a visual sense. The historic environment contribution to Green Infrastructure is much wider than that.	See comment ID 569.	See comment ID 569.	As per amendments in response to comment ID 163 and 569.	In response to representation and to add clarity.	Agreed.	withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	662	Not Specified	Yes	We are satisfied that the policy will ensure that green infrastructure is improved within the Borough. We support the inclusion of river corridors within the examples of multi-functional green space. (Para 6.29). We support paragraph 6.31 and the overall approach to GI within the borough to, inter alia, provide, protect, and maintain a wide range of existing green infrastructure, support biodiversity conservation, mitigate and adapt to climate change through natural drainage, flood water storage etc.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	782	Not Specified	No	Support: As with CN6 and CN7, the criteria in the policy are flexible and can be read either way: "The council will seek to protect and enhance existing public open space. Proposals for the redevelopment of public and private open spaces will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that: a) Replacement areas will be at least equivalent in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility, and there will be no overall negative impact on the provision of green infrastructure; or e) A robust assessment clearly demonstrates that the space is surplus to local requirements and will not be needed in the long-term in accordance with the council's local standards; or f) The proposal is for alternative recreational provision which meets evidence of local need in such a way as to outweigh the loss." There is no need to amend this policy so far as our Client is concerned.	There is no need to amend this policy so far as our Client is concerned.	Support noted.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1252	Yes	No	Under Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act (1998), the Secretary of State for Education must give prior approval for the disposal of school playing fields by requiring the LEA to demonstrate that the land is surplus to the requirements of both the host or neighbouring schools and that the sale proceeds are "ring-fenced" for reinvestment into improved sports and educational facilities. In addition to like-for-like replacement, there are other ways in which surplus school playing fields can be replaced in terms of equivalent quantity or quality. For instance, where a school site is "over-landed" and it is not necessary to replace playing fields, the proceeds from the sale of surplus land are required to be reinvested for other sport and recreational educational infrastructure. Section 77 thus meets the intentions of Policy EM5 as a mechanism to utilise surplus school playing fields to re-invest in educational infrastructure to serve local need.	To provide greater certainty and clarity, the County Council requests that the role of Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 is acknowledged under Policy EM5. This is justified and effective because it goes beyond traditional land use planning by integrating policies for development with programmes from other organisations that influence the nature and functioning of places. It also allows a flexible response to changing circumstances regarding the delivery of education infrastructure. The following should be included as supporting text to Policy EM5: In the circumstance where the Education Authority has received approval for the disposal of surplus school playing fields from the Secretary of State, in accordance with Section 77 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998, and where equivalent or greater community benefits are provided, this will be regarded as satisfying the objectives of this policy.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and incorporating the requested wording would make the policy overly specific. Furthermore, there is already sufficient flexibility within the policy in order to address the kinds of scenario outlined by HCC, subject to appropriate justification.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.29	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1280	Yes	No	The subject is not GI per se, but rather variously, the green infrastructure strategy, the green infrastructure network, public open space and green space. There is no definition of green infrastructure (what classes of assets it includes) and its relationship with the green infrastructure strategy, the green infrastructure network, public open space and green space. For this reason, it is unlikely to be effective. Is not consistent with NPPF 114. The current policy allows for the degradation of green infrastructure, for example, by damage to assets. The allocations are likely to degrade the public right of way network, and likely to reduce access to land informally used as Public Open Space. There is no recognition in the plan (and little in the SA) that this impact is likely, and no policy requirement to compensate for this. The monitoring appears to be solely concerned with the provision of new GI, and not the possible detrimental impacts on the existing GI resource.	We suggest that these points can be addressed by changing policy wording in EM5 and supporting text, but given the variety of ways the council may wish to address this point, we do not feel it appropriate to suggest specific wording. While Para 6.97 makes reference to light pollution, it does not make reference to the types of impacts listed in NPPF Para 125, namely local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. In our view the latter two can often be overlooked, and to be effective the plan should include reference to these in this Para. The plan should map ecological networks so as to be consistent with the NPPF Para. 117. The plan has not mapped ecological networks	Add to the start of paragraph 6.29: "Green infrastructure is a network of green spaces and other environmental features which provides a built-functional green space resource." Regarding the comment on allocations, detailed Site Assessment indicates why the sites were selected for allocation taking account of suitability for development and the ability to achieve this sustainably, taking account of cumulative impacts. Policies SS33.1 to SS3.11 of the Local Plan also include detailed criteria which development proposals on these sites must accord with. The allocated sites will also provide new public rights of way (where required) and open space. For completeness, an additional criteria after criteria e) of policy EM1 regarding "intrinsically dark landscapes" has been added - see response to CPRE (comment IS: 1238). Additional text with regards to light pollution is not required as paragraph 6.97 (supporting text to policy EM12 (Pollution) refers to light pollution and impacts light pollution may have on local amenity. Policy EM12 also refers to "Development proposals will be permitted provided that it does not result in pollution which...poses unacceptable risks to...the natural environment." Whilst the intention of Para 117 of the NPPF is noted, it is considered that the local ecological network is evolving and therefore to map local SINC's (which are regularly reviewed) on the Local Plan policies map is not suitable. It is considered a more suitable approach to map national designations and keep an up to date schedule of local assets which are available for all to view. Amendments have been made to paragraph 6.26 which now states: "The locations of nationally designated sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (i.e SS3's) are identified on the Policies Map. Locally designated sites (such as SINC's and LNR's) are identified within the council's Living Landscapes natural environment strategy. Priority areas for habitat creation and restoration are identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy. Locally designated sites (SINC's) are designated, amended and /or deleted on an annual basis." The council will continue to work with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership on this matter and have	Add the following to the start of paragraph 6.29: "Green infrastructure is a network of green spaces and other environmental features which provides a multi-functional green space resource."	Response to representation. Suggested changes will add to the soundness of the policy and consistency with the NPPF.	Agreed	Natural England agree with the recommended changes. Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Submission Local Plan policy EM5, policy EM5 implementation and monitoring box, para 6.105 (6.97 of the Pre Submission Local Plan) . Natural England were satisfied that these amendments overcome their objection.
6.29	N/A	Mr Paul Beevers 1	N/A	N/A	86020	645	Yes	No	It is important that examples explicitly include natural green space	Add; natural habitats and local nature reserves	Add 'local nature reserves' into the paragraph under 'accessible countryside and woodland' for comprehensiveness.	Add 'local nature reserves' into the paragraph under 'accessible countryside and woodland'	In response to representation and for comprehensiveness.	Agreed - requested clarification that LNRs are designated by the Borough Council. Policy EM4 criteria d) clarifies that LNRs are locally designated sites. Added LNR to the glossary - "Sites with wildlife or geological features that are of special interest locally and/or offer people special opportunities to study or learn about nature or simply to enjoy it. They are designated by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council."	Remains outstanding
6.29	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	674	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support the inclusion of river corridors within the examples of multi-functional green space. (Para 6.29).	intentionally left blank	Support noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.31	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	In the penultimate bullet point of the paragraph amend as follows: "contribute to the <u>conservation protection</u> ..."	For consistency with changes suggested and made to Policy EM11.	Agreed.	N/A
6.31	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	163	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes the recognition of the "historic dimension", but as drafted the text implies that the historic dimension is only part of visual amenity, whereas it is, of course, much more. It would be better to simply say "...landscape quality and character, visual amenity and the historic environment."	intentionally left blank	Amend paragraph as suggested. Change will add clarity.	Amend penultimate bullet point in paragraph 6.31 as follows: "...landscape quality and character, and visual amenity including the historic dimension and the historic environment."	Response to representation and to add clarity.	Agreed	Remains outstanding
6.31	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	749	Yes	No	The contribution of the historic environment to green infrastructure could usefully be more explicitly addressed than in Para 6.31. The contribution of the historic environment to green infrastructure is much more than just visual.	Amend second bullet to read: "...provide opportunities for informal recreation and access to nature and heritage within appropriate distance thresholds...". Amend the last bullet to "...landscape quality and character, and visual amenity including historic and archaeological sites".	Amendments to the second bullet point and the second to last bullet point in response to representations (comment ID 163) from English Heritage and David Hopkins (HCC) (comment ID 569) include the suggested changes.	As per amendments in response to comment ID 163 and 569.	N/A	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
6.31	N/A	Mr David Flint	N/A	N/A	778560	14	Yes	Yes	I support the proposal to enhance the network of high quality "multi-functional" green space.	I propose planting an Oakley Jubilee Wood adjacent to Cowdown Copse in Oakley as proposed by Jubiloaks (Jubilee Wood Oakley Supporters) with the support of Oakley and Deane Parish Council and as submitted to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in January 2013. I propose that green corridors be created by strengthening the existing hedgerows and by planting trees along: a. The new multi-user pathway from Kempshott to Oakley b. The old drove road from Fuzzy Drove to Pardown and to Bull's Bushes Copse c. The old Roman Road from Pack Lane to Old Down Woodland Park	Support noted. The policy provides a framework to provide, protect, maintain and enhance the borough's green infrastructure.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.31	N/A	Sheila Peacock	N/A	N/A	781532	37	Yes	No	I see no specific targets for reducing the use of fossil fuels or cars in any of the new developments.	I think you should set specific targets, such as proportion of two-car households (low), proportion of electric cars (high), percentage time that central heating should be needed to keep house temperatures above 16 deg C (say), proportion of children who can walk to the new schools (a large majority) and frequency and capacity of public-transport services (e.g. what proportion of the working residents can be conveyed to Basingstoke Station by bus (or tram!) in the mornings to catch commuter services to London - and can local jobs be provided for the remainder so they don't need to take their cars into town?). It should be possible to work out such targets on the basis of existing information on employment destinations of borough residents.	The Local Plan must be read as a whole. Policy CP9 requires development to minimise the need to travel, promote opportunities for sustainable transport modes (including non-car modes), improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future. New development is regulated by Building Regulations e.g. Part L (Conservation of fuel and power). The Government's zero carbon buildings policy is for new homes to be zero carbon by 2016. A new criteria has been added to policy EM10 (Delivering high quality development) which requires development proposals to minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design, layout, orientation, massing, materials, landform and landscaping; and facilitate the incorporation of low carbon and renewable energy technologies as much as is feasible and viable. The suggested targets are not considered suitable for a Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.31	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	HCC	N/A	786148	569	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	I think that some wording in paragraph 6.31 would help acknowledge the contribution the historic environment can make to green infrastructure. In paragraph 6.31, the second bullet point could read "...nature and heritage..." In paragraph 6.31 second to last bullet point "...including historic and archaeological sites".	No change to second bullet point as the council has no distance threshold for recreation and access to heritage assets. Amendments to second to last bullet point in response to comment ID 163 from English Heritage and comment ID 749 from HCC satisfy the suggested change. HCC confirmed via email on 9 September 2014 that they were satisfied with the amendments.	As above (comment 163) plus additional wording at the end of the sentence "...including archaeological sites"	Response to representation	Agreed.	Withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
6.31	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Envionment Agency	N/A	786309	675	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support paragraph 6.31 and the overall approach to Gi within the borough to, inter alia, provide, protect, and maintain a wide range of existing green infrastructure, support biodiversity conservation, mitigate and adapt to climate change through natural drainage, flood water storage etc.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.33	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	275	Yes	No	Its not clear how, if at all, this paragraph adds value to the policy or the Plan. It appears to simply repeat sentiments already expressed?	Remove the paragraph unless someone can explain how it adds value to the Plan.	No change. The paragraph is necessary as it sets the scene and relates to countryside areas in the borough. Paragraph 6.32 sets the scene and relates to Basingstoke town.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.33	deleted	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Delete Para 6.33	For consistency	N/A	N/A
6.36	6.35	Mr Pete Errington	HCC	N/A	658243	723	Yes	No	Appendix 3 defines infrastructure as including open space and CN5 requires infrastructure 'to meet the needs and requirements that are expected to arise from that development' However, Para 6.36 implies that allocated sites will be required to remedy any existing deficiencies in open space, which appears unreasonable and unjustified.	Delete the second sentence in Para 6.36 as it contradicts CN5.	For clarity amend the second sentence to state that " ~~The council will support~~ opportunities for..."	Amend second sentence as follows: " ~~in-addition, The council will support~~ opportunities for remedying deficiencies..."	In response to representation and for clarity.	Agreed.	withdrawn/agreed with change
6.36	6.35	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1253	Yes	No	Appendix 3 defines " infrastructure " as including open space, and Policy CN5 requires infrastructure provision " to meet the needs and requirements that are expected to arise from that development ". However, under Policy EM5, the second sentence of Paragraph 6.36 implies that allocated sites will be required to remedy any existing deficiencies in open space. This appears to be unreasonable and unjustified.	Delete the second sentence in Paragraph 6.36 as it could be interpreted as contradicting Policy CN5.	For clarity amend the second sentence to state that " ~~The council will support~~ opportunities for..."	Amend second sentence as follows: " ~~in-addition, The council will support~~ opportunities for remedying deficiencies..."	In response to representation and for clarity.	Agreed.	withdrawn/agreed with change
New paragraph	6.36	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Para inserted into supporting text regarding Manydown Country Park.	For consistency with SS3.10	N/A	N/A
6.37	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	To read "The Council's adopted greenspace, sport and recreation standards".	For clarity	N/A	N/A
6.37	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Refers to open space standards being in appendix 3. This should be appendix 4.	Change to appendix 4	Typographical error	Agreed.	N/A
Policy EM5 - Green Infrastructure - Implementation and Monitoring box	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend second paragraph of "Implementation and Monitoring" box as follows: "...will need to be set out in the relevant <u>masterplan</u> or development brief..."	For consistency with SS3.	Agreed.	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mrs S Campbell	Stratfield Turgis Parish Council	N/A	86126	437	Yes	No	The River Basin Management Plan for the Thames Basin identifies that the Loddon catchment is currently failing to meet the good ecological status of the Water Framework Directive. This is primarily due to treated effluent discharges from the Basingstoke area and in particular phosphate discharged from the Sewage Treatment Works. If it does not meet standards now despite the failure being known how is it going to meet standards in the future when thousands more houses are discharging waste? This is in contravention of Vision and Objectives 2.6 " the need to protect and manage and improve the quality of the borough's water environment in light of growth pressures and given that some of the borough's water bodies do not meet good status under the water framework directive".	Concrete proposals must be made as to how they plan to prevent deterioration in this important area. Exactly how will BDBC 'protect and enhance its quality'(see 6.38) Something more than annual monitoring by the Environment Agency is necessary unless they are content to merely chart its decline. The damage will have been done before any measures can be put in place - assuming there are any measures that will help. How are they going to evaluate the risks to the Basingstoke Chalk and what protection measures can they put in place? Before development starts there must be an action plan already being implemented not just pious words. .	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. No change as the Policy is considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Dr Pauline Holmes	Hampshire and Isle of White Wildlife Trust	N/A	121655	583	Yes	No	Pleased to see the aspirations of the policy but do not believe the policy aspirations will be achieved. Policy as currently worded fails to meet the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and also the NPPF. Monitoring "will be based on the deterioration of an individual elements band status of the borough's water body(ies)" This only takes into account deterioration between the different bands and not any deterioration of water quality within the band itself. As the bands are designed to understand the high-level broad status of water quality it is considered that for monitoring the local plan this is not sufficient. Any deterioration within the band itself is still deterioration and needs to be picked up before it reaches the critical point of moving from one band status to another. Detecting issues of deterioration early will enable identification of causes and potential solutions. This will enable any necessary adjustments to the local plan to be made in a timely approach.	To make the plan sound we would wish to see a change of wording to state that "monitoring will be based on the deterioration of water quality within a band status of the borough's water body(ies)"	The Policy as drafted states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration, Policy SS4 will kick in. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration was within each classification or status, this would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mrs. Maria Miller MP	N/A	N/A	121767	449	Yes	No	The policy contains no substantive measures within it for how to improve water quality. Rather the measures are at best directed at preventing further deterioration and at worst would only be implemented after deterioration. The WCS acknowledges a minor risk around biological and ecological status, but claims risk can be mitigated through monitoring and phasing. This is not good enough and further studies are needed before permission is granted for greenfield development. The treatment works is already operating at the best available technology and more homes will mean no improvement in the health of the river. The river is currently failing to meet a good standard and is therefore failing the EU directive, for which there is a significant fine. The WCS only refers to assessments up to 2021, not 2029, so there is no assessment of capacity for at least 8 years.	Needs to promote partnership working to improve water quality.	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. No change as the Policy is considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	501	Yes	No	Development in Basingstoke which requires further abstraction will impact on the current high levels of phosphates in the River Loddon. No monitoring of the river flow downstream of the towns STW since 2003. New meters are being installed but will not be in action until the end of the financial year 2013/ 2014. It is understood that present day technology cannot improve the river status, and that actions by the Environment Agency might only be deliverable between 2016 and 2021. Considerable doubts as to the ability of the Waste Water Infrastructure to protect the river environment. Policy EM6 is weak, complacent and at odds with Policy CN5. No development should be permitted unless it can be clearly shown that there will be no deterioration in the status of the River Loddon or rivers in the Borough. An essential prerequisite should be that any necessary work to the STW should be identified, funding agreed, and completed before permission for any major development be granted.	Amend policies EM6 and SS4 to match the strength of policy CN5.	Water companies are required to ensure there is adequate supply of water to support new development. They must produce WRM Plans to demonstrate sufficient supply and the measures to achieve this. Abstraction may form a part of these plans. However, the EA require water companies to demonstrate that any plan for further abstraction is sustainable. Therefore the additional development is highly unlikely to be supplied water through additional abstraction. Alternative methods of supply must be found. Although the WFD specifies that good status should be met by 2015, there are circumstances where it is possible to delay meeting good status until 2012 or 2027, or where a lesser objective is required. These circumstances include technical feasibility, disproportional costs, or natural conditions (recovery times). It is likely that these circumstances will lead to an extended deadline to meet good status. The Policy as drafted states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration Policy SS4 will kick in. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration acceptable within each classification or status would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The EA have flagged up to Thames Water STW that require improvements works etc. and this information is submitted to OFWAT to secure funding to enable TW to make these improvements. Currently Chineham and Sherbourne St John STW have been put forward by the EA for improvements.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	371	No	No	Concern that s significant expansion of these communities would not only cause the direct loss of habitat, but can also create increased surface water runoff and flood risks, increased demand on water supplies and increased need for wastewater treatment. This could result in changes in water levels and water quality which would in turn impact on the habitats and species currently found there. With the headwaters of this fragile ecosystem already at carrying capacity, it is doubtful that mitigation would be sufficient to prevent degradation of the remaining habitats. Development should not be proposed if it cannot be demonstrated that the objectives of the WDF can be met. The Plan identifies that the risk of not meeting the status required can be mitigated through monitoring. It does not however identify the means by which good quality status will be achieved. The policy is not therefore consistent with national policy.	Meet the directives of the WFD before any development is undertaken on SS3.9 and SS3.7.	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. No change as the Policy is considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Alan Gibberd 1	N/A	N/A	420886	724	Yes	No	Paragraph 6.38 - The Borough Council will work in partnership to protect, manage and improve the water quality of the borough's water environment. It is accepted that the level of phosphates in the effluent from the STW is six times over the guidelines set by the WFD. Despite this in the opinion of Water Cycle Study the level of proposed development would not result in a drop of the rivers band status. However it is accepted that there is a possibility that monitoring might suggest that there is a deterioration, further development will be prevented until the necessary remedial measures were in place. However monitoring is reactive, not proactive. It only reveals what has happened not what will, by which time the damage has been done. This monitoring must be strictly defined and enforced. It should also be clearly stated what the procedure should be should any deterioration be discovered and a halt to development be required.	I would therefore strongly support Policy CN5 Infrastructure, with its emphasis on development proposals only being permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that infrastructure can be provided and phased to support the requirements of the proposed development. However it must be made clear that this policy will be robustly defended	Although the WFD specifies that good status should be met by 2015, there are circumstances where it is possible to delay meeting good status until 2012 or 2027, or where a lesser objective is required. These circumstances include technical feasibility, disproportional costs, or natural conditions (recovery times). It is likely that these circumstances will lead to an extended deadline to meet good status. The Policy as drafted states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration Policy SS4 will kick in. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration acceptable within each classification or status would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The Policy as drafted states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status".	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Graham Smith	Test Valley Borough Council	N/A	625620	485	Not Specified	Yes	The Council supports this policy, particularly the recognition of the importance of Groundwater Quality within the River Test catchment.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Graham Ritchie	Wokingham Borough Council	N/A	625631	546	Not Specified	Yes	We support this policy.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	26	Yes	No	This comment also applies to 6.45 and 'Implementation and Monitoring' This policy seems to be reactive with regard to discharges into the River Loddon which currently fails to meet EU quality standards. Annual monitoring is inadequate in ensuring that discharge from Chineham treatment works does not adversely affect water quality.	A more robust approach with more frequent monitoring and improvements put in place before the relevant major developments around Basingstoke are allowed to proceed.	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. No change as the Policy is considered sound.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	MS Jeanette Fogg	N/A	N/A	783873	76	No	No	The relevant planning authorities have clearly not examined southern waters 2013 report on the environment and climate change. This report says that it is a water sensitive area. It will it says extract water from rivers in the winter to supplement the water supplies for summer. Secondly a desalination plant will be built to supply the south. 1) this is already more than sensitive it is a drought area where hose pipe bans are the norm. Our river Loddon is polluted many more times than all standards. Our rivers are drying up already. Wildlife will be wiped out in its entirety if this sort of development goes ahead. 2) where is this desalination plant. Southern water have installed water meters in many places here to alleviate the demand for water. A 10% reduction is expected from the use of water meters. Why? Because it is so water stress - water must be monitored carefully. The proposed amount of houses is not sustainable.	Currently aquifers are only 70% full in spite of excessive rainfall last year. If current temperatures continue we have barely two years left with our current water supply. With an increased housing stock of 13000 in this area only it is inevitable than less rainfall will go into the aquifers because of the extra building on greenfield sites. This plus an extra demand on water supplies ensures that at the end of five years water will run out. Plans to build a pipeline from the North to South to replenish water and desalination plants must be built first, and wooden housing considered for future building. These have less impact on the environment. The water running off concrete is polluted and runs not into aquifers but into rivers, rivers then flood because of excess water and rivers run to the sea, the water is warm where it has not gone through the earth to cool it and hence rising sea water and temperatures. Flooding will increase in the South of England.	This policy refers to the water quality of the rivers and in particular the River Loddon and River Test. In terms of water supply, the Council works with the water companies to ensure that their water management plans support the Council's aims and objectives, as set out in the Local Plan. The water companies have confirmed that they can support the number of homes set out in the Local Plan. Therefore the Policy is considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Bruce Batting	N/A	N/A	785794	503	No	No	River Loddon fails to meet the 'good' status under the WFD. Thames Water have previously expressed a view that there was insufficient river flow past the Sewage Treatment Works to dilute the effluent. Any development that would require further abstraction would impact on the current high levels of phosphates. No monitoring of the river flow downstream of the STW since 2003. There are therefore considerable doubts as to the ability of the waste water infrastructure to protect the river environment. SOL believes that the Council needs to be proactive before development is committed particularly when the quality of the Loddon needs to be enhanced and maintained. New infrastructure should be provided prior to occupation of the development.	No development should be permitted unless it can be clearly shown that there will be no deterioration in the status of the River Loddon or rivers in the Borough. An essential prerequisite should be that any necessary work to the STW should be identified, funding agreed, and completed before permission for any major development be granted. SOL PC requests that the wording of EM6 and SS4 should be altered to match the strength of Policy CN5.	Water companies are required to ensure there is adequate supply of water to support new development. They must produce WRM Plans to demonstrate sufficient supply and the measures to achieve this. Abstraction may form a part of these plans. However, the EA require water companies to demonstrate that any plan for further abstraction is sustainable. Therefore the additional development is highly unlikely to be supplied water through additional abstraction. Alternative methods of supply must be found. Although the WFD specifies that good status should be met by 2015, there are circumstances where it is possible to delay meeting good status until 2012 or 2027, or where a lesser objective is required. These circumstances include technical feasibility, disproportional costs, or natural conditions (recovery times). It is likely that these circumstances will lead to an extended deadline to meet good status. The Policy as drafted states that "should monitoring indicate that there is likely to be a deterioration in an elements band status". This means that should monitoring flag up the potential for deterioration Policy SS4 will kick in. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. The Water Framework Directive allows for deterioration within the limits of a status or classification. For example, if dissolved oxygen was currently classified as moderate status, and the limited numerical deterioration acceptable within each classification or status would not constitute a breach of the Directive or be reported as deterioration. The EA have flagged up to Thames Water STW that require improvements works etc. and this information is submitted to OFWAT to secure funding to enable TW to make these improvements. Currently Chineham and Sherbourne St John STW have been put forward by the EA for improvements.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mrs Lorna Cuthill	Mapledurwell and Up Natley Parish Council	N/A	785933	528	Yes	No	As the River Loddon catchment is currently failing to meet the good ecological status of the Water Framework Directive, no development should be allowed to take place until better sewage treatment is in place, and the quality of the River Loddon is improved. Just monitoring will not address the issue.	No development should be allowed to take place until better sewage treatment is in place, and the quality of the River Loddon is improved.	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. No change as the Policy is already considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1068	Yes	No	Page 89 in the Local Plan confirms that the River is currently failing to meet the good ecological status of the river as required by the Water Framework Directive. This is primarily due to the discharge of treated effluent into the River. Studies have identified that further additional discharges of treated sewage could potentially result in a decrease in the biological quality of the river. Development should not be proposed if it cannot be demonstrated that the objectives of the Water Framework Directive can be met. The Plan identifies that the risk of not meeting the status required can be mitigated through monitoring. It does not however identify the means by which good quality status will be achieved. The policy is not therefore consistent with national policy.	Meet the directives of the Water Framework Directive before any development is undertaken on SS3.9 and SS3.7.	The concern is noted. The evidence base (the Water Cycle Study) supports the approach and the level of development proposed in the Local Plan. This was undertaken in partnership with the key stakeholders including water companies and the Environment Agency and is considered a robust approach. The Policy is considered sound.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	663	Not Specified	Yes	We are pleased to see the importance of water quality is recognised in the Pre-submission Local Plan. The policy is a good step toward incorporating the aims and objectives of the Thames River Basin Management Plan (TRBMP). We support the inclusion that SuDS should be incorporated where possible. We support the inclusion of the "Development proposals adjacent to any watercourse will be expected to incorporate measures that are in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the actions of the Thames River Basin Management Plan". We are satisfied that potentially contaminating development will need to demonstrate that groundwater and surface water is protected to prevent deterioration of water quality and pollution of the water source. We are pleased that the policy states..."deterioration in an individual elements band status..."it demonstrates that WFD compliance is based on all elements that make up good status;	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	760	Not Specified	Yes	Support Policy EM6 where it states "The council will work in partnership [with the water companies and others] to protect, manage and improve the water quality of the borough's water environment". Thames Water support the use of sustainable drainage systems in appropriate circumstances. However, it should also stated that sustainable drainage systems are not appropriate for use in all areas, for example areas with high ground water levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage. A well maintained and managed sustainable drainage system is also required to prevent it becoming ineffective, potentially increasing overland flows, and consequently having an impact on the sewerage network. Thames Water were fully supportive of the water cycle study process and its findings. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to review the document with the Council and the Environment Agency on a regular basis in the future to ensure that it remains relevant and up to date.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted and future partnership working is welcomed.	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Ms Gemma Avery	South East Water	N/A	787268	1028	Yes	Yes	We welcome Policy EM6 protect the water quality in the area and ensure there are adequate supplies for the district over the planning period.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted.	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM6 - Water Quality	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	In first sentence of policy, remove semi-colon after environment.	In first sentence of policy, remove semi-colon after environment.	Grammatical correction	Agreed	N/A
6.39	N/A	Mr Michael Wales	N/A	N/A	784586	195	No	No	No mention is made that the River Loddon already fails to meet legislative requirements.	A comment should be added: "The River Loddon does not meet current legislative requirements and the proposed expansion will exacerbate this situation as currently -2013- there are no effective plans by Thames Water to address this situation". "Additional Housing will be dependent upon Thames Water and the Water Regulator putting effective plans into place to address the current legislative failures and provide additional waste capacity prior to more housing being erected".	Comment noted. This is acknowledged in Para 6.43 of the draft Local Plan.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.43	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	676	Yes	Yes	We are pleased that the policy states..."deterioration in an individual elements band status..."it demonstrates that WFD compliance is based on all elements that make up good status; both biological and physio chemical and paragraph 6.43 emphasis that WFD compliance is based on all elements that make up the band status of a water body. We support the inclusion of the "Development proposals adjacent to any watercourse will be expected to incorporate measures that are in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the actions of the Thames River Basin Management Plan". We are satisfied that potentially contaminating development will need to demonstrate that groundwater and surface water is protected to prevent deterioration of water quality and pollution of the water source.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.47	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	677	Yes	Yes	We are pleased to see that Whichchurch and Overton sewage treatment works are referred to specifically in paragraph 6.47 and the need to protect the groundwater body status and to manage impact of new development.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM7 - Managing Flood Risk	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	665	Not Specified	Yes	The policy is in line with national policy and seeks not to increase and potentially reduce flood risk after development has taken place. It clearly outlines the need for flood risk assessments, safe access and egress and to reduce surface water runoff wherever possible. We are pleased to see that paragraph 6.51 states "new development will not be acceptable in Flood Zones 2 or 3.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM7 - Managing Flood Risk	N/A	Mr Mark Mathews	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	N/A	786489	757	Not Specified	No	Thames Water do not object to the Policy in principle, but consider that it should be amended to specifically refer to sewer flooding. Any flood risk policy should include reference to sewer flooding and an acceptance that flooding could occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site infrastructure is not in place ahead of development. It is vital that sewerage/waste water treatment infrastructure is in place ahead of development if sewer flooding issues are to be avoided. It is also important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure, for example: - local network upgrades take around 18 months - sewage treatment works upgrades can take 3-5 years	Amend the Policy to specifically refer to sewer flooding.	The information relating to sewerage infrastructure is noted. Agree to refer to sewer flooding for clarity.	Include reference to sewer flooding in the relevant footnote to read " Flood zone 2 and/or 3, an area that has experienced localised or ground water flooding, at risk of future surface water flooding, at risk of sewer flooding or a site within or upstream of a Critical Drainage Area".	Response to Rep	Agreed	Withdrawn/Agreed with change
Policy EM7 - Managing Flood Risk	N/A	Ms Gemma Avery	South East Water	N/A	787268	1029	Yes	Yes	We support Policy EM7 relating to flood risk and impacts of climate change.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.51	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend to read "For new development, the sequential approach has to be followed in accordance with national guidance. All developments will be requires to manage surface water run-off as part of an overall strategy demonstrating that for developments on Greenfield sites, Greenfield run-off rates can be met and if the site is previously developed that the development reduces run-off rates".	Factual update	N/A	N/A
6.51	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	679	Not Specified	Not Specified	We are pleased to see that paragraph 6.51 states "new development will not be acceptable in Flood Zones 2 or 3.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mrs Louise Dale	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	N/A	627212	720	Yes	Yes	On reviewing the above Local Plan and matters of Sustainability the MOD would be interested with the implementation of biomass, solar heating and the use of photovoltaic cells and the implementation of SUDs. The MODs concern relates to the potential for biomass due to flue stacks which could potentially infringe statutory height safeguarding surfaces. In relation to the use of solar panels or PV cells the MOD is concerned due to the potential increased risk of glare hazardous to air traffic procedures and critical stages of the flight process i.e. take off and landing. A further MOD concern affecting the area of Basingstoke and Deane relates to the development of wind turbines due to their potential to create a physical obstruction to air traffic movements and cause interference to Air Traffic Control radar installations.	In regards to the draft local plan DIO Safeguarding wish to review any planning application that occupies the published statutory safeguarding zones through the statutory consultation process to ensure developments do not obstruct or degrade the operational capability of these defence facilities.	Support noted. Development proposals are assessed on their own merits and statutory consultees will be consulted as appropriate.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mr Martin Heath	N/A	N/A	631343	238	No	No	The Government has just released further guidance as Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy (July 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government). This does not change the underlying framework, but focuses on developing local plans and a positive strategy in addressing the necessary developments. Considerations include: the local potential for renewable and low carbon energy generation - the range of technologies that could be accommodated - different costs and impacts from different technologies - legal commitments by the UK to cut greenhouse gases and meet increased energy demand from renewable sources. Whilst local authorities should design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development, there is no quota which the Local Plan has to deliver	Meet the guidance	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Development proposals and decision making on proposals will take into account government guidance.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	165	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports Policy EM8 for its recognition of the potential impacts of commercial renewable energy generation proposals on the historic environment and heritage assets.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	27	Yes	No	It is not clear how "adverse" other impacts need to be. While in later sections there is reference to wind farms in the AONB, what about solar farms. These could blight the countryside if not well shielded from public view.	Supplementary guidance that gives worked examples of how the balance between "be permitted" unless "adverse impacts". Would, for example, Ellisfield be permitted under this policy? And what if it were in the AONB?	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraph 97 of the NPPF. Development proposals are assessed on their own merits and against the Local Plan as a whole (including policy EM1 - Landscape).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Cllr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	187	Yes	No	There is no requirement for developments to connect to any scheme such as district heating which risks undermining the stated aim of the policy.	Add to Policy EM8 - new developments should connect to any district heating scheme unless they can demonstrate an environmental benefit from not doing so.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The Energy Opportunities Plan sets out opportunities for district heating with CHP in the borough. Policies SS3.7 criteria e) and SS3.8 criteria m) requires development to ensure that renewable energy technologies are harnessed for the sites by utilising opportunities presented by the nearby incinerator and any opportunities this may have for CHP. Paragraph 4.74 of the Local Plan also requires the feasibility of district heating and CHP at Basing View to be explored and incorporated into the redevelopment proposal if both feasible and viable.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mr David Anders	TCI Renewables Limited	N/A	784789		Yes	No	As required by the NPPF the policy requires a planning balancing exercise to be undertaken to weigh any adverse environmental, economic or social impacts of a renewable or low carbon energy generation proposal against the benefits. However, the draft policy is not considered to be fully in accordance with the NPPF as paragraph 14 states proposals for sustainable development (which includes energy generation from renewable and low carbon sources) should be "granted permission unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits".	The policy should be worded to make it clear that a renewable or low carbon energy generation proposal will be permitted unless there would be adverse environmental, economic or social impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.	No change as the policy is already considered sound and consistent with paragraph 97 of the NPPF as the policy refers to "adverse impact" and "cumulative" impacts. The parts of Para 14 quoted are for cases where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mr Michael Harwood	Highclere Parish Council	N/A	786426	729	Yes	No	EM 8 section 6.68 This section is not clear enough about noise and visual impact to protect homes in the area.	EM8 section 6.68 Words to the effect that even small wind turbines should be at least 500 metres from homes and solar farm sites should not be visible from roads.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole including policy EM1 (Landscape) and EM12 (Pollution). The government's "Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy" also includes guidance for wind turbine/ solar farm proposals and decision making. Development proposals are assessed on their own merits.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable/Low Carbon Energy Generation	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1271	Yes	No	Although the Local Plan promotes the use of renewable energy through Policy EM8 - Commercial Renewable / Low Carbon Energy Generation, Hampshire County Council is concerned that the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not make a clear commitment to give consideration to appropriate low carbon and renewable energy technologies. There is potential to incorporate renewable energy technologies in the new development areas and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be designed to maximise this opportunity. Currently it does not reflect the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraph 10 (page 22): "Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change"	Hampshire County Council would recommend the following additional text to the IDP: 34.2 Strategies Energy Opportunities Plan, as set out in the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and low Carbon Development Study (2010) 34.3 Existing provision - Existing renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in Basingstoke - Provision of suitable land for renewable energy infrastructure 34.12 Infrastructure required to support Local plan Estimates of renewable energy infrastructure required to support the Local Plan based on feasibility studies	Add the requested text to the IDP for completeness.	Amend the IDP as follows: 34.2 Strategies Energy Opportunities Plan, as set out in the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and low Carbon Development Study (2010) 34.3 Existing provision - Existing renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in Basingstoke - Provision of suitable land for renewable energy infrastructure 34.12 Infrastructure required to support Local plan Estimates of renewable energy infrastructure required to support the Local Plan based on feasibility studies	In response to representation and for completeness.	Agreed.	withdrawn/agreed with change
6.68	N/A	Mr Andrew Lord	North Wessex Downs AONB	N/A	426054	452	Yes	No	Policy is not consistent with paragraph 116 of the NPPF that states that applications for major development in AONBs should be refused except in exceptional circumstances. Therefore the starting point of policy EM8 that applications should be approved is not consistent with national policy on AONBs.	Policy should be amended to make specific reference to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF that specifically state that the starting point for major applications is refusal in AONBs. Also include reference to the North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on renewable energy (October 2012).	The Local Plan should be read as a whole including policy EM1 (Landscape) which sets out the framework in terms of development within the AONB. Paragraph 6.68 provides further guidance which suitably sits within the supporting text. Reference to current documents within policies has generally been avoided throughout the plan to minimise dating. However, reference has been made to the NPPF and the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan in policy EM1. Reference will be made to the North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on renewable energy.	Reword paragraph 6.68 to include reference to <u>...and the North Wessex Downs AONB Position statement on renewable energy</u> . Deleted footnotes 17 and 18 as <u>superfluous</u> .	In response to representation.	Agreed.	Remains outstanding
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	666	Not Specified	Yes	We support the inclusion of this policy. However, it may be prudent to also recommend the numerical rate i.e. 105l/Wh/d within the policy While we understand the efficiency measures have been informed by the Water Cycle Study.	we would recommend the following be added: Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (CAMS) should also be referred to when addressing sustainable water use. CAMS set out local water resource availability and the wider water situation, including the pressures facing the region. The document in its current form contains no reference to CAMS, which may have implications for any future abstraction activity, and will also emphasise the need for water efficiency measures.	For clarity the numerical rate will be added to the policy as a footnote.	Add footnote text to "level 4" in criteria a) as follows: <u>"This equates to a maximum of 105 litres per person per day."</u>	In response to representation and for clarity and comprehensiveness.	Partially agreed by Members but requested that it should read "This equates to a maximum of 105 litres per person per day."	Agreed with change.
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	N/A	86266	855	Not Specified	No	The policy is contrary to the direction of national policy. The Government has signalled its intention to abandon the Code in its Housing Standards Review (page 40) we would query whether it would be appropriate for the Council to prescribe adherence to a potentially obsolete standard in its local plan. The Council has also failed to assess the cost of this local policy in its viability assessment.	The policy should be deleted.	For clarity, the numerical rate will be inserted as a footnote - see response to comment ID: 666. Add footnote text to criteria b) to explain what Code for Sustainable Homes credit for external water use equates to. The Housing Standards Review is not currently government policy. Factual changes can be made if recommendations in the Housing Standards Review are implemented. The Council has assessed the cost of this policy requirement in its Viability Assessment.	Add footnote text to criteria b) to explain what Code for Sustainable Homes credit for external water use equates to as follows: <u>"This equates to new homes recycling rainwater and reducing the amount of mains drinking water used for external water uses. For example, this could be achieved through the use of such methods as rainwater butts and central rainwater collection systems).</u> "	In response to representation and for clarity.	Partially agreed by Members but requested that it should read "...mains potable drinking water used..."	Remains outstanding
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1202	Yes	No	The NPPF sets out (at paragraph 95) a requirement for local authorities: " When setting any local requirement for a buildings sustainability, to do so in a way consistent with the Governments zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. Draft Policy EM9 is currently not consistent with the Governments future thinking of their zero carbon buildings policy as set out in the Building Regulations Part L consultation (January 2012). Policy EM9 is based both on setting a high Code standard for water use above that of Government policy. This is contrary to the NPPF objectives. It is unclear whether these onerous requirements have been subject to viability testing to ensure the policy is effective. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF indicates that the scale of policy burdens should not threaten viability, and the policy is therefore unsound on this basis. See full response	The draft policy is inconsistent with national policy; the requirements are unduly onerous; may not be effective and have not been subject to any viability testing to ensure they do not impact on the ability to deliver sustainable development. The policy as drafted could prevent or delay the delivery of much needed homes to meet local needs and has not been positively prepared. This policy is unsound and should be deleted.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Paragraph 6.70 explains the evidence for the policy requirement. The Council has assessed the cost of this policy requirement in its Viability Assessment. The Governments Housing Standards Review at paragraph 199 states that achieving 105 litres per person per day can be achieved at a relatively small cost – both in terms of cost to house builders and in usability of the fittings for the householder.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1037	Yes	No	Policy should seek Code Level 3 as a minimum until the buildings regulation changes have been introduced, and seek Code 4 where viable. Seeking higher levels can cause additional costs which could impact on the provision of affordable housing.	Policy should seek Code Level 3 as a minimum until the buildings regulation changes have been introduced, and seek Code 4 where viable.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Paragraph 6.70 explains the evidence for the policy requirement. The Council has assessed the cost of this policy requirement in its Viability Assessment. The Governments Housing Standards Review at paragraph 199 states that achieving 105 litres per person per day can be achieved at a relatively small cost – both in terms of cost to house builders and in usability of the fittings for the householder.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	28	Yes	No	While generally this is a good policy, the opt out on "viability grounds" leaves it a bit open to interpretation. If a low carbon solution costs 20% more now a developer might consider it unviable, but in the long-term it may prove more cost effective as the cost of resources and carbon rises.	More explanation of viability, taking into account some value attributed to carbon footprint and resource usage. Also the time-frame (not now but over a relevant lifetime). Again some worked examples in supplementary guidance of what would pass this test and what would not would help.	No change as the policy is considered consistent with paragraph 173 of the NPPF which states "Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking."	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding.

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Ms Gemma Avery	South East Water	N/A	787268	1030	Yes	Yes	We support Policy EM9 proposing homes are built to code level 4 and non-residential development built to excellent standards to ensure the most water efficient technologies are implemented. This will reduce the pressure on current resources for the growing population and ensure our plans allow for the expected growth across the area.	Policy EM9 might also mention that you plan to ensure there are adequate water resources for the area by supporting the demand side measure and supply options along with the required infrastructure and planning as identified in our WRMP.	Support noted. No change to the policy as the policy is already considered sound. The water company Water Resource Management Plans are referred to within the IDP.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A, Remains outstanding.
Policy EM9 - Sustainable Water Use	N/A	Flavia Estates	Flavia Estates	N/A	787392	1055	No	No	We support the provision of sustainable water measures in association with new housing development to help meet the needs of the local area and national objectives. However, it is considered that the Code for Sustainable Homes standards to be provided as part of any new development should be determined on a site-by-site basis, having regard to site-specific circumstances concerning viability.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support is noted. No change as the policy is already considered sound. The policy includes a flexibility clause which states that the standards apply "...unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it would not be feasible on technical or viability grounds." Development proposals are also assessed on their own merits.	No change.	N/A	N/A	N/A, Remains outstanding.
New Paragraph	6.71	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	666	Not Specified	Yes	We support the inclusion of this policy. However, it may be prudent to also recommend the numerical rate i.e. 105/l/h/d within the policy While we understand the efficiency measures have been informed by the Water Cycle Study.	we would recommend the following be added: Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (CAMS) should also be referred to when addressing sustainable water use. CAMS set out local water resource availability and the wider water situation, including the pressures facing the region. The document in its current form contains no reference to CAMS, which may have implications for any future abstraction activity, and will also emphasise the need for water efficiency measures.	For clarity the numerical rate will be added to the policy as a footnote.	Add the following text as a new paragraph after paragraph 6.70: " <u>Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (CAMS) should also be referred to when addressing sustainable water use. CAMS set out local water resource availability and the wider water situation, including the pressures facing the region.</u> "	In response to representation and for clarity and comprehensiveness.	Partially agreed by Members but requested that it should read "This equates to a <u>maximum</u> of 105 litres per person per day."	Agreed with change.
6.75	6.76	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Remove the word "ancient" before monuments	For consistency	N/A	N/A
6.75	6.76	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	167	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the recognition of the borough's historic environment as 'an important asset forming a vital part of the area's character and local distinctiveness, and the references to heritage assets and the Local List. However, greater mention should be made of the archaeological resource of the borough.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	This point is noted, and will be considered more specifically in relation to EM11. In relation to EM10 however, it is considered that an extra reference to history and heritage assets in 2 c) is the most appropriate response and this also reflects more closely the wording of paragraph 58 of the NPPF.	A reference to heritage assets added to EM10, and a clause regarding archaeology is proposed for insertion in EM11.	Response to rep and in line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF.	No objection raised in respect of EM10 amendment to include reference to heritage assets.	Superseded with updated representation
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	delete "and" at the end of criterion d)	To ensure the policy is effective	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Mr John O'Donovan	De La Rue	Turley Associates	133019	1207	Yes	No	The policy sets out a number of very detailed criteria upon which development proposals will be assessed. Whilst we have concerns regarding the policy in its entirety, we object in particular to the wording of criterion (b). If the Council's intention is for all homes to meet lifetime homes standards, this should be stated explicitly within the policy to avoid confusion. If this is indeed the Council's intention, we would raise significant concerns as the cost associated with this voluntary code is considerable. It is unknown whether this onerous policy requirement has been subject to viability testing to ensure that the policy is effective. It cannot be demonstrated that this is the most appropriate policy approach as the policy has not been tested or assessed against reasonable alternatives. See full response	We conclude that draft Policy EM10 is unsound and requires amendment or deletion. The policy is unduly restrictive, has not been positively prepared, will not be effective and will not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.	The policy relates to 'lifetime mobility standards' as opposed to 'lifetime homes' and the council has SPD to clarify the interpretation of this term. Furthermore, Para 6.81 is worded in a flexible manner. Therefore, it is considered that in the light of the flexibility incorporated into the policy there is the scope for the interpretation of the policy to respond to the viability issues associated with individual schemes and consequently the requirement will not undermine the viability of new development. In addition CN3, addresses this issue more specifically, and in paragraph 5.53 refers to viability considerations being a relevant factor to determine the mix of dwellings. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, it is considered that no change is required. Lifetime mobility standards (at 15%) were also factored into the council's evidence base in relation to the viability of affordable housing and CIL, and consequently this approach is consistent with paragraph 173 of the NPPF.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Dr David J Skyrme	N/A	N/A	781057	29	Yes	Yes	A very important policy that needs to be considered for every application. I am particularly pleased to see the recognition of Village Design Statements as valid guidance (6.82). Some of my councillors thought that they carried no weight, yet were not up to the challenge and unnecessary cost of developing a full blown neighbourhood plan.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1223	Yes	No	While the policy's intentions are positive and welcome it asks too much of the typical applicant and, if applied as written, would lead to objections which would be inappropriate and out of line with national policy. Some aspects of section 1 apply to large scale development but not to small infill applications. For example a new house in a street can hardly be expected to meet 1a or 1.e. It is excessive to require that the applicant for a modest new dwelling in an existing street should understand, let alone respond to, the requirement that it should positively contribute to local distinctiveness, the sense of place and the existing street scene, taking into account all relevant SPDs and community documents that identify the local character and distinctiveness of an area which is valued by local communities, whilst allowing for innovation where appropriate.	Add, following section 1, the following text: Small scale developments in an existing urban of village street context are not expected to deliver the above requirements but should show how they relate well to the local context. Delete 2a and instead add the following text after Section 2: Developments whose scale is significant in the local context or sited at locally sensitive or prominent sites should show how they positively contribute to local distinctiveness, the sense of place and the existing street scene, taking into account all relevant SPDs and community documents that identify the local character and distinctiveness of an area where appropriate.	The policy already has regard to the scale of development through the adoption of two lists, one of which excludes residential extensions. It is considered that most of the requirements are justified in relation to smaller scale development, though there will need to be some flexibility of interpretation based upon the scale of the proposal, which it is considered the policy allows for. However, additional definitions have been proposed for inclusion in the glossary in order to clarify the meaning of the terms local distinctiveness and sense of place. Local Distinctiveness: The positive features of a place and its communities which contribute to its special character and sense of place. and Sense of Place: Creating somewhere that is recognisably distinct but simultaneously strengthens local distinctiveness.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Additional clause added to the first list in light of Paras 94 - 97 NPPF, and in order to underpin the design and sustainability SPD: <i>Minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design.</i>	Conformity with NPPF	Members agreed to the principle of the change, but after discussion, decided it should be shortened to just read: ' <i>Minimise energy consumption through sustainable approach to design</i> '. As members felt the additional paragraph referred to above adequately covered the approaches needs to meet this policy requirement.	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Mr Stafford Napier	N/A	N/A	413817	50	Yes	No	Insufficient reference to access to public transport contrary to NPPF Guidelines	Add a Clause 2. g) Development layout should include good access to public transport.	Clause a) includes the requirement for developments to be well connected, which allows for consideration of the connectivity between the proposed development and the public transport network. Consequently no change is necessary	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	168	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports requirement 2 a) for its reference to local distinctiveness.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Clause 2 c) amended to include reference to 'history' and 'heritage assets' - in order to reflect paragraph 58 NPPF and the English Heritage representation.	Conformity with NPPF	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference to bicycle parking also included in clause 2 e) to improve clarity	Improve clarity	Wording amended to say 'bicycle storage' following discussions at MAP.	N/A
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Mr Nik Lyzba	Royal British Legion	N/A	786428	740	Yes	No	Policy not consistent with national policy. It refers to the role that community documents, including Community Plans, have to play in informing efficient and appropriate housing densities, however community plans are not development plan documents which have undergone rigorous examination and should not be the basis for policies which are set out in the Local Plan. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that a plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based upon proportionate evidence. It is not clear how the evidence supporting this policy could be collected or tested if it relates to community plans which have not been subject to rigorous examination.	The reference to community plans in footnote 19 should be deleted.	The policy provides a context for community documents, including community plans, to be given appropriate consideration when assessing the suitability of a development. The policy is not based on community plans but applicants should have regard to these documents as they are based on community involvement, and have the potential to provide useful information regarding the context associated with proposed development. Accordingly, it is considered justified to retain the reference to these documents in the footnote.	No Change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A		Mrs. Maria Miller MP	N/A		121767	459	Yes	No	The Vision refers to meeting the needs of the most vulnerable, but the plan makes no provision for making the borough more accessible to those who are disabled or have mobility impairments, and should include a policy to improve physical access to housing, public and commercial buildings and meet the transport needs of individuals. The Vision refers to responding to climate change, but the plan is not proposing to apply any additional standards over and above BREEM / the Code.	Include policies to make provision for those with disabilities and more stringent requirements to respond to the challenges of climate change.	Policy CN3 and a new policy on housing for older persons/specialist accommodation addresses the issue of housing for people with mobility impairments. the new policy includes a criteria stating that the location of such development must be appropriate in terms of access to facilities, services and public transport; The plan has also been subjected to an Equalities Impact Assessment. Policy EM9 includes requirements for development proposals to achieve specific water consumption targets of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEM. Policy EM10 also now includes an additional criteria as follows "Minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design." Paragraph 6.81 of the Local Plan also states that "...Development should be flexible, accessible to all and should be able to respond to the challenges of climate change."	Response to representations	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EM10 - Delivering High Quality Development	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference to 'location' also included in clause 2 e) for completeness	For completeness	Agreed	N/A
6.77	6.78	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	respond to the local context' changed to 'respond positively...' - to increase consistency between the wording of the policy and the supporting text.	For consistency	Agreed	N/A
6.77	6.78	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Minor change to the last sentence to improve clarity - include the words '. The Council' and add an s to encourage.	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
6.78	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	169	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the references in the paragraph to distinctive character and local distinctiveness.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change needed	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.80	6.81	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paragraph re-ordered to improve clarity	For clarity	Change not supported at MAP. Paragraph amended, see officer changes below.	N/A
New Para (between 6.81 and 6.82)	6.83	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New paragraph added in order to reflect and explain the additional clause in the first list concerning sustainable design. New paragraph is as follows: <i>Proposals for new development, including the construction of new buildings and the redevelopment and refurbishment of existing buildings (with the exception of householder extensions), shall be designed to minimise energy consumption. This requirement encompasses landform, landscaping, as well as layout, design, orientation, massing and materials. These requirements need to respect the local context and any relevant heritage assets. This approach prioritises 'passive' solutions in the form of measures such as high standards of insulation, air-tightness and appropriate orientation. However, as part of the council's positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources, new development should also be designed to facilitate the incorporation of renewable or low carbon technologies.</i>	For clarity	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	historic' replaced with 'heritage'	In order to achieve more consistent terminology.	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Protect' replaced with 'conserve' and inclusion of 'detailing' at the end of list.	Consistency of terminology and as often detailing is an important consideration, and it would be helpful to identify this issue.	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The following removed from policy <u>Nationally designated heritage assets such as Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments have special protection through legislation</u> and new reference included in the footnote	After negotiations with EH, the footnote has been amended, and now covers this point in a more comprehensive manner (i.e. also covers the relationship between designated and non-designated heritage assets).	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	nationally or locally designated heritage assets or undesignated' removed.	In order to achieve more consistent terminology, and in order to reflect the amendments to the footnote.	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	HCC	N/A	786148	571	Yes	No	The approach to historic environment issues within this document lacks emphasis and cogency, to the extent that it fails to be a 'positive strategy'. In many places reference to the historic environment are drafted as for the historic built environment with incidental reference to scheduled monuments and archaeological sites. This drafting results in an approach to the historic environment that is hesitant and incomplete. For example, EM11 which should address the historic environment as a whole is clearly written with the historic built environment in mind and needs to address the wider definition of the historic environment, which includes archaeology. In addition, provision b) refers to host building rather than heritage asset, provision c) appears to only apply in relation to conservation areas, and d) by use of 'material and design', is also very suggestive that this provision accrues to built structures rather than the wider character that is the historic environment.	At present, EM11 incorporates archaeological consideration through footnote 22, and through supporting text 6.85. The supporting text should have an explicit acknowledgement of the wider resource that is encompassed by the term heritage asset as secured by policy EM11 at its outset (Historic built structures, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and historic parks and gardens). The range of heritage assets intended to be encompassed by the policy should be the key part of the supporting text (6.83). Likewise Para 6.75, whilst mentioning scheduled monuments, expresses the value placed on the historic environment in terms that lays the emphasis on the historic built environment and does not properly reflect a balanced review of the wider nature of the historic environment. See full response for suggested re-wording.	It is proposed to address these comments in various ways. First, directly address the issue of archaeology through two paragraphs within the supporting text. It is also proposed to clarify the council's approach to ensuring the conservation of both designated and non-designated archaeological sites. In addition, more focus on improving the Top of Town area of the conservation area is proposed to be included within the supporting text of the policy. Furthermore, reference is also proposed to be made to the goal of removing buildings from the At Risk Register, as well as including reference to Article 4 Directions in the implementation and monitoring section as recommended in the representation.	Include specific reference to archaeology in the supporting text (see response to comment ID 175), explaining the council's approach to ensuring the conservation of both designated and non-designated archaeological sites. In addition, more focus on improving the Top of Town area of the conservation area is proposed to be included within the supporting text of the policy. Furthermore, reference is also proposed to be made to the goal of removing buildings from the At Risk Register, as well as including reference to Article 4 Directions in the implementation and monitoring section as recommended in the representation.	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	change all references in the plan to Scheduled Ancient Monuments to Ancient Monuments	For consistency throughout the plan	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
6.83	6.85	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	171	No	No	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph but feels that the Council should set out the measures it will employ to ensure that it will deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment within the borough in addition to development management as part of its positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment of the borough as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. For example, a programme of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, Article 4 Directions where appropriate to protect the historic environment, reviewing Grade II buildings at risk, measures to address heritage assets at risk and/or actively seeking opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. (See also our comments on Policy EM11).	The Council should set out the measures it will employ to ensure that it will deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment within the borough e.g. a programme of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, Article 4 Directions where appropriate to protect the historic environment, reviewing Grade II buildings at risk, measures to address heritage assets at risk and/or actively seeking opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.	It is proposed to address these comments in various ways. Including through overtly supporting improvements to the Top of Town area of the conservation area, as this provides an opportunity to include positive action the council is already taking as part of the overall strategy for the historic environment. In addition, reference is also proposed to be made to the goal of removing buildings from the At Risk Register, including the means of doing it (as requested by English Heritage) as well as including references to Article 4 Directions in the implementation and monitoring section as recommended in the EH representation.	Please see the proposed officer changes at the bottom of the spreadsheet. These are aimed at addressing the concerns of English Heritage, in particular in relation to the need to demonstrate a positive and clear strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment.	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
6.83	6.85	Mr David Hopkins	HCC	N/A	786148	581	Yes	No	The approach to historic environment issues within this document lacks emphasis and cogency, to the extent that it fails to be a 'positive strategy'. In many places reference to the historic environment are drafted as for the historic built environment with incidental reference to scheduled monuments and archaeological sites. This drafting results in an approach to the historic environment that is hesitant and incomplete. For example, EM11 which should address the historic environment as a whole is clearly written with the historic built environment in mind and needs to address the wider definition of the historic environment, which includes archaeology. In addition, provision b) refers to host building rather than heritage asset, provision c) appears to only apply in relation to conservation areas, and d) by use of 'material and design', is also very suggestive that this provision accrues to built structures rather than the wider character that is the historic environment.	At present, EM11 incorporates archaeological consideration through footnote 22, and through supporting text 6.85. The supporting text should have an explicit acknowledgement of the wider resource that is encompassed by the term heritage asset as secured by policy EM11 at its outset (Historic built structures, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and historic parks and gardens). The range of heritage assets intended to be encompassed by the policy should be the key part of the supporting text (6.83). Likewise Para 6.75, whilst mentioning scheduled monuments, expresses the value placed on the historic environment in terms that lays the emphasis on the historic built environment and does not properly reflect a balanced review of the wider nature of the historic environment. See full response for suggested re-wording.	It is proposed to address these comments in various ways. First, a specific reference is proposed for inclusion in the policy regarding archaeology, as well as two paragraphs within the supporting text, explaining the council's approach to ensuring the conservation of both designated and non-designated archaeological sites. In addition, more focus on improving the Top of Town area of the conservation area is proposed to be included within the supporting text of the policy. Furthermore, reference is also proposed to be made to the goal of removing buildings from the At Risk Register, as well as including reference to Article 4 Directions in the implementation and monitoring section as recommended in the representation.	Include specific reference to archaeology in the supporting text (see response to comment ID 175), explaining the council's approach to ensuring the conservation of both designated and non-designated archaeological sites. In addition, more focus on improving the Top of Town area of the conservation area is proposed to be included within the supporting text of the policy. Furthermore, reference is also proposed to be made to the goal of removing buildings from the At Risk Register, as well as including reference to Article 4 Directions in the implementation and monitoring section as recommended in the representation.	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
6.83	6.85	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	protect' changed to 'conserve' and 'historic' changed to 'heritage'.	In response to rep.	Agreed	N/A
6.84	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	172	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the statement that the first presumption is that (heritage) assets will be conserved and enhanced. The second half of the paragraph referring to host buildings is, however, rather unclear. What is important is the significance of the heritage asset, how that has been retained through any changes in the physical fabric of the building and how the proposals will affect it.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The second half of the paragraph relates to the interpretation of clause b) in the policy, and therefore is helpful from a development management perspective, and should support more predictability and efficiency in decision taking, as required by the NPPF paragraph 17. In addition, it is considered that the issues raised by EH are adequately addressed by the policy text itself, therefore, no change is needed.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
6.84	6.86	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	heritage' included in second line, as well as 'in a manner appropriate to their significance' included.	In order to reflect wording of the NPPF.	Agreed	N/A
6.85	6.87	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	173	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the recognition in paragraph 6.85 that non-designated assets still have heritage interest and are therefore a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. However, some of these assets are quantified as those on the Local List. It would also be worth explaining that some non-designated assets, particularly archaeological remains, may be of equivalent significance to designated assets, but for whatever reason have not been formally designated.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is recommended that greater clarity is provided in relation to what constitutes non-designated heritage assets, their status, and how they will be addressed during the planning process.	<u>Proposed amendment to footnote 22 in order to address EH comments: Heritage assets include designated and non-designated heritage assets. Designated heritage assets include Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation. Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which are not formally designated heritage assets, although they may be identified as having local importance. In some instances non-designated assets, particularly archaeological remains, may be of equivalent significance to designated assets, despite not yet having been formally designated.</u>	Response to representation	Agreed	Superseded by subsequent representation
6.85	6.87	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	un-quantified' replaced with 'non-designated'	Clarification of terminology	Agreed	N/A
6.86	6.88	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	175	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph in principle, but it should explicitly refer to the need for, as a minimum, the relevant historic environment record to have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Council should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	It is considered that the paragraph already essentially achieves the requirements set out by English Heritage. However, the requirement for more regard to archaeology has been incorporated into the supporting text.	<u>Proposed new paragraph in order to address EH comments: In the case of archaeological sites, applicants for planning permission will need to demonstrate that any development which may impact on designated heritage assets has been sensitively located and designed, and that appropriate provision has been made for ensuring the preservation in situ and on-going management, conservation and protection of (whether above or below ground) the heritage asset (satisfying this requirement includes the submission of an appropriate desk based assessment of the heritage asset, and where necessary a field evaluation). Development proposals which may affect archaeological sites considered to be non-designated heritage assets shall be informed by an appropriate desk-based assessment (and only where necessary a field evaluation), and the findings of this assessment will be a material consideration which informs the determination of the planning application. and Where the local planning authority is satisfied that the preservation in situ of archaeological remains is not possible or desirable, the applicant will need to demonstrate that satisfactory provision has been made for a programme of archaeological investigation, excavation and recording before, or during, development and for the subsequent publication of any findings, where appropriate.</u>	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
6.87	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	176	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports this paragraph.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted			N/A	N/A
6.87	6.89	Officer in response to rep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The following added to the end of Para: <u>In addition, the council will continue to list locally significant buildings in order to positively identify non-designated heritage assets.</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Some concern about potential demolition of locally listed buildings.	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
New para - supporting text	N/A	Officer in response to rep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Para in response to EH concerns: <u>The council has and will continue to pursue a proactive approach to the conservation and enhancement of the borough's historic environment. This approach will include the production of a programme for the review of the existing conservation area appraisals and the production of management plans, and any other necessary studies and strategies to support the conservation, maintenance and enhancement of the borough's heritage assets. This process will also encompass seeking to identify and facilitate opportunities for the enhancement of conservation areas and the setting of heritage assets which would better reveal their significance.</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Agreed	N/A
New para - supporting text	N/A	Officer in response to rep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Para proposed in response to EH concerns: <u>In addition to the general approach set out above, an important strategic priority for the council is the enhancement of the Top of Town area which is located within the Basingstoke Town Conservation Area. The council will proactively seek to achieve improvements of this part of Basingstoke in order to ensure that this area fulfils its potential for enhancement of the conservation area. The council will also proactively work towards establishing an effective management plan for the Top of Town area.</u>	EH have concerns about the lack of positive strategy regarding the Historic Environment. It seems sensible to highlight the efforts being made in respect of the top of town in order to help alley EH's concerns.	Agreed	N/A
New para - supporting text	N/A	Officer in response to rep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Para in response to EH concerns: <u>The council will proactively seek to reduce the number of heritage assets currently on the national and local Heritage at Risk registers and seek to avoid assets becoming at risk in the future. The registers will be regularly reviewed and appropriate action will be taken by the council to safeguard buildings most at risk. Where evidence of neglect is reported, or becomes apparent during the course of planning or listed building applications, the council will make contact with owners to draw their attention to the risks to their property, suggest appropriate measures and find out their plans for maintenance and reuse. The council will also work proactively with owners in order to establish an appropriate use for any heritage asset at risk. The council will seek to facilitate the bringing back into use of any vacant heritage assets (listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas), in order to minimise future risks to the significance of the building, including through its programme aimed at bringing back into use empty homes. If necessary, as a last resort, the Council may use its legal powers to secure the future of a heritage asset. A record of other heritage assets at risk, such as archaeological sites, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens will be kept, with due regard to the Heritage at Risk programme devised by English Heritage.</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Agreed	N/A
New para - supporting text	N/A	Officer in response to rep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	New Para in response to EH concerns: <u>In pursuing the aims set out above, the council will have regard to the use of urgent works/repair notices as set out in the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area Act) 1990 and the powers of maintenance under Sections 77 or 79 of the Building Act (1984) as well as the use of a Section 215 Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (as amended). In taking forward any action, the council will also have regard to the advice set out in English Heritage.</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Inclusion of the words: <u>'Making Article 4 Directions where this is deemed to be appropriate in order to ensure the proper conservation of heritage assets.'</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Agreed	N/A
Policy EM11 - The Historic Environment - Implementation and Monitoring	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	words: 'and any subsequent updates' replaced with <u>'including through the updating of such documents'.</u>	In response the representation from English Heritage, and further negotiations with EH, in particular their concerns regarding lack of positive strategy for Historic Environment.	Agreed	N/A
Footnote 25	footnote 37	Officer	NA	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	addition of park and outdoor recreational spaces to the list of sensitive land uses set out in the footnote	Following discussions with Environmental Health.	Agreed	N/A
6.92	6.100	Officer in response to MAP	NA	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Include 'sewage related activities' in list at end of first paragraph.	Following debate at MAP, where there was a desired to ensure that impacts from sewage were highlighted.	Agreed	N/A
6.94	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	680	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support paragraphs 6.94 - 6.96. However, while Para's 6.94 - 6.96 discuss risks from contamination to future users, we would also expect risks to other receptors including groundwater and surface water to also be considered and assessed.	We would recommend that these receptors be added to the supporting paragraphs.	Agreed, in respect of this paragraph receptor is more appropriate.	Minor wording as outlined above	Response to rep.	Agreed	Remains outstanding
6.95	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	681	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support paragraphs 6.94 - 6.96. However, while Para's 6.94 - 6.96 discuss risks from contamination to future users, we would also expect risks to other receptors including groundwater and surface water to also be considered and assessed.	We would recommend that these receptors be added to the supporting paragraphs.	No reference to user or receptor in this paragraph, so no change needed.	Minor wording change as outlined above	Response to rep.	Agreed	Remains outstanding
6.96	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	682	Not Specified	Not Specified	We support paragraphs 6.94 - 6.96. However, while Para's 6.94 - 6.96 discuss risks from contamination to future users, we would also expect risks to other receptors including groundwater and surface water to also be considered and assessed.	We would recommend that these receptors be added to the supporting paragraphs.	Whilst it is considered that the term receptor would be too wide ranging, it is considered that the term 'sensitive use' as opposed to 'user' would be more consistent with the approach in the policy text, and the definition of this term is set out in footnote 25.	Minor wording change as outlined above	Response to rep.	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
6.94	6.102	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	667	Not Specified	Yes	We support paragraphs 6.94 - 6.96. However, while Para's 6.94 - 6.96 discuss risks from contamination to future users, we would also expect risks to other receptors including groundwater and surface water to also be considered and assessed. We would recommend that these receptors be added to the supporting paragraphs.	We would recommend that these receptors be added to the supporting paragraphs.	Comments from the EA are noted, and a minor change has been proposed in order to broaden out the use of the word 'users' in the contaminated land section in order to cover other receptors.	Substitute 'users' for 'receptors', and include a definition of receptors as a footnote: Ground contamination becomes a material consideration when proposed development may contribute to, or expose <u>receptors</u> to, unacceptable levels of contamination which gives rise to risks to health or other <u>adverse impacts</u> . Contamination may exist due to past uses of the land, and it is vital that these do not impact upon receptors the future <u>receptors</u> .	Response to rep.	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
7.1 - 7.9	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update all text	In response to updated evidence and conformity with the NPPF	N/A	N/A
7.2	N/A	mrs Jane love	N/A	N/A	780377	11	Yes	No	It quotes that it will enhance training and employment but contains no evidence for this.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Reference to skills is deemed more appropriate to policy CN4. Change made.	Please see change made to Para 5.48 under Policy CN5.	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
7.5	N/A	Anthony Durrant	N/A	N/A	637355	328	Yes	No	It is noted that a substantial part of the justification for the proposed plan for the borough hinges on attracting new employers to accommodate the existing unemployment and a proportion of the anticipated new residents occupying the new developments. The positive statements are essentially based upon hopes and wishes and doing as much as possible to retain existing employers. Employers close to SS3.3 and SS3.8 are actively looking for other premises outside of their current location in Chineham. There are also already empty industrial, office and retail units particularly in Festival Place. There is little substance provided in support of the statements in the plan. Without this local growth the borough becomes even more a satellite for London and other centres with the associated increasing strain on an inadequate transport network.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Substantial changes have been made to the supporting text in response to the new evidence base (ELR 2014).	See changes made to paras 7.1-7.9	In light of new evidence and in response to reps received	N/A	Remains outstanding
7.9	N/A	Mr Chris Quintana	N/A	N/A	785867	514	Yes	No	Plan does not include a policy on employment skills. The impact of creating more jobs, essential for the long term economic wellbeing of the borough, needs to be made sustainable by developing the local labour market both in terms of size and skills level. If new jobs are not matched by an enhanced workforce the likely result is additional in-commuting. Skills need to be matched to business needs. The link between educational establishments, training/ development and skills is not recognised in the Local Plan.	Add a policy on employment skills which recognises the link between educational establishments, training/ development and skills is not recognised in the Local Plan.	Reference to skills is deemed more appropriate in policy CN4 and additional wording has been added accordingly	Update education bullet point under paragraph 5.48 with the following wording: 'education <u>including skills and training initiatives</u> '	Response to representation	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mrs Laura Harley	Overton Parish Council	N/A	205715	249	Yes	No	There seems to be no plans for setting land aside for employment purposes for Overton despite the planned housing.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Overton Parish Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No Change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mrs Cathy Burt	Whitchurch Town Council	N/A	205565	455	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	In essence the plan is considered to be legally compliant and sound. However, the removal of the area for industrial development to the north west of the existing site in Whitchurch with no identified alternative location, would leave the town without scope for industrial expansion during the next 15 years. Local employers are expressing serious concern, and the members of the town council consider that opportunities to work locally should be factored in when fixing housing targets.	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Whitchurch Town Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No Change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	R E Thompson	N/A	N/A	785516	458	Yes	No	It is with extreme disappointment that it is noted that the local plan does not contain any allowance of land for employment in Whitchurch. The previous local plan allocated 4.9ha at Ardglan, which was proposed to be accessed via a new road constructed to the north of the railways line and which also provided access to the proposed station car park. That same policy sought to provide housing at R E Thompson's existing site at Whitchurch. It is short-sighted in the extreme not to provide for further expansion of employment at Whitchurch, especially when the current consultation envisages adding 350 homes to the Town, when there are other opportunities that have not been looked at.	Since the council are proposing to carry forward the railway car park proposal to the north of the railway, this was the proposed 'way-in' to the former Ardglan allocation, it seems logical that some provision for employment land is made there.	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Whitchurch Town Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No Change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	Policy EP1 - Economic Growth and Investment	Mr Chris Quintana	N/A	N/A	785867	510	Yes	No	The plan does not include new employment allocation(s). This could damage the business sector and the borough's overall economic prosperity. Only a small supply of land currently available for industrial and warehousing development and very few freehold opportunities in the borough. Demand for industrial and warehousing premises in Basingstoke has been sustained during the recession and is likely to grow significantly over the next 16 years. The lack of land and premises for these uses will potentially divert inward investment to other locations and expanding companies may have no alternative other than to relocate.	Plan should include new employment land allocation(s).	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The ELR identifies that there is an oversupply of accommodation and land supply for office uses in the borough and a substantial undersupply of premises and land to meet the needs of the storage and distribution sector (B8 uses). The Council will allocate a new site(s) to accommodate this identified need through the production of a future Development Plan Document once the Local Plan has been adopted.	Policy EP1 and the supporting text has been amended to reflect the fact that additional employment site(s) will need to be allocated to meet the forecasted needs for storage and distribution floor space in the borough.	In response to updated evidence	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	622	Yes	No	The wording of Policy EP1 seeks to direct employment development to a list of 'defined employment areas' including at Whitchurch. However, the Proposals Map does not define any such Employment Area at Whitchurch and so this element of the policy is not considered to be deliverable. although this is by no means clear, it is considered possible that the council intended 'Employment Area' to mean the concentration of existing employment development to the northern part of town, clustered around the station. Whilst supporting that closer is laudable, it is clear that there is very little scope to intensify or 'infill' development here without affecting the viability of existing businesses. The Local Plan - or its evidence base contained within the Employment Land Review - does not contain any information that would support this broad policy aspiration. Policy SS8 was deleted at Cabinet, though no reasons have been given for this in the minutes.	Given the demand for new employment floor space in Whitchurch, and in the light of the comments above, it is considered that specific provision should be made within this policy to allocate an employment site at Whitchurch. This allocation would ensure that the plan is sound for the following reasons: Positively prepared: by providing a deliverable way of meeting objectively assessed need for employment land within the borough. Justified: by providing a deliverable solution of the evidenced need for employment land in the borough. Locating the proposed employment allocation next to the proposed car-park allocation (SS11) is considered the most appropriate strategy. Effective: by promoting a specific deliverable site that is being promoted by the landowner. Consistent with National Policy: by being in accordance with Para 28 of the NPPF insofar as it relates to the need to take a positive approach to sustainable development.	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Whitchurch Town Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	700			<i>intentionally left blank</i>	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Comment noted.	No Change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	Policy EP1 - Economic Growth and Investment	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	788	Not Specified	No	Objection. This policy is inconsistent with SS8 because it directs hotels to the town centre first. Most of Basing View is not within the town centre but SS8 should in the objector's opinion clearly accept that hotels are appropriate in Basing View as part of the regeneration - see comments on policy SS8 above. This makes the Policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the NPPF.	This objection would be overcome if the special policies for Basing View were made clear in relation to the overall EP1 Policy. In addition, if the objector's suggestion for the TC Boundary was accepted as described in EP3 below.	The NPPF identifies hotels as a main town centre use in Annex 2. For the purposes of the sequential test NPPF Annex 2 defines 'edge of centre' for non office and retail uses as being within 300m of a town centre boundary. However, the definition also goes onto state that in determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre account should be taken of local circumstances. In light of the fact the site is due to be regenerated as a whole and a detailed Masterplan / Supplementary Planning Document it is officers view that the site needs to be considered in its entirety and therefore the Basing View site (excluding the Gresley Road triangle) should be considered as Edge of Centre for all town centre uses except retail.	All references to hotel uses have been removed from the policy as part of the major amendments made following the consultation.	response to rep and compliance with national planning	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	801	Not Specified	No	There is no intention to allocate land in Overton for this which means the community will increasingly become a dormitory from nearby towns. A better solution is required for this community and not to just rely on commercial development in Whitchurch for the SW of the borough. The policy does not mention the current access problems for many of the borough's commercial and retail areas. Eastrop roundabout is a major obstacle to expansion in central Basingstoke and will deter shoppers to the town unless improvements are made to it and access points from Festival Place and Basing View.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, Overton Parish Council could decide to allocate land for employment uses if there was an identified need through its Neighbourhood Plan.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	Policy EP1 - Economic Growth and Investment	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	992	Yes	No	Objection is raised to the sequential approach to new employment development set out in Policy EP1. The sequential approach set out in EP1 establishes edge of centre sites as being the most suitable for new office and hotel development, including those edge of centre sites within the Basing View Employment Area. However, for office development, edge of centre is identified in Appendix 2 of the draft local plan as "locations outside the town centre, but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange". The problem with this being: i) It excludes a substantial part of the site (approximately two-thirds) of the defined Basing View Employment Area, including the Gresley Road site. As a result, these parts of the Basing View Employment Area are to be considered as "other out of centre sites within employment areas" which makes them the least sustainable locations for new office development as currently set out in Policy EP1.	Proposed changes: The Sequential approach set out in Policy Ep1 should be changed to ensure that all of the defined Basing View Employment Area (including Gresley Road) is identified as the most suitable location for new office and hotel development after town and district centres. These changes (in addition to those suggested for Appendix 3) are necessary to ensure that they positively support the economic vision and strategy of the local plan, are consistent with other policies of the plan and are effective in delivering the regeneration of Basing View, the proposed changes are consistent with Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the NPPF in respect of the economy and national and draft local plan policies in respect of town centres and other town centre uses. In this regard the proposed change to Policy EP1 does no more than put all of the Basing View Employment Area in par with all other edge of centre locations and is considered to be appropriate.	The NPPF identifies hotels as a main town centre use in Annex 2. For the purposes of the sequential test NPPF Annex 2 defines 'edge of centre' for non office and retail uses as being within 300m of a town centre boundary. However, the definition also goes onto state that in determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre account should be taken of local circumstances. In light of the fact the site is due to be regenerated as a whole and a detailed Masterplan / Supplementary Planning Document it is officers view that the site needs to be considered in its entirety and therefore the Basing View site (excluding the Gresley Road triangle) should be considered as Edge of Centre for all town centre uses except retail.	Substantial changes to policy EP1 and EP2 to address the range of concerns and provide clarity on what the policy is seeking to achieve.	In response to updated evidence and conformity with the NPPF	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1061	Yes	No	The 2013 Retail Assessment estimates 30,000 square metres of retail capacity is needed over the plan period. Policy EP3 seeks to address this need by expanding Basingstoke town centre. However, the local planning authority will likely need to identify other retail sites to accommodate the identified need in a sustainable manner over the plan period. The Borough Council and County Council as landowners believe that Manydown can play an important role in this respect. EP1 states that employment uses will be permitted where they are of a scale and type appropriate for the site's location and they will contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed use community.' It is felt that this policy sentence in EP1 in combination with clause (c) in SS3.10 is insufficient and the local planning authority should consider identification of locations for new centres at Manydown on the Proposals Map, consistent with the draft masterplan and landowner representations under draft Policy SS3.10.	Identify potential locations of new local centres on Proposals Map 1a.	Policy EP1 focuses on the allocation of land for traditional B class employment uses (office, light industrial, industrial and storage and distribution floor space). The revised policy states that 'Permitting employment uses at the allocation sites at the strategic housing sites detailed in Policy SS3 where they are of a scale and type appropriate for the site's location and where they will contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed use community'. In relation to retail provision, Policy SS3.10 states c) Include the provision of ... community facilities, <u>local shopping facilities</u> It would be inappropriate to identify the location of new centres at this time as this could prejudice the full master planning exercise.	No change	n/a	n/a	Withdrawn
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Cllr John Izett	N/A	N/A	787475	1117	Yes	No	The 2013 Retail Assessment estimates 30,000 square metres of retail capacity is needed over the plan period. Policy EP3 seeks to address this need by expanding Basingstoke town centre. However, the local planning authority will likely need to identify other retail sites to accommodate the identified need in a sustainable manner over the plan period. The Borough Council and County Council as landowners believe that Manydown can play an important role in this respect. EP1 states that 'employment uses will be permitted where they are of a scale and type appropriate for the site's location and they will contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed use community'. It is felt that this policy sentence in EP1 in combination with clause (c) in SS3.10 is insufficient and the local planning authority should consider identification of locations for new centres at Manydown on the Proposals Map, consistent with the draft masterplan and landowner representations under draft Policy SS3.10.	Identify potential locations of new local centres on Proposals Map 1a.	Policy EP1 focuses on the allocation of land for traditional B class employment uses (office, light industrial, industrial and storage and distribution floor space). The revised policy states that 'Permitting employment uses at the allocation sites at the strategic housing sites detailed in Policy SS3 where they are of a scale and type appropriate for the site's location and where they will contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed use community'. In relation to retail provision, Policy SS3.10 states c) Include the provision of ... community facilities, <u>local shopping facilities</u> It would be inappropriate to identify the location of new centres at this time as this could prejudice the full master planning exercise.	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mr David Smith	Valad Property Group	Indigo Planning	787635	1147	Yes	No	Intec Business Park is currently within a designated employment area (falling within Daneshill East). The Council's Employment Land Review (2009) identifies that there is an oversupply of employment floor space with the Borough but advocates a policy which resists loss of B1 space but highlights that in certain cases mixed use development would be appropriate. The site is a suitable location for mixed use development as it is within the main urban area, of lesser environmental value, adjacent to residential and employment areas and served by public transport. There is a serious and significant shortfall of housing land supply in the borough and it is unclear whether the draft Plan will meet housing needs set out in the SHMA update for 2013 (currently unavailable). NPPG guidance may require the housing targets to be revised further to reflect market signals. The site would be an appropriate location to accommodate any additional housing required to meet local needs. See attached documents	It is requested that Intec Business Park is also identified as an allocated site for residential led, mixed use development. This would enable Valad to engage with the Council and prepare a masterplan for regeneration of the site in accordance with Appendix 5 of the draft Plan. The requested amendments will ensure the Plan is sound and consistent with national planning policy, in particular paragraphs 17, 22 and 47 of the NPPF.	The Intec site is located within an established employment area and appears to be experiencing relatively strong occupancy rates despite the economic downturn and reduced demand for office floor space. In light of the successful regeneration of the adjacent Kingsland Business Park (specifically the Horizon Development) to provide modern industrial / storage and distribution units to meet market needs. If the site were to be redeveloped due to a reduction in demand for office accommodation at the site, we would encourage the re-use of the site for alternative employment uses where there is an identified supply based on the Employment Land Review (as amended)	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	Policy EP1 - Economic Growth and Investment	Ms Joanne Russell	SEGRO	Barton Willmore	787641	1153	Yes	No	We object to policy EP1 within the Pre-Submission Local plan because it fails to allocate additional land principally for B8 use, that is on our client's view, suitable and available for development that meets the needs of this industry sector. The sites listed within the Policy as allocations do not offer the market investors the location or scale of site that would encourage new investment into the Borough. This appears unjustified given the location of the borough within the South East, and historic demand for these sites. We do not consider that the Council have followed the advice in Employment Land Review (p 2.59) or taken account of the evidence presented, notably that the second largest sector for jobs in Basingstoke urban area is attributed to logistics. The sector should be better catered for in the emerging Local Plan through a new allocation of land for this issue. Policy EP1 is restrictive in enabling other speculative sites to come forward. Full response attached	We would strongly encourage the Council to consider the allocation of new logistics sites along the M3 corridor within the Borough, and to review the potential of this site at Basingstoke Golf Course.	The Council has updated its Employment Land Review which identifies that there is a reduced need for B1a (office floor space) in the borough over the Local Plan period and that there is an increased demand for B8 (storage and distribution) floor space in the borough. This updated Employment Land Review findings reflect those of the Local Enterprise Partnership research that has recently been published. Basingstoke Golf Course has been promoted for residential development and therefore is not being made available by the landowner for employment uses.	Policy EP1 has been revised and now includes the following statement within the policy: i) <u>Allocating a new employment site or sites for industrial, storage and distribution uses in a subsequent Development Plan Document.</u>	In response to representations and updated evidence	No objection	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Zurich Assurance Ltd	Zurich Assurance Ltd	N/A	131191	1164	No	No	Object to Policy EP1 as the proposed housing number will result in a very low growth in the Borough's working age population by 2029, rather than aligning working age population growth with the job growth. The under provision of new housing when compared with the level actually required to deliver economic growth is not consistent with national policy. In the NPPF the Government requires the development plan system to promote housing and economic growth.	Need a housing requirement to achieve the Council's economic aspirations and to deliver an appropriate level of job creation. Need to undertake a further review of its housing and economic policies and requirements and, in due course, re-consult on its pre-submission draft before it is submitted to the SoS.	The updated Employment Land Review (ELR) identifies three potential employment scenarios that could occur over the Local Plan period. These scenarios are labour demand forecasts, continuation of historic trends in floor space delivery and labour supply forecasts based on the findings of the SHMA. These forecast scenarios provide a range of potential floorspace requirements over the Local Plan period. The findings of the Employment Land Review have informed the updated Local Plan economic policies (specifically policies EP1 and EP2).	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	Policy EP1 - Economic Growth and Investment	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1180	No	No	The borough maintains a supply of land earmarked for employment use and also restricts the change of use of employment land. The BDBC Annual Monitoring Report 2012 shows the Total Land Available for Employment use to be almost 70ha In the past, new completed floor space was at a rate of up to 5ha per annum so the supply of 70ha was generous but not unreasonable. However in recent years the report has shown a drastic drop in the completions rate of new employment builds to a now steady rate of only some 0.5 ha per year. If the need has now dropped to some 10% of the past need, then the reserve should similarly be reduced. With such a fall in demand it would not reduce availability if 50% of the employment land reserves were released for housing. This would release some 35ha of land. Planning guidance requires a density to be of 30-50 dwellings per ha. This land bank is therefore capable of accommodating some 1,050 to 1750 homes.	Assess the employment land reserve and earmark sites that are suitable or potentially suitable for residential use. Review the commercial land reserve in line with NPPF and release land from it to other designations including where suitable housing. Adjust the Greenfield housing numbers down by the housing number released for Brownfield employment land turned over to housing and assess reserved Greenfield land as part of the review of sites.	The Council has updated its Employment Land Review which identifies that there is a reduced need and oversupply of land for B1a (office floor space) in the borough over the Local Plan period and that there is an increased demand and shortage of land for B8 (storage and distribution) sites in the borough. The Employment Land Review identifies that a significant proportion of the identified land supply is made up of un-implemented permissions that may expire within the first few years of the local plan period. However, the ELR identifies opportunities to unallocate some employment sites that are currently allocated for B1 uses as there is no reasonable prospect of the site coming forward for its allocated use and the site would be unsuitable for storage and distribution uses where there is an identified demand.	Text has been updated to reflect the findings of the updated Employment Land Review	In response to updated evidence	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Mr Roger Tustain	Taylor Wimpey	Nexus Planning	85583	1184	Not Specified	No	The level of housing growth contained within Policy SS1 of the Local Plan will support the creation of only 361 new jobs per annum. This is significantly below the number of new jobs required to support the Borough's identified job needs of 800 jobs per annum (as set out in the ELR). We are of the view that the Borough's Employment Land Review conclusion that by 2026, total employment in the Borough is projected to increase by 16,400 jobs considered a robust and credible basis on which plan for the future long-term needs of the Borough. A. The Local Plan's economic strategy and policies, in particular Policy EP1, are undeliverable as the Local Plan is not planning to make provision for a sufficient level of housing growth to support the identified and evidenced sustainable economic development needs of the Borough and wider functional economic area. The approach to support economic prosperity within the Local Plan is unsound and fails to satisfy the NPPF.	It is our view that the level of job growth within the Local Plan should be at least 800 jobs per annum (as supported by the Borough Council's own evidence base) to deliver the Local plan's economic policies. Based on the DCLGs 2008-based projections, the level of housing growth within the Local Plan therefore needs to be approximately 1,123 dwellings per annum (or 20,214 dwellings over the plan period 2011-2029) to support the planned level of economic growth and achieve the Borough's and wider Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership economic aspirations and vision for the plan period.	The updated Employment Land Review (ELR) identifies three potential employment scenarios that could occur over the Local Plan period. These scenarios are labour demand forecasts, continuation of historic trends in floor space delivery and labour supply forecasts based on the findings of the SHMA. These forecast scenarios provide a range of potential floorspace requirements over the Local Plan period. The Employment Land Review findings have informed the updated economic policies of the Local Plan (specifically policies EP1 and EP2).	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A	Ms Joanne Russell	SEGRO	Barton Willmore	787641	1157	Yes	No	Policy SS3 allocates Basingstoke Golf Course for 1,000 new dwellings. The policy does allow for some employment uses on the site, however the policy suggests that these must be of a scale and type appropriate to the site's location, given the proposed residential development. Clearly, logistics uses and their requirements for scale and 24-7 operations are not conducive to residential environments and therefore the current allocation of the site for residential development would not sit comfortably with proposals for logistics development. The developability of the site is not in question, however its use may be more appropriate for employment given its proximity to the M3 and the ability for it to be detached from the urban area and existing residential properties. Such sites for logistics and distribution use are more difficult to find, than areas for housing expansion.	We would strongly encourage the Council to consider the allocation of new logistics sites along the M3 corridor within the Borough, and to review the potential of this site at Basingstoke Golf Course.	The housing allocation sites have been through detailed assessments including site assessment and sustainability appraisal. The sites selected form the most appropriate strategy when compared to the alternatives. Basingstoke Golf Course has been promoted to the Council for residential development and it has been found to be suitable for this use. Updated policies EP1 and EP2 deal with the allocation of future employment land and the need for land for logistics/distribution uses is recognised. Allocations will be made through a forthcoming DPD which will include the necessary evidence base/site assessments etc.	See updates to Policies EP1 and 2.	Consistency with newly updated policies and new evidence	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP1 - Employment Development	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1191	Yes	No	Policy EP1 should allow for further employment development at Worting, as an extension to the existing employment uses at Worting House, either as part of the Marydown allocation or otherwise.	see above	The Employment Land Review identifies the need for employment land in the borough and concludes that there is likely to be an oversupply of land and premises for office uses over the Local Plan period. The NPPF directs office uses to town centres or edge of centre sites first as part of the sequential test. The site in question is unlikely to be suitable for industrial and warehousing uses due to the surrounding uses (both existing and proposed).	No change	n/a	n/a	Remains outstanding
All supporting text	superseded	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update all text	In response to updated evidence	N/A	N/A
7.11	superseded	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	412	Yes	No	Pre-Submission Local Plan has limited consideration on the issue of additional industrial and distribution floor space. This is an area where Basingstoke has been a major and successful provider over recent years. Recent evidence suggests that for the period 1st January 2013 to 30th June 2013 there has been a take up of in excess of 300,000 sq ft of industrial distribution floor space in Basingstoke. This is set against a take up of only circa 50,000 sq ft of offices over the same period.	An up to date reassessment of B2/B8 provision and available sites is required. The Local Plan must allocate a suitably substantial site for commercial/ industrial uses to meet the needs of inward investors and also existing companies wishing to build or to expand their business activities. Land in the vicinity of M3 Junction 7 would seem to be appropriate location for such uses in Basingstoke Borough. Policies should be flexible to take account of new assessments or for the advent of a new major specific user.	The Council has updated its Employment Land Review which identifies that there is a reduced need for B1a (office floor space) in the borough over the Local Plan period and that there is an increased demand for B8 (storage and distribution) floor space in the borough. This updated Employment Land Review findings reflect those of the Local Enterprise Partnership research that has recently been published.	Text has been updated to reflect the findings of the updated Employment Land Review	In response to updated evidence	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	713	Yes	No	Object to criteria b) of the policy as it does not accord with Government policy and the NPPF. It is inappropriate where a positive attitude is to be taken towards development and development decisions for there to be a specific requirement for marketing. Paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF make no suggestion that there should be policy provision to defer decisions subject to marketing. It is for the plan making stage itself to "have regard to market signals" in determining how to fix planning policy in relation to defined and other areas. In terms of decision making, local planning authorities must take a positive approach to decision making based upon the available evidence at the time of that decision in terms of evidence base across the market rather than in relation to an exercise for a specific single building. Marketing of an individual building can be distorted by non planning related and other factors that make such a requirement wholly unreliable and inappropriate.	Delete criteria b) of the policy.	The policies have been restructured following consideration of the representations received on the Local Plan. However the NPPF encourages mixed use and therefore the council considers that within the defined strategic employment sites the applicant should have explored options to retain an element of employment use(s) at the site. The Council also recognise that non employment uses within established employment areas can support there operation and function and support the wider regeneration of the site / area. The Council considers the marketing of a site . property to be a key 'market signal' and will expect developers to demonstrate that the site has been marketed for at least 6 months.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites both within and outside of the Strategic Employment Areas.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1172	No	No	Over recent years, the borough has provided successful developments that help to meet its housing needs with a large Brownfield developments, notably a major new build at Wintertur Way with high rise high density urban style development and with the conversion of office blocks to residential development in Crown Heights and Skyline Plaza. Together these have utilised Brownfield sites and regenerated underused commercial space. Policy EP2 still however resists change of use and sets landowners a high criteria to have to demonstrate the site to be redundant and now not suitable for employment. The plan has no encouragement for the re-use of redundant office space, which is in areas of close proximity to employment areas, the town centre and railway station, which would continue the success of Crown Heights and Skyline Plaza.	Amend SS8 and EP2 to encourage the re-use of office space for residential purposes.	The policy enables the loss of employment sites to alternative uses (including residential) where the proposals can satisfy the appropriate criteria.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites to alternate uses.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1176	No	No	Throughout the town, various commercial space has slowly turned from manufacturing to predominantly warehousing and commercial sales units. These spaces have seen a downturn in the present economy and many are now old, unattractive and under-used. Other areas have large vacant plots that have been earmarked for more retail units. A policy of consolidating and refurbishing these areas should be pursued. This would then allow the large-scale re-designation of one or more areas of commercial land to housing built on Brownfield sites. West Ham Industrial Estate, Houndmills, Daneshill and other smaller estates are all looking tired and in need of redevelopment and a new use. This consolidation needs to be assessed further but we estimate the sites released could accommodate perhaps some 500 houses in sustainable, Brownfield sites.	Further to our proposed Amendments to SS8 and EP2 Put in place policies to actively work to consolidate the employment areas around the town to provide vibrant modern units that are fit for the present and future demand. In doing so turn over selected areas of employment land to accommodate residential development. This may yield some 500 houses on top of the expected windfall sites coming forward.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites to alternate uses, which includes residential uses. Whilst the council will welcome proposals to redevelop and intensify the use of established employment sites (where practicable) the council has no control over whether land owners decide to invest in their sites and stock. it is important to note that the Employment Land Review identifies that there is demand for industrial premises and strong demand for warehousing premises in the borough (such as that located in the employment sites named by the respondent). There is a need for stock refurbishment in some areas and for a new allocation for industrial / storage and distribution uses. Policy EP1 sets out that the council will protect the best employment sites for employment use (B-class).	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites to alternate uses.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1182	No	No	The borough maintains a supply of land earmarked for employment use and also restricts the change of use of employment land. The BDBC Annual Monitoring Report 2012 shows the Total Land Available for Employment use to be almost 70ha In the past, new completed floor space was at a rate of up to 5ha per annum so the supply of 70ha was generous but not unreasonable. However in recent years the report has shown a drastic drop in the completions rate of new employment builds to a now steady rate of only some 0.5 ha per year. If the need has now dropped to some 10% of the past need, then the reserve should similarly be reduced. With such a fall in demand it would not reduce availability if 50% of the employment land reserves were released for housing. This would release some 35ha of land. Planning guidance requires a density to be of 30-50 dwellings per ha. This land bank is therefore capable of accommodating some 1,050 to 1750 homes.	Assess the employment land reserve and earmark sites that are suitable or potentially suitable for residential use. Review the commercial land reserve in line with NPPF and release land from it to other designations including where suitable housing. Adjust the Greenfield housing numbers down by the housing number released for Brownfield employment land turned over to housing and assess reserved Greenfield land as part of the review of sites.	The Employment Land Review identifies likely future employment land requirements in the borough by use type. The report concludes that there is an oversupply of land allocated (un-implemented permission and some un-built plots on the allocated employment sites) for B1 (office uses) in the borough and that there is currently an oversupply of poor quality B1 accommodation in the borough. The Employment Land Review suggests de-allocating certain sites and revising the boundaries of certain allocated employment sites to reduce this oversupply and enable sites to come forward for alternative uses (such as housing) over the Local Plan period.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites to alternate uses. Some employment allocations have been removed and the boundaries of other allocations consolidated where there is limited prospect of delivering the allocated use over the plan period and the site has seen suggested for alternative uses.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Councillor Harvey requested that 12 months marketing were re-instated - officers to consider this approach.	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	988	Yes	No	As currently drafted the requirement to satisfy all three criteria regarding the acceptability of alternative uses is considered to have the potential to frustrate or undermine planned regeneration of basing View. Unless policy EP2 is re-drafted to reflect the likelihood and desirability of introducing an appropriate mix of uses through the Basing View SPD, and making specific allowance for it, the requirements of the Policy (especially if combined with the requirements of Policy EP3) could represent a significant impediment to delivery. EP2 is considered unsound as: it is not positively prepared in the sense that it does not make express provision for the planned introduction of alternative uses in to the Basing View Employment Area outside of the expanded town centre. it would not be effective in delivering the objectives of the draft local plan in relation to Basing View As a consequence it is not consistent with paragraphs 21 and 22 of the NPPF. Additional comments attached	Proposed change: it is proposed that draft Policy EP2 is re-drafted to include specific provision for alternative uses within the Basing View Employment Area which contribute towards the regeneration objectives for the area. This would be achieved by splitting the policy in to two parts, wherein part 1 provides for permission to be granted where alternative uses contribute towards the regeneration of the Basing View Employment Area (including Gresley Road) and Part 2 provides for permission to be granted for alternative uses of employment sites subject to meeting the 3 criteria already set out in draft Policy EP2. it is considered that such a change to EP2 would provide an appropriate local plan policy basis on which to prepare an SPD for basing View which makes planned provision for alternative uses in suitable locations outside of the expanded town centre without prejudicing national or local plan objectives for the town centre.	Officers agree that the policy could frustrate regeneration projects at Basing View and other strategic employment sites. Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites both within and outside of the Strategic Employment Areas. The policy now makes specific reference to complementary uses to support the operation and function of the employment area and to support the wider regeneration of the site.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1040	Yes	No	Loss of employment uses should be allowed where the alternative use will provide a high delivery of affordable housing, which brings much needed housing to those in local need and outweighs the loss of the employment space.	Policy should be amended to allow loss of employment uses where the alternative use will provide a high delivery of affordable housing.	The policy enables the loss of employment sites to alternative uses (including residential) where the proposals can satisfy the appropriate criteria.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites to alternate uses.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Mr Tom Lowery	T J Lowery Group Holding Ltd	N/A	648691	851	Yes	Yes	Support for this policy as it is important to recognise that there are some circumstances where a site that has been operating in employment use successfully over a period of time is no longer viable. The recent economic downturn has led to a significant over-supply of office space within Basingstoke & Deane, thus leading to a number of employment sites being partially, or totally vacant. Furthermore, the rise in the use of technology allowing people to work from home, or at least more flexibly than has been the case in the past, will in our view lead to less need for office/employment space. It is therefore important that Policy EP2 allows for a change of use from employment to alternative uses in appropriate cases, and should not be a major hurdle in the planning process where it can be demonstrated the site is no longer viable for employment use, nor is likely to be into the future.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted and updated Policy EP2 provides greater clarify for developers on the criteria that will need to be satisfied to enable the loss of employment sites within the allocated strategic employment areas and for other sites within the Settlement Policy Boundaries.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)	Pal Properties	Pal Properties	N/A	785602	472	Not Specified	Not Specified	Pal Properties own a vacant site know as 'Aurum, which is within the SPB and the defined employment area of Hampshire International Business Park. Given that the site continues to be identified in the council's SHLAA as an appropriate site residential development, at this stage of the plan making process the site should be allocated under draft policy S3 for residential use for 150 dwellings, in line with the most recent SHLAA.	The local plan should be amended to reflect the above.	The site boundary for the employment allocation at Hampshire International Business Park has been revised to remove the site which is identified in the SHLAA.	The site boundary on the proposals map has been amended.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Councillors Miller and Tomblin do not consider the site to be suitable for residential use.	Partially outstanding
Policy EP2 - Alternative Uses of Employment Sites	Policy EP2 - Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1081	Yes	No	Unsound because it does not distinguish between, or define, town centre employment sites and those in other locations. This might be interpreted to compromise the ability for the objectively assessed retail need to be met within the PSA or on its edge, or the meeting of other town centre use needs elsewhere in the town centre when NPPF (23) which states the importance of meeting the retail, leisure and other main town centre uses in full. Existing offices within the town centre are mostly located on the edge of the PSA. These locations are equally, if not more, suitable to retail, leisure or other main town centre uses. The development of new office floor space at Basing View will provide significant B1 employment floor space in close proximity to the town centre. As such, it is inappropriate to apply the same policy test regarding the alternative use of existing office sites in Basingstoke town centre as that applying to other undefined employment sites elsewhere in the borough	An additional explanatory paragraph be added after Para 17.23 to read: "Policy EP2 does not apply to existing offices or other employment uses within or on the edge of the Primary Shopping Area of Basingstoke Town Centre, as retail, leisure and entertainment uses are equally or more suitable in this town centre location." To be consistent with national town centre policy.	The policy has been updated to clearly define what policy criteria apply to the defined employment areas and the policy criteria that apply to employment sites in settlement policy boundaries that are not formally allocated. Given the identified oversupply of low grade office stock in the Employment Land Review, proposals for the loss of old office stock outside the established Employment Areas for alternate uses will be viewed favourably unless there are strong economic reasons to retain the building (i.e. the occupants have a long lease at the site and there is no suitable alternate provision in the local area, there is an identified demand for the type of premises proposed to be lost).	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites outside of the defined employment areas.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Superseded with updated representation
All supporting text	superseded	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update all text	In response to updated evidence	N/A	N/A
7.21	superseded	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	718	Yes	No	Object to paragraph 7.21 as it does not accord with Government policy and the NPPF. Inappropriate to create a policy out of supporting text that does not apply to the subject set out in the policy text itself. Evidence base does not indicate there is a need for "proposals involving the loss of employment land outside of Employment Areas" to "be resisted".	Delete first sentence in paragraph 7.21.	Sentence deleted as part of the restricting of the policies EP1 and EP2.	Text deleted. Policies EP1 and EP2 have been amended substantially along with the supporting text.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
7.22	superseded	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	726	Yes	No	Object to paragraph 7.22 as it does not accord with Government policy and the NPPF. It is inappropriate where a positive attitude is to be taken towards development and development decisions for there to be a specific requirement for marketing. Paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF make no suggestion that there should be policy provision to defer decisions subject to marketing. It is for the plan making stage itself to "have regard to market signals" in determining how to fix planning policy in relation to defined and other areas. In terms of decision making, local planning authorities must take a positive approach to decision making based upon the available evidence at the time of that decision in terms of evidence base across the market rather than in relation to an exercise for a specific single building. Marketing of an individual building can be distorted by non planning related and other factors that make such a requirement wholly unreliable and inappropriate.	Delete criteria paragraph 7.22.	The Council considers that marketing of a site is compliant with the NPPF and is a market signal as to the likelihood of a site or premises being utilised for future economic uses. Policies EP1 and EP2 have been amended substantially along with the supporting text. We consider that vacancy and marketing forms a useful market signal for the council to determine that the site / land is no longer suited to employment uses. However, Officers agree that the 12 month marketing period is too onerous and could delay schemes in coming forward. Therefore the updated supporting text to policy EP2 requires a marketing period of 6 months. We consider that this will prove to be less of a burden on developers whilst ensuring that sites / premises suitable for future employment use(s) are retained to deliver economic growth in the borough.	Text deleted. Policies EP1 and EP2 have been amended substantially along with the supporting text.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Councillor Harvey requested that 12 months marketing were re-instated - officers to consider this approach.	Remains Outstanding
7.23	superseded	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	730	Yes	No	Object to paragraph 7.23 as it does not accord with Government policy and the NPPF. Inappropriate to create a policy out of supporting text that does not apply to the subject set out in the policy text itself. Evidence base does not indicate there is a need for "proposals involving the loss of employment land outside of Employment Areas" to "be resisted".	Delete first paragraph 7.23.	The Council has updated its employment land review which indicates that there is an oversupply of dated office stock in the borough and that the industrial market is performing well. Officers agree that proposals involving the loss of employment land outside of Employment areas should only be resisted where there are strong economic reasons.	Policy EP2 has been updated to clarify the position that will be taken to the loss of employment land / sites that are not allocated as Strategic Employment Areas.	Response to rep and wider rewriting of the economic policies.	Agreed	Remains Outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Michael Fearn	Barclays Bank PLC	N/A	538125	57	Not Specified	No	Policy EP3 which seeks to restrict the location of A2 uses in the Primary Frontages in Basingstoke Town Centre is not based on sound evidence and the retail studies 2009 and 2012 provide no evidence to justify a stance that is out of step with National Policy. In order to support regeneration, the Local Plan should focus on the quality of the occupier and their contribution to vitality and viability. Planning Policy designed to restrict the presence of significant generators of footfall such as a Bank in Primary Frontages will actively work against the achievement of the Council's objectives and is inconsistent with National Policy.	The second paragraph of the policy should be changed to read "Within the defined Primary Shopping Frontage, active ground floor uses including shops, banks and building societies will be permitted. Changes of use of shops to together retail uses and the change of use of existing retail uses (Use Classes A1 to A5) to non-retail uses will not be permitted without clear evidence that their presence will support vitality and viability".	Comments are accepted and a more flexible approach is suggested for the shopping frontages of Basingstoke Town Centres which will permit A2 uses subject to certain criteria.	See response to Stephen Butterworth for new wording	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	MRS JULIA JOHNSTON	Chineham Parish Council	N/A	781298	64	No	No	It is considered that the current central shopping area is not suitable for the current thinking on Transport as set out in Policy CN8 for increased use of public transport. Consideration should be given to any future redevelopment of the Malls and the bus station to make a common "gateway" to the shopping centre with rail bus and taxi provision integrated instead of the present crowded, fragmented and inadequate access	Positive measures should be defined to enhance the use of public transport to lessen reliance on private cars.	The Local Plan sets the overall planning framework for the town centre and more detailed aspects, if considered suitable in the longer term, would be progressed through a more specific Town Centre Strategy DPD/SPD as suitable.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	177	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to the cultural and historic offer of the area in Policy EP3.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	Support
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Cllr Paula Baker	BDBC	N/A	784545	190	Yes	No	The evidence base does not justify the classification of Overton as a District Centre rather than a Local Centre. For example Overton has no Secondary School.	Show Overton as a Local Centre in Policy EP3.	The classification relates to actual centres (i.e. shopping areas with other town centre uses such as leisure uses) rather than towns or settlements in the more general sense. As such, the classification is based on the town centre type uses present in a village or town. District centres are usually defined as those which have shops containing at least one supermarket or superstore and a range of non-retail services, such as banks, building societies and restaurants, as well as local public facilities, such as a library. In contrast, Local Centres are identified as comprising a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a small catchment. The audits completed for the borough's Retail Assessment in 2009 found some 32 retail and service businesses in Overton centre (the same as recorded in 2004 illustrating a longer term trend) and concluded that it functioned as a small district centre.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	737	Yes	No	There needs to be clarity in the policy to make clear the last sentence of the first paragraph refers only to development in town, district and local centres with the text at the top of page 112 addressing out of centre proposals. If this is not the intention, then the policy as drafted is inconsistent with paragraphs 23,26 and 27 of the NPPF. Policy text relating to sequential assessment needs greater clarity to be NPPF compliant.	Amend final sentence of first paragraph of policy to read "Any town centre development that...". Amend last paragraph on page 111 by adding "Proposed" before "development" in line 1, deleting "only" in line 2, replacing "could be" with "is" in line 3, replace "it could not be accommodated" with "there are no suitable and available sites" in line 3 and "town" before "centre" in line 4.	Agree that further clarity could be added to the policy regarding which centres are being referred to. It is considered that the second paragraph is already clear and reflects the NPPF in its approach.	Amend text in first paragraph as follows: Any development that would harm the vitality and viability of a <u>defined</u> centre will not be permitted	Response to representation - for clarity	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Cllr John Izzett	BDBC	N/A	787475	1118	Yes	No	The 2013 Retail Assessment estimates 30,000 square metres of retail capacity is needed over the plan period. Policy EP3 seeks to address this need by expanding Basingstoke town centre. However, the local planning authority will likely need to identify other retail sites to accommodate the identified need in a sustainable manner over the plan period. The Borough Council and County Council as landowners believe that Manydown can play an important role in this respect. EP1 states that "employment uses will be permitted where they are of a scale and type appropriate for the site's location and they will contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed use community." It is felt that this policy sentence in EP1 in combination with clause (c) in SS3.10 is insufficient and the local planning authority should consider identification of locations for new centres at Manydown on the Proposals Map, consistent with the draft masterplan and landowner representations under draft Policy SS3.10.	Identify potential locations of new local centres on Proposals Map 1a.	Policy SS3.10 already states that shopping facilities should be provided on the Manydown site and therefore a framework for future retail provision on the site is in place. It is suggested that a reference to new centres is added to Policy EP3 to reinforce this. To identify where the centres should be located at this early stage could prejudice the suitable future masterplanning of the area. The current draft masterplan has no status and will continue to evolve in light of additional evidence including consultation.	New text added to Policy EP3 as follows: <u>New local and district centres may also come forward as part of larger developments set out in Policy SS3.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	Agreed	Withdrawn - support changes made.
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A		Worting Business Park and Flavia Estates	N/A	787600	1125	Yes	No	Policy EP3 should be amended to include new District and Local Centres within major development areas	Policy EP3 should be amended to include new District and Local Centres within major development areas	Agreed that such a reference should be made.	New text added to Policy EP3 as follows: <u>New local and district centres may also come forward as part of larger developments set out in Policy SS3.</u>	Response to representation and to improve clarity	Agreed	Withdrawn/agreed with change
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Stephen Butterworth	Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1121	Yes	No	On the town centre policy itself, Festival Place Unit Trust finds EP3 is not sufficiently rigorous and is therefore inconsistent with the NPPF and draft NPPG in applying the sequential and impact tests Also, no encouragement should be given to further development at existing retail parks. Improving their design and integration is more appropriately achieved through the LP design policies. Retail assessment is a cautious estimate that must be reviewed over time as circumstances change. There is no explicit assessment of potential development sites within the PSA or in edge of centre retail locations and thus no assessment of which sites ought be allocated for retail and/or other main town centre uses (RSU Jan 2009 11.40 and 11.45; RSU December 2012 6.6 and 6.9). To support the vitality and viability of the town centre and to allow sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change it should be amended to be less restrictive.	Town Centre Policy EP3: Policy EP3 be amended as follows: The word "significantly" is inserted into the last sentence of the first Para, so as to read: "Any development that would significantly harm the vitality and viability of a centre will not be permitted". The third Para is amended to read: "... following a Sequential Assessment, it is demonstrated that the development could not be accommodated within the centre or in an accessible edge of centre development as well connected to the centre, having first demonstrated flexibility in the format and scale of development proposed". The second and last sentence of Para 3, dealing with out-of centre locations such as retail parks, is deleted. To be consistent with national policy on the sequential test. Basingstoke Town Centre Needs, Allocations and Designations: The third sentence of Para 7.27 be amended (see full rep) The second sentence of Para 7.29 be amended (see full rep) Policy EP3 and 7.28 be reworded (see rep)	- It is considered appropriate to only allow development that would not harm the vitality and viability of an area, significantly or not, and therefore the inclusion of the word significantly is not appropriate. - In relation to out of town locations, the policy enables proposals which improve design and connectivity only where there is no increase in floorspace and this approach is in line with the NPPF rather than encouraging out of centre development as suggested. - It is considered that the evidence base on which the policy is founded is robust in terms of assessing future needs. The policy allows for additional capacity within the town centres and also other centres including centres on new development and therefore it is not agreed that all identified need should be located within the town centre PSA. The policy will enable Basingstoke Town Centre to remain competitive and enhance vitality and viability. The evidence base will be updated to reflect any changing trends, as suggested etc.	See updated policy text below. Paragraph 7.28 has also been updated to reflect the changes. Paragraph 3 has been updated as follows: Development, including extensions to existing facilities, for main town centre uses outside of the defined centres will only be permitted if, following a Sequential Assessment, it could be demonstrated that <u>the development</u> could not be accommodated within a centre or edge of centre location <u>having demonstrated flexibility in the format and scale of development proposed</u> . Development proposals within out of centre locations, such as retail parks, which improve their quality of design and connectivity will be encouraged only where there is no increase in floorspace and there is no impact on the vitality and viability of other centres.	Response to representation.	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	770	Not Specified	No	We object to the town centre boundary as shown in Map 2. This map should include Vista and the adjoining car park/offices. Generally, the policy follows the NPPF guidance it says "development, including extension to existing facilities, for main town centre uses outside of the defined centres will only be permitted if, following a Sequential Assessment, it could be demonstrated that it could not be accommodated within a centre or edge of centre location" That test cannot be faulted in terms of consistency with the NPPF. This makes the Policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the Framework.	This objection would be overcome by accepting the amendment to Map 1f with the inclusion of additional Town Centre related land as noted on the drawing attached (please see full response).	The area of land in question is clearly separated from the pedestrianised town centre by the road and has a different character to the areas both to the north (Top of Town) and the residential areas to the south. Due to the sensitivity of the site in question (proximity to the conservation area) and current uses on the southern side of New Road including offices, community uses and the recently completed McCarthy and Stone residential development which now dominates the street scene on this side, the southern side of New Road has an edge of centre character. It is considered suitable to retain the boundary as currently proposed. The Vista site was granted permission for a Premier Inn hotel in March 2013.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Ian Sowerby	Lamron Estates	Bell Cornwell	786546	783	Not Specified	No	Object to the town centre boundary shown on Map 2. This map should include Vista and adjoining car park/offices. Generally, the policy follows the NPPF guidance it says: "Development, including extensions to existing facilities, for main town centre uses outside of the defined centres will only be permitted if, following a Sequential Assessment, it could be demonstrated that it could not be accommodated within a centre or edge location." That test cannot be faulted in terms of consistency with the NPPF. This makes the policy unsound in terms of justification, effectiveness and compliance with the Framework.	This objection would be overcome by accepting the amendment to Map 1f with the inclusion of additional Town Centre related land as noted on the drawing attached.	See response above (770)	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	802	Not Specified	No	The policy does not mention the current access problems for many of the borough's commercial and retail areas. Eastrop roundabout is a major obstacle to expansion in central Basingstoke and will deter shoppers to the town unless improvements are made to it and access points from Festival Place and Basing View. As far as Overton is concerned the absence of off street parking in sufficient quantity close to the commercial area is a major disadvantage and a serious threat to the village's continued viability commercially.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Transport Assessment supporting the local plan identified the junctions on the defined highway network that are likely to experience increased congestion over the Local Plan period. Eastrop Roundabout is one of the junctions identified where traffic volumes will increase. Improvements to Eastrop Roundabout will be made to support the regeneration of Basing View. The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Authority to deliver improvements to the local highway network.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	972	Yes	No	The drawing of the primary shopping area to include extensive areas of car parking along the northern frontage of New Road is unjustified and is not consistent with national policy. Clear guidance on how the primary shopping area should be defined is set out at Paragraph 6.4 of "Planning for Town Centres Practice Guidance" (2009) and the inclusion of extensive areas of car parking which have no existing primary frontages, do not include any "other main town centre uses" and are not the subject of any planned extensions to the primary shopping area is clearly contrary to such guidance. As a consequence, the definition of the primary shopping area has the potential to frustrate or prevent the delivery of sustainable retail development in edge of centre or out of centre locations, which would otherwise represent the most suitable location available in compliance with the sequential approach.	Proposed change: Redefine the primary shopping area to exclude the areas of car parking along the northern frontage to New Road. The proposed change is consistent with national policy guidance on the definition of primary shopping areas. It is justified on the basis that the primary shopping area as currently proposed could frustrate or prevent necessary and sustainable development and is contrary to national policy.	The area of land in question lies to the north of New Road which forms a more suitable boundary to the pedestrianised town centre. The area has a mix of uses found within town centres including car parking, office uses and also existing retail uses. The inclusion of this area provides some flexibility to provide additional retail in the area, to both enhance the offer of the Top of Town area (a priority of the Borough Council) and the centre more generally. It is therefore considered suitable to retain this area within the secondary frontage.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A		The Basingstoke Jersey Limited Partnership	N/A	787221	1020	Yes	Yes	We support the inclusion of Churchill Plaza in the Town Centre boundary especially considering the proximity to the primary shopping area. We agree with the general principle of extending the town centre boundary to ensure sustainable growth over the plan period considered the policy to be sound in line with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Support noted	No change	N/A	N/A	Support
Policy EP3 - Town, District and Local Centres	N/A	Stephen Butterworth	Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	continuation of rep 1121	Yes	No	On the town centre policy itself, Festival Place Unit Trust finds EP3 is not sufficiently rigorous and is therefore inconsistent with the NPPF and draft NPPG in applying the sequential and impact tests. Also, no encouragement should be given to further development at existing retail parks. Improving their design and integration is more appropriately achieved through the LP design policies. Retail assessment is a cautious estimate that must be reviewed over time as circumstances change. There is no explicit assessment of potential development sites within the PSA or in edge of centre retail locations and thus no assessment of which sites ought to be allocated for retail and/or other main town centre uses (RSU Jan 2009 11.40 and 11.45; RSU December 2012 6.6 and 6.9). To support the vitality and viability of the town centre and to allow sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change it should be amended to be less restrictive.	Town Centre Policy EP3: Policy EP3 be amended as follows: The word "significantly" is inserted into the last sentence of the first Para, so as to read: "Any development that would significantly harm the vitality and viability of a centre will not be permitted". The third Para is amended to read: "... following a Sequential Assessment, it is demonstrated that the development could not be accommodated within the centre or in an accessible edge of centre location well connected to the centre, having first demonstrated flexibility in the format and scale of development proposed". The second and last sentence of Para 3, dealing with out-of centre locations such as retail parks, is deleted. To be consistent with national policy on the sequential test. Basingstoke Town Centre Needs, Allocations and Designations: The third sentence of Para 7.27 be amended (see full rep) The second sentence of Para 7.29 be amended (see full rep) Policy EP3 and 7.28 be reworded (see rep)	- It is agreed that paragraph 3 should be updated to reflect the need to show flexibility in format and scale. - The expansion of the town centre boundary has led to a number of potential future development sites being brought into the boundary, which will enable future needs to be met, as suitable. - It is agreed that addition flexibility within the primary frontage should be supported and the policy and paragraph 7.28 have been updated to reflect this.	New policy text as follows: <u>Proposals for shops (A1 Use Class) are encouraged within the defined Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages. Other retail uses (Use Classes A1-A4), will be permitted where:</u> <u>a) Individually or cumulatively they do not undermine the vitality, viability or character of the frontage; and</u> <u>b) They do not give rise to unacceptable environmental or public safety impacts.</u> <u>Proposals for the loss of retail uses (A1-A5) to non-retail uses in the defined Primary Shopping Frontage will not be permitted.</u> <u>Within the defined Secondary Shopping Frontage, proposals for other town centre uses will be permitted where the above criteria are met and the cultural and historic offer of the Frontage is supported.</u>	Response to representation.	Agreed	Remains outstanding
7.27	N/A	Mr Michael Fearn	Barclays Bank PLC	N/A	538125	538	Not Specified	No	Policy EP3 which seeks to restrict the location of A2 uses in the Primary Frontages in Basingstoke Town Centre is not based on sound evidence and the retail studies 2009 and 2012 provide no evidence to justify a stance that is out of step with National Policy. In order to support regeneration, the Local Plan should focus on the quality of the occupier and their contribution to vitality and viability. Planning Policy designed to restrict the presence of significant generators of footfall such as a Bank in Primary Frontages will actively work against the achievement of the Council's objectives and is inconsistent with National Policy.	The second paragraph of the policy should be changed to read "Within the defined Primary Shopping Frontage, active ground floor uses including shops, banks and building societies will be permitted. Changes of use of shops to other retail uses and the change of use of existing retail uses (Use Classes A1 to A5) to non-retail uses will not be permitted without clear evidence that their presence will support vitality and viability".	Comments are generally accepted and a more flexible approach is suggested for the shopping frontages of Basingstoke Town Centres which will permit A2 uses subject to certain criteria.	See response to Stephen Butterworth for new wording	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
7.27	7.22	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Should be '2012 Retail Assessment Update' rather than '2013'.	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A
7.27	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	739	Yes	No	The Council's Retail Assessment (2012) used to identify convenience goods floorspace "capacity" essentially "redistributes" surplus expenditures from overtrading stores to under trading ones. This is a wholly inappropriate approach as it would serve to protect less efficient and often qualitatively poor space. It is therefore not consistent with the Government's approach to fostering effective competition and the NPPFs approach towards positively providing customer choice. The overtrading within superstores in Basingstoke at 2012 is substantial. This justifies far more than the 4,000 square metres growth in convenience goods floorspace over the plan period referred to in paragraph 7.27. Notes that the spending "capacity" to support new floorspace from overtrading alone will be much greater than £50m. When this is added to the Local Plans' stated requirement (up to 4,000 square metres) for convenience goods floorspace, there is around twice the Plan's stated requirement.	Delete 4,000 square metres. The convenience goods floorspace requirement for the period is around twice the Plan's stated requirement.	Officer's consider that the approach used in the retail assessment is robust and therefore no changes are considered necessary.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
7.28	7.23	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Insert "see policies map")" at the end of the first sentence. Refer to the Primary "Shopping" frontage. After "it is necessary to protect the" ensure reads as follows "retail uses in this Frontage, particularly A1(shops). The policy also enables an element of complementary non A1 retails uses (A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (Restaurants and cafes) and A4 (Drinking establishments) in order to enhance the offer and strengths of the shopping frontage. A greater variety of retail uses are found in the defined Secondary Shopping Frontage which mainly comprises 'Top of Town' area. A more flexible approach to town centre uses is taken towards proposals in this Secondary Shopping Frontage but these should not result in an imbalance of retail uses where this affects the vitality, viability or character of the area...."	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A
7.28	N/A	Mr Michael Fearn	Barclays Bank PLC	N/A	538125	539	Not Specified	No	Policy EP3 which seeks to restrict the location of A2 uses in the Primary Frontages in Basingstoke Town Centre is not based on sound evidence and the retail studies 2009 and 2012 provide no evidence to justify a stance that is out of step with National Policy. In order to support regeneration, the Local Plan should focus on the quality of the occupier and their contribution to vitality and viability. Planning Policy designed to restrict the presence of significant generators of footfall such as a Bank in Primary Frontages will actively work against the achievement of the Council's objectives and is inconsistent with National Policy.	The second paragraph of the policy should be changed to read "Within the defined Primary Shopping Frontage, active ground floor uses including shops, banks and building societies will be permitted. Changes of use of shops to other retail uses and the change of use of existing retail uses (Use Classes A1 to A5) to non-retail uses will not be permitted without clear evidence that their presence will support vitality and viability".	Comments are generally accepted and a more flexible approach is suggested for the shopping frontages of Basingstoke Town Centres which will permit A2 uses subject to certain criteria.	See response to Stephen Butterworth for new wording	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
7.29	N/A		The Basingstoke Jersey Limited Partnership	N/A	787221	1022	Yes	No	Due to the proximity of the site to Festival Place and the physical separation of other sites allocated within the extended town centre boundary from the primary shopping area, Churchill Plaza is sequentially the most appropriate location on which to deliver future retail accommodation. We consider that the designation of the primary shopping area needs to be redefined to allow the site to accommodate retail uses without the requirement for a sequential assessment.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Primary Shopping Area defines 'the area where retail development is concentrated'. Churchill Plaza is currently in an office use and therefore its inclusion within the Primary Shopping Area is unjustified. An application to change the use on the site should be tested through the sequential test where the factors raised by the respondent can be considered appropriately. Under the draft policy, the site would be considered as edge of centre rather than out of centre. The site should not be allocated for retail as there is currently no certainty over delivery.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
7.29	N/A	Mr Michael Fearn	Barclays Bank PLC	N/A	538125	540	Not Specified	No	Policy EP3 which seeks to restrict the location of A2 uses in the Primary Frontages in Basingstoke Town Centre is not based on sound evidence and the retail studies 2009 and 2012 provide no evidence to justify a stance that is out of step with National Policy. In order to support regeneration, the Local Plan should focus on the quality of the occupier and their contribution to vitality and viability. Planning Policy designed to restrict the presence of significant generators of footfall such as a Bank in Primary Frontages will actively work against the achievement of the Council's objectives and is inconsistent with National Policy.	The second paragraph of the policy should be changed to read "Within the defined Primary Shopping Frontage, active ground floor uses including shops, banks and building societies will be permitted. Changes of use of shops to together retail uses and the change of use of existing retail uses (Use Classes A1 to A5) to non-retail uses will not be permitted without clear evidence that their presence will support vitality and viability".	Comments are generally accepted and a more flexible approach is suggested for the shopping frontages of Basingstoke Town Centres which will permit A2 uses subject to certain criteria.	See response to Stephen Butterworth for new wording	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
7.29	7.24	Mr Julian Jones (Dummer Parish Council)	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	130006	543	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Suggest the wording of clause 7.29 should be reviewed in conjunction with the Glossary definition of Edge of Centre. Should the term be hyphenated? Is section 7.29 clear and serving a useful purpose?	Agree that the wording should be reviewed and additional suggested wording has been added to paragraph 7.29 to improve clarity and bring the approach in line with the NPPF. The term should not be hyphenated and this will be reflected in a change to the glossary.	New suggested wording: The definition of a Primary Shopping Area in Basingstoke Town Centre effectively leaves some sites outside of this area, but inside the extended Town Centre Boundary. Some of these sites are, by definition, 'edge of centre' for retail purposes but within centre for all other town centre uses (see definition of edge of centre in the glossary). This approach ensures that uses in these areas will complement rather than... ' Also update glossary by removing the hyphens	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
7.29	7.24	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	738	Yes	No	It is not correct to say that all sites within the extended town centre are 'by definition' edge of centre for retail purposes. Some sites fall outside the relevant definition in terms of distance and ease of connection.	Add "some" before "these" on line 3 of paragraph 7.29 and delete the last sentence of paragraph 7.29 or clarify that it relates to office development consistent with the definition in the NPPF Glossary.	Agreed, and additional wording will be added to paragraph 7.29 to improve clarity and bring the approach in line with the NPPF.	See response to representation 543 plus the following changes to the paragraph: In line with the council's approach to Basing View, part of the area within the extended town centre boundary in this location (within 300m of the Primary Shopping Area) will be considered as edge of centre rather than out of centre for retail uses.	Response to representation	Agreed	Withdrawn - support changes made.
7.30	7.25	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Should be '2012 rather than '2013'.	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A
7.31	7.26		Chineham Shopping Centre Limited Partnership	N/A	786413	714	Not Specified	No	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local plans should be positive, promote competitive town centre uses and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the entire plan period. Furthermore, local authorities should allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale, type and need of retail development within town centres and should ensure these are not compromised by limited site availability (NPPF, paragraph 23). Accordingly, we strongly urge the council to apportion greater weight to the significant role District Centres serve in the day-to-day needs of their local population (in particular, Chineham Shopping Centre). Policy EP3 fails to recognise the importance of the shopping centre within the hierarchy as a facility that is used and relied upon by a large number of local residents in the Chineham area and further afield.	Currently, these findings are not reflected within the draft Local Plan and greater clarification should therefore be included within the main policy justification. Chineham Shopping Centre Limited Partnership's aspirations for the site are to retain and refurbish the existing shopping centre, with future plans to extend the current retail provision on the southern and western parts of the site, through the addition of new retail floorspace. Chineham Shopping Centre Limited Partnership notes the District Centre status of the shopping centre, however given the aspirations for the site, it would be helpful to ensure that future investment and protection of the centre is formerly identified within the plan process. We believe Chineham Shopping Centre should be allocated and identified for further retail expansion, development and intensification, in line with the role and function of the centre	Chineham is named in the policy as a district centre and the policy allows for suitable retail expansion within such centres. There is no specific need to reflect future aspirations within the policy or through a specific allocation as suitable flexibility is already built in. Additional text has however been added to the supporting text to reflect proposals.	Additional wording added to paragraph 7.31 to reflect aspirations - <u>The policy supports the refurbishment and expansion of retail floorspace within such centres, providing a framework for proposals such as the expansion of floorspace at Chineham District Centre.</u>	Response to representation	Agreed	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Mr Derek Kane	St Mary Bourne Parish Council	N/A	111301	83	Not Specified	Not Specified	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The policy should be amended to add: Growth beyond an employee headcount of 10 will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that (a) the enterprise primarily serves the local rural economy, for example as a support service for farming or woodland businesses or other activities that are inherently local in their nature; or (b) recruitment to the new posts generated can and will be focused locally and that suitable employees are locally available; or (c) there are overriding reasons why the particular location is vital to the continuing success of the enterprise.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Consider that these issues can be assessed as part of the planning application process. The suggested change is not consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF which requires planning policies to support economic growth and promote a strong rural economy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Mrs Doreen Gascoine	Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Parish Council	N/A	542232	476	Yes	No	While some rural locations might be suitable for the initial start-up and early growth of a range of small businesses, a rural setting is inappropriate for larger enterprises other than those directly supporting the rural economy or the immediate local economy. A larger enterprise needs more staff and growing businesses usually recruit either from a local urban area or on a wider national/international scale. In either case, this recruitment would result in staff either commuting from a town to an unsustainable rural location, or an exacerbation of housing shortages and rising costs as staff move in to the local rural or urban area from elsewhere.	This policy should be amended to add the following: "Growth beyond a total of 10 employees will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that: a. The enterprise primarily serves the local rural economy; for example, as a support service for local farming or other inherently local activities. b. Recruitment to the new jobs can, and will be, focused locally and that suitable employees are available locally. c. There are overriding reasons why the particular location is vital to the continuing success of the enterprise".	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Consider that these issues can be assessed as part of the planning application process. The suggested change is not consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF which requires planning policies to support economic growth and promote a strong rural economy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Ms Becky French	CPRE Hampshire	N/A	637125	1246	Yes	No	Supports policies for the economic development of the rural area, including the conservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment. However, policy is unsound in that in relation to economic development in the countryside it does not adopt the most appropriate strategy for the protection of the character of the countryside and of supporting thriving rural communities. Conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including the local landscape should be a central part of encouraging and sustaining an attractive and prosperous countryside. The proposed policy does not sufficiently conserve and enhance the different landscape character areas of the borough, while accommodating the change needed to address social or economic objectives and meet the needs of communities.	The borough is largely rural in character and includes many locally distinctive and attractive landscapes greatly valued by both residents and visitors alike. Economic development and diversification is essential to maintaining and encouraging flourishing rural communities. The policy must be neither rigid or inflexible as this will be the most appropriate policy approach to achieve dynamic and flourishing rural communities, and also contributing to the wider objectives of sustainable development (such as protection of the character of the countryside).	No change as the policy is already considered sound and is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. The Local Plan must be read as a whole, including policies EM1 (Landscape Impact), EM10 (Delivering high quality development) and EP5 (Rural tourism).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	178	Yes	Yes	English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference to heritage impacts in criterion i) of Policy EP4	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Noted.	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	512	Yes	No	Criteria C is not clear and appears to combine the replacement of a building with the extension of a building. It is proposed that the two alternatives are split into two and drafted in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework Para 89. The requested wording incorporates reference to 'temporary in nature' and 'does not result in the requirements for another building to fulfil the function of the building being converted'.	We request that the policy wording is amended to: c.i. are for the replacement of a building, which is not temporary in nature, provided the building is not materially larger than the one it replaces and does not result in the requirement for another building to fulfil the function of the building being replaced. c.ii. Are for the extension of or alteration of a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.	No change as the policy is already considered clear, sound and consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. The suggested change has been drafted in accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF which is in relation to the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt. No requirement for the policy to be consistent with paragraph 89 of the NPPF as there is no Green Belt with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	512	Yes	No	Criteria d). does not allow for new buildings to support the rural economy.	Requested that 'and' is replaced with 'or' in criterion d. Requested that the sentence below criteria D) is amended to "All development proposals must be of a use and scale that is appropriate to the site and location, <u>and where appropriate the agricultural holding to which it relates</u> , when considering."	No change as the policy criteria d) is already considered sound. The first part of criteria d) permits development proposals for economic uses in the countryside where they will "enable the continuing sustainability or expansion of a business or enterprise...". The policy is consistent with paragraph 28 (bullet point 2) of the NPPF. No change to the sentence below criteria d). The requested change is not necessary as the policy needs to be read as a whole, including criteria d) which already refers to 'business' and 'enterprise'.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	512	Yes	No	Criteria iv) Unclear as to why there is provision for residential accommodation in the rural economy policy when this is dealt with under Policy SS6.	Consider deleting sentence on provision for residential accommodation.	No change as the policy criteria is already considered sound. The criteria complements Policy SS6.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend last paragraph as follows: "Development proposals that result in an increase in HGV's..."	Typographical error (remove apostrophe).	Agreed	N/A
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	c/r Ian Tilbury	BDBC	N/A	784568	693	No	No	There was a late change to this policy that now reads: Development proposals that result in an increase in HGV's on C and U roads, or a significant increase in other traffic on C and U roads, will generally not be permitted. While I understand the concerns around HGV's in particular, had this policy been in place in my ward in recent years it would have prevented the development of Laverstoke Park Farm, a universally acclaimed organic farm. Hardy's the renowned local plan nursery which wins gold medals at the Chelsea Flower Show every year. Along with several other farm diversification schemes. Throughout the last 50 years, most new jobs in my ward have been created in the countryside, while at the same time employment sites in the villages have been brought up for housing development. Had this been prevented some of these business's could have been located in Overton village, sadly that is no longer possible.	Replace last sentence with: "Development proposals that result in a significant increase in HGV and other traffic on C and U roads will generally not be permitted." This should give enough scope to prevent totally inappropriate development.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. The policy addresses the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough.	No change	N/A	Members did not agree with suggested change. Wording should remain as previously agreed through P&I, Cabinet and Council.	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	287	Yes	Yes	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The parish council is in support of the general impact of Policy EP4. The policy could be improved if amended by adding "in assessing substantial expansion proposals or repeated incremental proposals, approval will only be granted where the principal of continued support for the rural economy can be demonstrated and the nature and size of the resulting business would not be more appropriately located in an urban location where the resulting total number of employees would have better access to methods of travel to work other than by the private car."	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Consider that these issues can be assessed as part of the planning application process. The suggested change is not consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF which requires planning policies to support economic growth and promote a strong rural economy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Policy EP4 - Rural Economy	N/A	Mr Michael Harwood	Highclere Parish Council	N/A	786426	728	Yes	No	EP4 section (d) While some types of rural locations may be suitable for the initial start up and early growth of a wide range of small businesses, particularly micro enterprises, a rural setting is inappropriate for larger enterprises, other than those that directly support the rural economy or the immediate local economy. By definition, a larger enterprise requires more staff and the main source for new staff in most growth businesses is either local urban areas or recruitment at a wider -national and even international - level. In either case, this entails either commuting from a town to an unsustainable rural location, or exacerbating housing shortages and rising costs as people move into the district's rural or urban area from elsewhere.	EP4 section (d) The policy should be amended to add: Growth beyond an employee headcount of 10 will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that (a) the enterprise primarily serves the local rural economy, for example as a support service for farming or woodland businesses or other activities that are inherently local in their nature; or (b) recruitment to the new posts generated can and will be focused locally and that suitable employees are locally available; or (c) there are overriding reasons why the particular location is vital to the continuing success of the enterprise.	No change as the policy is already considered sound. Consider that these issues can be assessed as part of the planning application process. The suggested change is not consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF which requires planning policies to support economic growth and promote a strong rural economy.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
7.35	7.3	Councillor	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend first sentence of paragraph as follows to remove typographical error: "The rural areas of the borough makes a vital..."	Typographical error	Agreed	N/A
7.36 and 7.37	7.31 and 7.32	The Garden Centre Group	The Garden Centre Group	N/A	784237	106	Yes	No	Despite a recognition that the rural economy is made up of a diverse range of businesses, Para. 7.36 goes on to state that Policy EP4 - Rural Economy only relates to class B1, B2 and B8 proposals. Should this be the case, the Local Plan would appear to offer no support or policy guidance to the sustainable growth of non-B1 rural businesses such as that belonging to my client. Accordingly, my client OBJECTS to Policy EP4 - Rural Economy of the Local Plan in so far as it relates only to Class B uses. It is considered that should the extent of this policy be limited so as to exclude all non- Class B uses, it would render it 'unsound' by virtue of being inconsistent with national policy (specifically paragraph 28 of the NPPF).	N/A	Policy EP4 is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. The point regarding paragraph 7.36 is accepted and therefore will delete "The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals." from the paragraph However, the Council will amend paragraph 7.37 for clarity as follows: " <u>Proposals for use classes B1, B2 and B8 and other</u> proposals for rural economic development will be supported where the use and class..."	Delete "The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals." from paragraph 7.36. Amend paragraph 7.37 as follows " <u>The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals and other</u> proposals for rural economic development. <u>Such proposals</u> will be supported where the use and scale of the development is appropriate to its location. This <u>also</u> applies to farm diversification..."	Response to representation and to ensure Local Plan is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF.	Agreed	Agreed with change
7.36 and 7.37	7.31 and 7.32	The Garden Centre Group	The Garden Centre Group	N/A	784237	109	Yes	No	It is noted that nothing contained within the wording of the policy would prevent it from relating to an existing retail business since it refers to economic uses and the definition for 'economic development' set out in the NPPF includes main town centre uses with B Class Uses and community uses. Accordingly, the exclusion of non Class B uses is only instigated by virtue of the final sentence in Para. 7.36 of the explanatory text, which would not be afforded the same weight as the policy, once adopted. In order to avoid future confusion and to afford the required support to all types of rural business, it is requested that this sentence be deleted and a clarification included which would confirm that the term economic uses covers all forms of economic development including certain town centre uses which it is impractical to locate in a town centre location.	N/A	Policy EP4 is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Accepts the point regarding paragraph 7.36 and therefore will delete "The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals." from the paragraph However, the Council will amend paragraph 7.37 for clarity as follows: " <u>The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals and other</u> proposals for rural economic development will be supported where the use and class..."	Delete "The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals." from paragraph 7.36. Amend paragraph 7.37 as follows " <u>The policy applies to use classes B1, B2 and B8 proposals and other</u> proposals for rural economic development. <u>Such proposals</u> will be supported where the use and scale of the development is appropriate to its location. This <u>also</u> applies to farm diversification..."	Response to representation and to ensure Local Plan is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF.	Agreed	Agreed with change
7.40	7.35	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	520	Yes	No	Paragraph 7.40 is confusing and, relating to replacement dwellings, does not appear to be applicable to the policy which precedes it.	We request that you consider deleting this paragraph.	For clarity the word 'dwelling' will be replaced with 'building'. Guidance on replacement dwellings in the countryside is contained in Policy SS6 and paragraphs 4.61 and 4.62.	Replace the word 'dwelling' with 'building'.	Response to representation and for clarity.	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Policy EP5 - Rural Tourism	N/A	Cllr Horace Mitchell	BDBC	N/A	784488	1224	Yes	No	Sections (d) and (e) fail to recognise the traffic-generating aspects of camping and touring caravan sites and the fact that users travel into and out of the borough mainly using trunk roads and do so either in large vehicles (motorhomes) or towing trailers or caravans. The LPA needs to have a sound basis for refusing sites that will present avoidable problems for tourists and for other road users.	Add section (f): The site is located with easy access to trunk or other major roads, via local roads suitable for vehicles towing caravans or trailers and large motorhomes.*	The Local Plan must be read as a whole including policy CN8 which provides appropriate and NPPF compliant guidance on highway matters (Transport).	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Stephen Reid	Save Manydown Group	N/A	85822	469	Yes	No	The TA in relation to this site contains incorrect information about trips, which should have been spotted by officers or members. Costings for relevant in the IDP for this site are underestimated and throws into doubt the soundness of the plan. The link road costings indicate a single lane road which may not be appropriate. There is no provision for junctions off the new road with the A339 B3400, or it is likely that rat-running will occur through Winklebury and the Clarke Estate. The Southern part of Manydown is largely land-locked and a new road onto Pack Lane will lead to extra pressure on the double railway bridge. The plan makes no provision for an improved or new rail crossing.	The TA should be revisited and verified with updated trips, and the TA / IDP should include costs for the necessary junctions between the link road and the B3400 / A339, with an indication of how the costs will be met. Further work is needed on crossing the railway line, and road works should be classified as 'essential'. Work should be undertaken to plan the infrastructure for Manydown in its totality, reflecting the previous inspector's advice and planned as a whole.	The Local Plan Transport Assessment was updated during the consultation period to correct typographical errors in the consultants report. With regards to the Manydown link road and associated junctions, it should be noted that that two entirely new junctions are proposed to serve this allocation site and that a Masterplan has not yet been produced for the site. Therefore, it is the Local Planning Authorities view that, at this stage, detailed junction designs are not worked up. It is the intention that this is undertaken at a later stage as part detailed masterplanning and/or planning application process for this development site once the allocation has been confirmed in the Local Plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1209	Yes	No	Transport Assessment (2013) Trip rates in Table 8.26 of the Transport Assessment for SS3.9/SS3.7 are inconsistent with other town areas, which combined with dubious reliance on employment and bus timetables would have produced an underestimate of the impact on the relevant junction analyses.	None identified.	The trip rates have been calculated using industry standard methodologies which are set out in the TA document and the Highway Authority have been engaged in this process. On larger sites, trip rates can often be lower due to a degree of self containment within the site, for example the provision of schools, medical facilities and convenience retail provision within the site.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	N/A	N/A	786148	592	Yes	Yes	I was pleased to note that the Local Plan has an explicit reference to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record in paragraphs 6.86 and 6.87, as it is relevant evidence base. I would suggest that it should be noted as part of the evidence base in preparation of the plan, as the HER was consulted within the SHLAA sustainability process.	I was pleased to note that the Local Plan has an explicit reference to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record in paragraphs 6.86 and 6.87, as it is relevant evidence base. I would suggest that it should be noted as part of the evidence base in preparation of the plan, as the HER was consulted within the SHLAA sustainability process.	Appendix 1 reflects key pieces of evidence base completed to inform the Local plan rather than a comprehensive list of every relevant document. The evidence outlined in the representation were considered in the site selection process, as outlined in the Housing Site Assessment documents listed in the appendix	No change	N/A	Changed response , as above	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	552	Yes	No	Appendix 1 contains a summary of the evidence base, and the only relevant evidence appears to be the 2001 Landscape Assessment - 2001. There is no reference to the Historic Environment Record, Heritage at Risk Register, Conservation Area Character Appraisals or other characterisation exercises. All of these documents should have informed the council's selection of development sites and policy development.	The plan should contain a more coherent, comprehensive, positive and clear strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, informed by an adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence base, with clear vision, aims, objectives and policy criteria. The strategy should explain the significance of the historic environment in and to the borough, identify current issues and trends and include policies to address these issues and so deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. EM11 should contain a criterion specifically requiring the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Footnote 22 should be reworded to correctly identify what are considered to be "designated heritage assets" in terms of the NPPF, and to explain that "non-designated heritage assets" may nevertheless still be of national importance. The NPPF also requires Local Plans to identify where development would be inappropriate, for example due to historic significance.	Appendix 1 reflects key pieces of evidence base completed to inform the Local plan rather than a comprehensive list of every relevant document. The evidence outlined in the representation were considered in the site selection process, as outlined in the Housing Site Assessment documents listed in the appendix	No change	N/A	Change of approach here - don't think we need to add all docs in	Superseded by subsequent representation
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1210	Yes	No	Site assessment [Volume 1, January 2013] pg 112 The possibility of a bus gate is raised in the Evidence Base document: the site assessment [Volume 1, January 2013] pg 112 states - "There is limited scope to provide additional exits from this site due to a heritage site (Park Pale), although a bus gate may be feasible to the south". This access would be in direct conflict with SS3.9 criteria e) and f). A bus gate onto Pyotts Hill will not be sound due to reasons set out in the representation.	No changes identified.	Any S106 or CIL funding that is required as part of the development of any sites allocated through the Local Plan will be secured through a condition in the granting of planning permission. Criteria i of Policy SS3.9 ensures that if planning permission was granted for the site, measures to improve accessibility to public transport modes including pedestrian access will be made.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr MacInnes	Brookvale Community Association	N/A	130668	398	Yes	No	A plan cannot be positively "prepared" when relying upon paid 3rd parties to "objectively assess" development and infrastructure needs. However, the "delivery" of (economic) "sustainable development" is "improved" with the inclusion of Manydown. This site must be a "flag ship" for (environmental) "sustainable development" specified in the "tender process".	Re-instate "zoning" to include housing, employment, education, leisure, recreation, conservation and green (water source) designations. Identify "land swaps" e.g. Camrose to the Common. Identify "site expansions" e.g. Saunders Field, A339 Doughnut Basing Fen. Adhere to "strategic gaps" (green belt), reverse Kiln Farm decision overridden by Pickles. Accumulate definite evidence that increased housing will accommodate those who really need it, not attract new incomers who will be a drain on the economy. "Presumption to approve" must include community and environment needs - currently overrides community and environmental benefits. Do not approve without infrastructure. Currently "domineries" are being created. Communities should be allowed to remove sites from the SHLAA. Local Plan "online portal" must include all evidence base. All SPDs to be online. Portfolio holders and councillors to respond and engage with communities. Consultation shouldn't be in the summer.	The housing work undertaken by Edge analytics uses the most up to date statistics and a recognised model. This work is considered to be a robust assessment of objectively assessed housing needs taking into account national guidance and planning policy. All of the evidence base and SPDs are available to view at the council's website. It should be noted that Strategic Gaps have been included in the Local Plan under Policy EM2 and are shown on the proposed Policy Maps. It is important to note that this land is considered to be the countryside and is not designated as Green Belt. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is as set out in the NPPF.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Alistair Craig	N/A	N/A	173028	385	Yes	No	The New Homes consultation has not been included in the summary of evidence base (weblink provided to the headline results on BDBC website)	Include the New Homes consultation in the evidence base summary	Noted. Reference is made to the New Homes consultation in the Statement of Consultation, this change is therefore not considered to be necessary.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved.
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1136	No	No	There appears to be inconsistencies in the assessment of the Manydown site. The site was assessed for the 2001-2011 draft local plan under similar criteria to those before us now. Most striking is the assessment of the land for the agricultural quality. In the past, this was a major reason to reject the land and was highlighted in the inspectors report following the EIP in which the site was rejected. The land is assessed as having 97% best and most versatile in the site assessment. Given the assessment of the land quality and the NPPF and indeed past reports which gave considerable negative weight to the loss of a large tract of best and most versatile agricultural land, we are concerned that the assessment of the site leading to the site selection rates this factor as "marginally negative". Surely if the criteria is the loss of best and most versatile land and the land lost is almost all best and most versatile then it must score the highest negative score.	The site selection process needs to be verified by an independent body to ensure that it accurately recognises the factors used in the site selection process. The NPPF policy relating to the site selection process should be fully implemented to recognise the agricultural land quality at Manydown and the resulting removal of all high grade agricultural land sites from the Greenfield site selection process should be made.	The presence of best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification), should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations (e.g. biodiversity, the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land (grades 3b, 4 and 5) in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. It is for local planning authorities to decide whether best and most versatile agricultural land can be developed, having carefully weighed the options in the light of other evidence. Taking the above into account the site assessment concludes that development on Manydown would have a negative impact on the best and most versatile agricultural land but it is not considered to be a showstopper to development which would result in a strongly negative impact being identified.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1139	No	No	Site assessment The Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment and supporting documents referred therein detail the process and considerations from which the final sites are selected. The document presents detailed information on the factors considered and their impact on the proposed site. However from the point where the factors are listed to the point where sites are chosen or not there is very little support or demonstration of the actual process that leads to the inclusion of one site or the rejection of another. There is no demonstration by any scoring process to show an evidenced based assessment or a clear chain of reasoning as to how a site then goes forward or is rejected.	Demonstrate clearly the process from the raw data for each site to the selection process and how each of the factors are weighted, considered or evaluated against different constraints of other sites.	The site assessment and selection process is set out in a number of reports which have been before the Council's Planning and Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet. Details of these will be referred to in topic papers which will support the plan through the Local Plan examination process.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1144	No	No	Rather than assess individual Greenfield sites on their own merit, with the better scoring sites going forward on an individual basis, the process selects various sites which are grouped together shown in section 8.83 of the SA and SEA. There are only four options considered with groupings such as all the sites in the East only to make a major development in the east. There appears to be no justification for this process or for the way the sites are grouped. We see no reason for this and would maintain that the sites could be put forward on their own merit rather than in groups. Of the four groups (Option 1-4) at 8.83, the only option of the 4 choices which does not include BAS098 (Manydown) is option 2; the Eastern MDA. This option is rejected for being an MDA style concentrated development. There is no option put forward that reflects the preferred development option that has come forward in the consultation process - a distributed approach consisting of small sites.	The process needs to assess the sites on an individual basis and from that point then assess if the most suitable sites would have any impact upon any other. This would give the selection process a more robust process demonstrating that the sites that are put in the plan are actually the most suitable sites. This is then applying the grouping process after a clear selection process. An "Option 5" should be considered. This being an option that provides a distributed pattern of development and for the development to be on smaller sites as shown to be the preferred pattern of development in the consultation process. Effectively an option without an MDA.	The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment documents clearly show that each site has been examined individually as well as the cumulative impact of groupings of sites. It is important that the sites are not just considered in isolation but cumulative impacts are assessed.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1151	No	No	There are unique difficulties in developing the Manydown site, which are not properly recognised in the site assessment process despite such issues being raised and accepted as a strong basis for rejection of the site in past plans. At Manydown the land quality is far higher and classified as best and most versatile. Manydown was highlighted as having particular infrastructure difficulties in the delivery of water and sewerage services to the area. Manydown has difficulties that are still not overcome by huge infrastructure costs in linking it to and providing routes into the existing road network. Manydown is much further from expected destinations which discourages walking or cycling and makes bus provision more difficult and less attractive. Despite all these shortcomings, sites that do not have these issues and fit to the Boroughs dispersal housing policy are rejected in favour of Manydown. On so many aspects Manydown is far worse than other sites but still it is chosen.	The site assessment process needs to be amended to consider additional factors including the cost and difficulty in providing infrastructure, the continued uneven expansion of the town westward, and the impact on the take up of alternative modes of transport by the differing journey distance. We believe that if such are considered the continued westward expansion of Basingstoke at Manydown would be rejected by the selection process as it has been in the past.	The TA and the IDP, which provides clear and robust evidence, account for any infrastructure issues at the Manydown site and how these will be mitigated and funded.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1189	No	No	The Greenfield sites put forward consist of 11 sites, 10 of which are of small to medium size and spread around the Borough to utilise the present infrastructure. Each of these is between 100 and 1000 homes and consistent with the small dispersed sites aim. The 11 the site, Manydown (SS3.10) is 3080 homes. In the 2001-2011 plan, a development in this same location and of similar size was regarded as a "Major Development Area" and a concentration of development in one place. This housing allocation is therefore contrary to the adopted policies of the borough and the results of the Borough's consultation. In the site assessment it appears that options 2,3 and 4 are rejected as they contain concentrated development on an MDA but somehow option 1 is accepted when it contains a concentrated development on an MDA. The site allocation cannot be sound if justified by supporting data that is in fact indicating that this type of development is not wanted and the least preferred option.	The Officers need to accept that the consultation process has shown there to be a clear preference for small dispersed sites around the town and this must be shown in the selection process. The Manydown MDA should be removed from the plan as no submission by the owner has been made for a development pattern that conforms with the preferred dispersal pattern has been put forward.	The number of houses at Manydown has been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and a detailed site assessment process. It is considered that this site is required to fulfil the housing number for the borough up until 2029.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Gary Rolfe	Save Oakley Village Action Group	N/A	441981	1192	No	No	Emphasis must be placed on alternatives to the private car and factors that will affect the take up of alternative modes of transport and the ability of each site to deliver such alternatives must be considered. Walking is generally only accepted for a relatively short distance -perhaps one mile, while cycling is accepted for a longer distance but only on the basis of there being a safe route available. Public transport is accepted if the journey can be done in a single leg. The appraisal needs to adopt a more practical approach to ensure housing is built in areas where alternative modes of transport are a viable option. The Manydown site is badly located for the take up of alternative modes of transport. The employment areas are generally placed on the east of the town with residential development to the west. Further development to the west would site housing too far for walking to work or the town centre, without adequate cycling provision to access most employment areas.	The plan should consider the practical take up of alternative modes of transport for each site rather than apply a crude conclusion that all are suitable. In the light of such assessment the selection process should be re-considered with further weighting in favour of the sites close to the town centre and main areas of employment.	The sites selected are considered to be the most appropriate when compared to the alternatives. All possible sites have been assessed through the evidence base work. All the sites within the Pre Submission Local Plan are required to meet the housing requirement for the borough. Each site policy refers to a criteria which states that development of the site will improve accessibility to non-car transport modes, this includes the Manydown site policy (SS3.10). It is anticipated that provision of cycling facilities and infrastructure on site and quality public transport links for sites like Manydown would be provided. Local Plan Policy CN8 sets out the transport policy that all new developments will need to comply with. The Council will continue to work with Hampshire County Council to improve the cycle network in Basingstoke Town.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mrs Penny Mayo	Sherbourne St John Parish Council	N/A	677508	424	Yes	No	Vast majority of evidence base documents (such as traffic surveys and biodiversity) are out of date and therefore not relevant to a Local Plan currently being prepared.	All evidence base documents to be reviewed and updated to reflect the current situation.	The Transport Assessment was published on the Council's website during the consultation period having been worked up with HCC. This will be updated to respond to comments made by HCC and the Highway Agency and to take into account other proposed changes to the emerging Local Plan. There are other evidence studies that have since been updated such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).	Updated evidence will be referred to in the submission version of the Plan.	Response to rep	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	521	Yes	No	Rural Exception sites by their very nature are typically located in the countryside. The definition of countryside includes all areas outside the defined SPB's. The proposed definition of 'isolated' is overly restrictive and inconsistent with the typical meaning of 'isolated' as being 'remote' and the wording of the NPPF. The current first sentence of the definition intimates that any development that is separated from a SPB (of which there are currently 5) is isolated; this prohibits any development in the countryside. The second sentence is superfluous in that 'isolation' should be considered in the context of the built environment not necessarily the proximity to public transport and other facilities. In its current form the definition would prevent, for example, the provision of new housing within a settlement in the countryside which had a village school where that school required more pupils, because there were no public transport links.	We request the wording in the policy is amended to - 'will be permitted on sites in the countryside provided that'. Request that the policy wording is amended: In the context of new residential development in the countryside where there is significant separations between the proposed dwelling and the nearest settlement.	The fundamental concern raised relating to the definition of "isolated" are noted. See the officer's response under 'the Glossary'. In relation to Policy CN2 no change is suggested. However, it is suggested that the glossary cross refer the definition of SPB to the Countryside for clarity.	In the Glossary under Settlement Policy Boundary change last sentence to read "In general there is a presumption in favour of development within the Settlement Policy Boundary. Outside of an SPB is defined as open Countryside, (please see definition of Countryside), where development is more tightly controlled". Under Countryside change definition to read "In planning terms, any area outside a defined Settlement Policy Boundary (see Settlement Policy Boundary) is countryside where more restrictive policies would generally be applied."	Response to Rep	N/A	Resolved.
Appendix 1	N/A	Mrs Diane Craven	Hartley Wespall Parish Council	N/A	783674	519	Yes	No	Hartley Wespall Parish Council do not agree that "appropriate mitigation measures have been identified through the Transport Assessment and factored into the IDP". At this stage the TA has not received any formal comment from HCC on the soundness or the ability to deliver the projected results. The traffic strategy for the local plan should support the forecast capacity at the Bramley Road, Gaigner Avenue and Binfields roundabouts and elsewhere on the A33. A plan that is based on an assumption of over-capacity on the major roads and access points is unsound and should not be submitted. These roundabouts are forecast in the 2029 base plan to be operating at traffic rates that greatly exceed capacity, without factoring in the Local Plan developments. A responsible long terms plan would not be satisfied with over loading at these pinch points. The strategic solution of widening the A33 has been declared prohibitively expensive before by HCC.	The developments which will hugely increase traffic flow on the A33 should not be approved without an endorsement of the TA by HCC. The introduction to the assessment states that "more detailed work will need to be undertaken" and that as a result "the scale and nature of highway improvements delivered over the plan period may differ from those in the proposed study". If the local plan is to be truly deliverable then further work needs to be done to ensure that the roads and infrastructure can be delivered alongside the housing. The potential traffic capacity problems resulting from the local plan should be mitigated by the widening of the A33 from a single lane to bring capacity levels down below 100%. The plan that secures the required funding should be presented as part of the local plan approval process. The scope of the traffic assessment should be widened to include the likely effect on smaller roads through adjacent villages such as Hartley Wespall.	The Local Plan Transport Assessment has been produced to test the 'worst case scenario' for the traffic impacts on the strategic highway network. This high level model seeks to identify whether the forecast impacts on the highway network in 2029 could be mitigated. Hampshire County Council and the Highways Agency have been engaged throughout the development process of the Transport Assessment and agree with the approach that the scale and nature of highway works delivered may be different to those detailed in the study. As highways authority they will have the final say on what mitigation measures are implemented on their highway network. The Council continues to work with HCC on proposals to deliver infrastructure improvements on the wider Basingstoke network to support development in the town.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Julian Crawley	N/A	N/A	783708	114	No	No	Some of the documentation used to provide the Evidence Base is inadequate and / or out of date. It is not acceptable to delay updating this information until after adoption of the Local Plan - since this is the information required to allow BD&C to provide informed advice.	Out-dated and insufficient documentation (e.g. (but not limited to) the Biodiversity Assessment, Transportation Assessments, Water Cycle Study) should be updated before Local Plan decisions / policies are adopted.	The Transport Assessment was published on the Council's website during the consultation period and will be updated to respond to comments made by HCC and the HA and to take into account other proposed changes to the emerging Local Plan. Other evidence studies are currently being updated, such as the SHMA and the ELR. It has been agreed with the EA that the water cycle study was still fit for purposes and did not require updating.	Updated evidence will be referred to in the submission version of the Plan.	Response to rep	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Dr Roger Walters	N/A	N/A	784665	246	Yes	No	The River Loddon fails to meet the water quality of a Chalk River and there is nothing to suggest that there is sufficient water capacity after water abstraction close to the source of the River to provide sufficient volume of water all the year round to provide the necessary dilution of the additional wastewater generated from more housing in the Loddon Valley discharging to Chisleham SWT and in Bramley discharging to Sherfield on Loddon SWT. The SWT's at Sherborne St John and Sherfield on Loddon cannot be modernised to produce wastewater of the necessary quality to improve the downstream problems of the River Loddon.	The Water Study needs to be revisited before the Local Plan is agreed.	The Environment Agency are responsible for licensing for water abstraction and ensure that sufficient water is available to provide dilution. Water levels are controlled and monitored and if they find that the level of water abstraction is unacceptable the water company must source water from another water source to meet demand. The 2009 Water Cycle Study concluded that the further growth proposed is acceptable. It has been agreed with the EA that the water cycle study was still fit for purposes and did not require updating.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Beata Ginn	Highways Agency	N/A	784716	271	Yes	No	Transport Assessment was not completed and therefore cannot provide an informed judgement on the impact of future development in the Borough on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Transport Assessment was published on the Council's website during the consultation and was available for comment. However, this will be updated to respond to comments made by HCC and the Highway Agency and to take into account other proposed changes to the emerging Local Plan. Local Plan is sound as based on a robust and credible evidence base.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Resolved.
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Stephen Rowles	N/A	N/A	784969	918	Not Specified	No	Transport links to J7 of the M3 from town. This is currently identified in the plan but has no funding and improvements to J7 of the M3 do not even have any costing associated with them. With the introduction of another 1200 homes near to the Beggarwood estate there will be additional strain on J7 and on major routes into an out of the town centre. These routes are already heavily congested, especially at peak times.	To solve the problems identified above, I think that J7 will need additional work, especially for those travelling in a southerly direction. The junction needs to be improved to provide a separate route onto the A303 and easier joining the M3 south for those attempting to use it. I also think that there will need to be J6 improvements to deal with extra traffic headed into the North of Basingstoke, J6 already often has large queues both north and south getting onto and off the motorway. There is no indication in the plan that improvements to J6 have even been considered despite a plan to provide almost 2000 new homes in the north of Basingstoke. There also needs to be planning in place to improve the A30 and junctions into town, whilst some of these improvements are identified those have huge funding shortfalls and no indication as to where the finance is going to come from.	Appendix A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that improvements to J7 of the M3 are necessary to the delivery of all allocation sites in the Local Plan. This is noted as 'TBC' and will be delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy, which is currently being prepared. Other junction improvements and the funding for these improvements are set out in the TA and the IDP. Additionally, the Council has commissioned Parson's Brinkerhoff to update the model to support the submission Local Plan. As part of these updates the consultants will be looking to explore whether mitigation is required at M3 J7. If it is determined that mitigation is required the updated report will report on a mitigation measure for this junction. Appendix A of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that improvements to J7 of the M3 are necessary to the delivery of all allocation sites in the Local Plan. This is currently noted as 'TBC' and will be updated once the Transport Assessment updates are complete. The junction improvements set out in the updated Transport Assessment will be funded from a range of sources including the Community Infrastructure Levy (which is currently being prepared) in addition to other sources.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	N/A	785305	409	Yes	No	The evidence document Economic growth and employment land requirements in North Hampshire Final Report June 2008' which informs the employment development provision and policies is out of date. The economic position has changed in some respects since 2008.	The evidence base for the employment development provision and policies must be updated. This is to ensure the Council uses the most up to date commercial property intelligence available to inform the Local Plan employment policies.	The Employment Land Review is being updated and key information from the study will feed into the Local Plan document.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1138	Yes	No	According to the Transport Assessment (August 2013) Para 4.3.9: "It should be noted that the modelled arrival flows at the A33 North and South arms exceed the capacity of a single lane so some link capacity issues might be expected. An ideal solution is to widen the A33 to two lanes but this is not explored in this study" Development of SS3.7 and SS3.9 would prevent widening of the A33 and indeed, as noted in point 1, part of this mitigation opportunity would appear to be in direct conflict with the exit onto Gaiger Avenue roundabout from SS3.7. Table 8.26 uses AM trip rates of 0.36 for the developments SS3.7/3.9 combined, which are inconsistent with other areas in the town where higher rates are used. Trip rates would appear to be too low and therefore underestimating the impact on the junction analysis conducted within the Transport Assessment for the Thornhills, Binfields and Crockford Lane Junctions.	Revisit parts of the Transport Assessment, in order to clarify points raised.	The Transport Assessment and associated mitigation measures contained within it have been designed to be accommodated within the land in the control of the highway authority. This is to ensure that any mitigation measures can feasibly be delivered. The trip rates have been calculated using industry standard methodologies which are set out in the TA document and the Highway Authority have been engaged in this process. On larger sites, trip rates can often be lower due to a degree of self containment within the site, for example the provision of schools, medical facilities and convenience retail provision within the site.	The Transport Assessment is being updated to test any changes	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1142	Yes	No	Site assessment [Volume 1, Jan 2013] pg 112 states: "Improving bus networks and Linking walking and cycling trips to the existing will aid accessibility but distances to some off-site services are sufficient to make car journeys attractive and will dominate trips. Bus priority would be important to make town centre and employment Public Transport trips attractive and competitive. " No such provision is provided in the IDP. Indeed there is only one passing service and this is only available during day time and hourly at most. The possibility of a bus gate is raised in the Evidence Base document: the site assessment [Volume 1, January 2013] pg. 112 states - "There is limited scope to provide additional exits from this site due to a heritage site (Park Pale), although a bus gate may be feasible to the south". This is not feasible and in direct conflict with the SS3.9 criteria e) and f). A bus gate onto Pyotts Hill will not be sound due to reasons set out in the representation.	Ensure funding is in place before development starts. In the event that SS3.9 is developed it must include a requirement to preclude any and all vehicular access via Pyotts Hill.	Any S106 or CIL funding that is required as part of the development of any sites allocated through the Local Plan will be secured through a condition in the granting of planning permission. Criteria i of Policy SS3.9 ensures that if planning permission was granted for the site, measures to improve accessibility to public transport modes including pedestrian access will be sought.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr David Hopkins	HCC	N/A	786148	592	Yes	Yes	I was pleased to note that the Local Plan has an explicit reference to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record in paragraphs 6.86 and 6.87, as it is relevant evidence base. I would suggest that it should be noted as part of the evidence base in preparation of the plan, as the HER was consulted within the SHLAA sustainability process.	I was pleased to note that the Local Plan has an explicit reference to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record in paragraphs 6.86 and 6.87, as it is relevant evidence base. I would suggest that it should be noted as part of the evidence base in preparation of the plan, as the HER was consulted within the SHLAA sustainability process.	This has now been included in Appendix 1 of the Plan.	Include the Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record within Appendix 1 of the Plan.	Reponse to rep.	N/A	Resolved.
Appendix 1	N/A	Ms Katie Newton	Environment Agency	N/A	786309	668	Not Specified	No	Sustainability Appraisal We have the following comments to improve the accuracy and completeness of the document: Chapter 3 Whilst this section of the document talks about WFD in terms of surface water, there is no reference to groundwater status. This should be included here. Chapter 5 Only one minor reference to WFD is made, concerning groundwater (Water environment, pg. 28). In the same section, river quality is referred to but WFD is not. Such reference is vital, as it is against the WFD that any water or water environment assessments will be made.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Include wording in the Sustainability Appraisal to be consistent with the advice of the Environment Agency and the Water Framework Directive.	Include reference to groundwater status in Chapter 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal and a reference to the WFD in Chapter 5 of the Sustainability Appraisal.	Response to rep and consistency with the Water Framework Directive.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A		Basingstoke Golf Course	Boyer Planning	786517	796	Yes	No	Within the detailed site appraisal for BAS132 Basingstoke Golf Club, reference is made against three of the SA Objectives to the need for a replacement facility; "Current and future policies would require the developer to find an alternative location for the golf course, if the site is to be developed". We consider that this information is factually incorrect and not consistent with the Council's own evidence base including the LRNA. It is therefore considered that, even with the allocation of Basingstoke Golf Club to a residential use, there will be sufficient golf facilities to meet the Borough's needs in 2026 and beyond. It must also be noted that a cautious approach was adopted by the consultants carrying out the LRNA is their use of the lower figures in the range of 25,000 rounds per year for 9 holes, whereas the figure could rise to as many as 30,000 rounds.	To ensure that the SA's assessment is consistent with the Council's evidence base, we suggest that the text in question is removed from the assessment of the site in respect of SA objectives 14, 17 and 18.	Noted. The current LRNA states that there is current provision of 17 9-hole golf courses. The current need is 14 9-hole golf courses. It has been confirmed that with the loss of this Golf Course there remains adequate provision across the borough to meet current needs. This study is currently being updated with a general view that the loss of the facility is acceptable.	Correct reference in the site assessment to a replacement facility under BAS 132.	Response to rep and consistency with evidence base.	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 1	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	832	No	No	The conclusions of the Transport Assessment are drawn from unconstrained traffic growth to reflect the worst case scenario i.e. it does not allow for alternatives such as re-routing or re-timing of trips as a result of congestion. A model that allows for such alternatives will deliver different, and potentially more positive, results and it is therefore unclear why this approach has not been used. Concerning the link road between Cufaude Lane and the A33, it is considered that nil/limited evidence is provided by BDBC to justify the requirement for a link road. This is considered to be the case, despite the availability of the recent TA. The TA post dates the IDP, and therefore needs to be reviewed and checked against the TA. Furthermore, there are clear inconsistencies in the estimated cost of improvements, as set out in the IDP, e.g. IDP estimate for A33/Gaiger Avenue is £1million whereas in the TA it is £1.6-3m. This undermines confidence in contributions requested.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Local Plan Transport Assessment provides a worst case scenario for the highway network in 2029 with and without Local Plan Development. This approach is considered sound as it will demonstrate to the Planning Inspector that the 'worst case' of impacts on the highway network can be mitigated though the junction improvement measures identified in the report. The Cufaude Lane link road has been included in the model as the Highways Authority are exploring the feasibility of this proposal. This has therefore been included to test the potential impacts on the highway network if such infrastructure were to be implemented. The IDP was produced in advance of the TA, hence the discrepancies in costings. The IDP will be updated in the future with revised costings.	IDP to be updated responding to the most up to date evidence.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	860	Not Specified	No	No funding noted in Appendix A for any highway infrastructure improvement works required (lane widening and traffic signalization) to permit the increased cumulative traffic capacity requirements including reduction in traffic queuing times at the existing 'priority only' Crookford Lane/Hammors and Cufaude Farm and also the proposed safeguarded link road at Sheffield Park. The combined developments proposed on the edge of the existing conurbation and as a result will be reliant on public transport and some form of retail amenity or reduce their isolation and to reduce car dependency.	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	The Transport Assessment identifies and costs mitigation measures that are likely to be required on the highway network to accommodate the levels of growth planned on the highway network. The majority of the development sites are located close to existing public transport routes and therefore the council and highway authority (HCC) will work with public transport operators to ensure that the sites are served (where practicable).	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	JW Spiers	N/A	N/A	786807	864	Not Specified	No	Infrastructure delivery plan The 'identified funding' noted in Appendix A of the document is noted for use against highway infrastructure purposes only, and constitutes 17% of the indicative total costs required for highway infrastructure. None of the projects are shown as being fully funded and the entire remaining 205.5m shortfall stated in Appendix A required for all proposed infrastructure noted as being totally dependent on funding from CIL and/or other and also s.106 contributions will need to be put in place in a very short period of time. Developer contributions must be kept realistic and affordable to ensure developers wish to participate in any of the developments identified and maintain viability. I question the validity of this assumed level of funding being available from the various Government departments over the next 15 years. Several infrastructure requirements have been identified without any indicative cost or funding source. see full response.	Infrastructure requirement identified for A3010 Churchill Way/Eastrop Rbt junction improvements for delivery 2014-2029. This work must be scheduled for delivery in Appendix A to suit the new Waitrose development. I consider many of the infrastructure delivery rate timeframes are too general in timescale and should reflect more accurately the requirements for specific associated developments to give both the council and general public a greater degree of confidence in the validity of the document before it can be formally submitted. Unless the funding for the projects set out in the TA and IDP can somehow be guaranteed from the CIL bidding process, all the various infrastructure requirements identified in the local plan for Chineham only constitutes a 'desire list' of expenditure. Need to consider implications of the 'what if' scenario for the Chineham area if the level of government and council spending reduces or monies for everything identified are not forthcoming.	The infrastructure schedule (Appendix A) sets out indicative costs for infrastructure provision, sources of funding and a likely funding shortfall. In addition to S106 and CIL there are a number of funding streams which have not been considered in the schedule as these are not known yet. The IDP will be a useful document in making funding bids in the future and this document will be updated on a regular basis once more information becomes available and the funding shortfall may reduce. The council is working towards a programme of prioritising infrastructure projects and a spending process to ensure that infrastructure can be provided when it is needed. It should be noted that the Government recognises that funding may not be identified for all the identified forms of infrastructure, particularly beyond the first five years of the plan.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1254	Yes	No	HCC as Highways Authority has been assisting BDBC in the production of the transport evidence. The Highway Authority is content with the methodology used to determine the impact of different scenarios and the conclusions drawn within the TA concerning the most appropriate strategic distribution of housing development across the borough. However, before HCC can fully endorse this assessment, in particular the proposed mitigation measures, further work is seen as required in the following areas: Further development of the traffic models to assess individual proposed junction mitigation measures to ensure they robustly predict forecast capacities at these junctions Further consideration of mitigation measures for road links shown as being over capacity within the peak periods Further review of the deliverability of the proposed mitigation measures, and in particular a robust assessment of whether proposals can be delivered without significant land take from 3 rd party land owners	The mitigation models produced require further work in order to ensure that the information inputted into the models is correct and that the outputs from them are reliable, accurate and consider the need for all road users. Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority is keen to continue to assist BDBC with this process so that the County Council is in a position to support the soundness of the Local Plan based on a reliable and robust transport assessment which forms part of a wider up to date and accurate evidence base.	The Council has commissioned Parson's Brinkerhoff to update the model to support the submission Local Plan to take into account the concerns of HCC. The Council will continue to engage with HCC through the development of this updated model to ensure that they are satisfied that the evidence base is both robust and credible. The Transport Assessment text will be updated to reflect the position at the time of the plans publication.	No change	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1257	Yes	No	The Transport Assessment is referred to as being "prepared in conjunction with Hampshire County Council". Although Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority considers that BDBC has exercised its duty to cooperate in the preparation of this document, in terms of liaison with relevant transport officers, HCC do not consider the wording reflects the full position. The document is a BDBC funded piece of work as opposed to a jointly funded project. HCC's current position on the document has been reflected via representations made in relation to Policy SS3.10, Policy SS3.8 and in general comments regarding the issues related to the current Transport Assessment as referenced above (see rep ID 1254).	Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority would request the amended wording as set out below is inserted as an accurate representation of the current position: 'A further assessment was undertaken in 2013. This studies the patterns of movements around Basingstoke town by car. It looked at how increases in traffic flows along the highway network including the M3 would affect the movement of vehicles around Basingstoke. Hampshire County Council have been engaged in development of this work to date, but are not yet in a position to fully endorse all elements of the transport assessment work . '	The Council has commissioned Parson's Brinkerhoff to update the model to support the submission Local Plan to take into account the concerns of HCC. The Council will continue to engage with HCC through the development of this updated model to ensure that they are satisfied that the evidence base is both robust and credible. The Transport Assessment text will be updated to reflect the position at the time of the plans publication.	No change	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1265	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council has a responsibility for countryside access, recreation and rights of way across Hampshire including the Local Plan area of Basingstoke & Deane. Given the inclusion of the Countryside Access Plan in paragraph 14.2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Hampshire County Council would like the list of organisations amended in paragraph 14.1 to reflect the important role countryside services play in developing improvements to walking & cycling infrastructure.	The list of organisations listed in paragraph 14.1 should be amended to also include: Hampshire County Council Countryside Services Or alternatively, only include a reference to: Hampshire County Council	Agreed. Amend list of organisations in paragraph 14.1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change to Appendix 1. However paragraph 14.1 of the IDP has been amended to reference to HCC.	Response to rep.	N/A	Withdrawn/agreed with change.
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1267	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council has a responsibility for countryside access, recreation and rights of way across Hampshire including the Local Plan area of Basingstoke & Deane. The reference to the Countryside Access Plan (CAP) for the Hampshire Downs in paragraph 14.2 is welcomed. However reference should also be made to the Countryside Access Plans for the Forest of Eversley, and the Test and Itchen areas as parts of these Countryside Access Plans also fall within the Borough of Basingstoke & Deane. As these local area plans are due to be reviewed and updated the County Council would also like an additional reference to be made to the County Overview CAP, which provides the summary of the County Council's overarching objectives for improving the countryside access network.	The County Council request the Borough Council include the following additional text in paragraph 14.2 under Strategies: Countryside Access Plans for the Forest of Eversley Countryside Access Plans for the Test Countryside Access Plans for the Itchen	Agreed. Amend text under paragraph 14.2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change to Appendix 1. However paragraph 14.2 of the IDP has been amended to include the following strategies: Countryside Access Plans for the Forest of Eversley, Countryside Access Plans for the Test Countryside, Access Plans for the Itchen, and the County Overview for the CAP.	Response to rep.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr James Gagg	HCC	N/A	787747	1270	Yes	No	Hampshire County Council has a responsibility for countryside access, recreation and rights of way across Hampshire including the Local Plan area of Basingstoke & Deane. The County Council supports the references within the policies set out within the Local Plan for the need to ensure good pedestrian and cycle links within allocated sites that connect to the wider existing network of rights of way and other forms of non-motorised access and references regarding the maintenance and improvement of existing rights of way across and alongside sites and connections with the existing 'green grid' or 'green corridors'. The County Council is concerned that while policies all recognise existing rights of way / green network, there needs to be recognition of the desirability of new links to provide effective connections between the proposed developments and the wider network of rights of way and countryside access.	The County Council request the Borough Council include the following additional bullet point under paragraph 26.14: Where possible and appropriate, providing new pedestrian and cycle links to the wider countryside access network.	Agreed. Add wording to paragraph 26.14 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure that allocation sites where possible have good cycle and pedestrian accessibility.	No change to Appendix 1 of the Local Plan. However, text has been added to Paragraph 26.14 of the IDP.	Response to rep.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1269	Yes	No	There does not appear to have been any biodiversity assessment of this site, which appears to be woodland of some type. Consequently, it is unclear how this site can have been properly considered in the Sustainability Appraisal. There is no discussion of its ecological value in Para 9.18 of the Sustainability Appraisal, nor any consideration of alternatives, nor whether compensating for this loss would render the policy undeliverable. The policy seems thus to be unjustified, and that the requirements of the SEA regulations have not been met.	intentionally left blank	Biodiversity is one consideration amongst many. However, a proposal for a railway station on the site would have to satisfy policy EM4 and EM5 requirements as the Plan should be read as a whole. The site allocated for the station was secured through a development agreement and as a result is currently available. No alternate sites have been promoted for use as a rail station in the vicinity of the proposed station location, including draft allocation SS3.3 at Razors Farm which is being made available for residential development. We consider that the proposed station location adjacent to the established settlement of Chineham, the proposed Razors Farm allocation and in close proximity to Chineham Business Park is suitable. It is acknowledged by the council and its partners that the proposed station is a desirable piece of infrastructure, reflected by the schemes inclusion in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Hampshire County Council's District Statement and the fact that it has been shortlisted by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership as a key piece of strategic transport infrastructure in the LEP area. The site is a long standing allocation as it was allocated in the two previous Local Plans. The allocation was originally made following the 1990 Hampshire Rail Improvement Study, commissioned by the County Council and the then British Rail. A biodiversity assessment was undertaken in 1992 and it confirmed the site did not meet the SINC classification criteria. The Council will continue to work with its partners to identify potential funding streams to enable the implementation of a new station at Chineham.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Following discussions with Natural England minor amendments were made to the Sustainability Appraisal (inc. Strategic Environmental Assessment) of the Submission Local Plan to correct an oversight.
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1277	Yes	Yes	NE concurs with the overall conclusions as set out in section 12 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	intentionally left blank	Noted.	No change.	N/A	Support Noted.	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	N/A	787784	1279	No	Not Specified	One of the objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal is "(5) To protect and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of the local landscape, soils, geological and geomorphologic interests", and an associated appraisal criteria is "Will it retain the Borough's best and most versatile agricultural land?" It does not appear that data on best and most versatile agricultural land has been used to inform the Sustainability Appraisal and hence the site selection process. Given the NPPF says "109. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing ...soils", we regard the plan to be unsound on this basis, and that the requirements of the SEA regulations have not been met. Unfortunately there is no listing of what the contents of the appendices are, so we may have overlooked information contained therein.	intentionally left blank	The agricultural land data has been used and was obtained from Natural England to inform the site assessment process and the Sustainability Appraisal used to examine each site included within the Pre-Submission Local Plan. The data obtained on Agricultural Land Classification is the most up to date and best quality data used for the assessment of agricultural land in the site assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. Amendments will accordingly be made to the Revised Pre Submission Local Plan SA/ SEA. A list of appendices will be added to the contents page in the SA (inc. SEA) Report. Paragraph 3.4 of the Revised Pre Submission Local Plan SA (inc. SEA) Non-Technical Summary will also be amended to list the SA/ SEA appendices.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn and Resolved.
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Add in "Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record"	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Amend Heritage Assets to state "Heritage Assets at Risk Register"	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Include reference to the updated Employment Land Review 2014	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Include reference to the updated Housing site assessment	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update date to reflect latest version of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment February 2014.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Include latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment date of 2014.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Include latest Transport Assessment date of March 2014 and update summary.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update reference to the Viability Assessment of CIL charging Schedule.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	remove hyphens from "Edge-of-centre"	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	remove "settlement policy boundary (SPB) from the definition of 'isolated' and replace with "settlement"	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Change the first line of the definition of 'Regeneration' to read "The holistic process of reversing economic, social and physical decline in an area in order to provide demonstrable benefits to the local community".	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Delete "Ancient" from Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 1	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Delete "Smart growth".	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	777	Not Specified	No	IDP 11.11 As Overton considers itself to be a village rather towns in second line to 'communicate'. 11.12 Does developing core bus priority routes mean bus lanes? The absence of these is one of the major deterrents in getting people out of cars into buses as currently all vehicles form the same queue. 11.18 The draft already admits that many key junctions will be operated above capacity by 2029 without any more buses but there is no guarantee that the proposed source of funding to alleviate the problem will materialise. 11.11 No specific road improvement are proposed for the B3400 to reflect the additional traffic generated from Overton and Whitchurch - no mention is made of the effect of a major development east of Andover - let alone Manydown. The proposed new lane from B3400 to A339 could worsen things unless it is built to M3 jct 7 at the outset.	intentionally left blank	Agreed, change the word 'towns' to settlements. The IDP sets out in section 13 that HCC will work with public transport industry partners to improve the public transport service. This would also include improvements in the Overton area. Improvements at Basingstoke and Overton Rail Stations and Overton Rail Station car park improvements have been listed in the IDP schedule. The Transport Assessment provides clear and robust evidence to support the Local Plan. The document identifies a number of highway improvements that could be implemented to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan growth. The Transport Assessment provides a high level assessment of the impacts of implementing a full Western Bypass. However, it is officers view that a full western bypass will not be required in this plan period (up until 2029), but that a partial link road (B3400 - A339) should be implemented to enable the development of the Northern part of the Manydown site. Policy SS3.10 provides the policy basis for securing the partial link road over this plan period and for securing land to enable the delivery of a full western bypass in the future. This is also reflected in the draft IDP.	Paragraph 11.11 has been amended to change the word 'towns' to 'settlements'	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	917	Not Specified	Not Specified	English Heritage suggest that the council should examine whether any heritage-related projects should be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In preparing its CIL Charging Schedule, the council should be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on the viability and effective conservation of historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF means that it will be necessary to ensure that the conservation of heritage assets is taken into account when considering the level of the CIL, to be imposed so as to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment.	English Heritage consider it essential that the rates proposed in areas where there are groups of heritage assets at risk are not such as would be likely to discourage schemes being put forward for their re-use or associated heritage-led regeneration. In such cases, there may be a case for lowering the rates charged. In addition, English Heritage encourage the council to assert in their CIL Charging Schedule their right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances where development which would benefit heritage assets and their settings may become unviable if it was subject to CIL. We also urge local authorities to then offer CIL relief where these circumstances apply.	In accordance with Government guidance and best practice, the Viability Assessment that has been undertaken for the Borough Council considers those forms of development that are likely to come forward in the Borough over the plan period. This concludes that the both the policies in the emerging Local Plan and the proposed CIL rates would not threaten the ability of development to be delivered. It should be noted that applications that affect a heritage asset will be considered in line with policy EM1.1 and that the Borough Council will not approve planning applications that affect a heritage asset without the necessary mitigation measures, where appropriate.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Brian Langer	N/A	N/A	86045	803	Not Specified	No	Infrastructure Delivery - Plan Despite giving weight to the presence of a railway station in Overton when deciding to allocate 270 dwellings in the parish, the IDP does not address the need for better transport links between the station and the residential areas. The IDP also fails to provide for improved or extended parking close to the station. There is no mention of bus lane provision, but these are vital if encouragement of a change in transport usage is to be successful. There is also no mention of cemetery provision outside the town of Basingstoke. Some, like that in Overton have very limited capacity.	intentionally left blank	The IDP sets out in section 13 that HCC will work with public transport industry partners to improve the public transport service. This would also include improvements in the Overton area. Improvements at Basingstoke and Overton Rail Stations and Overton Rail Station car park improvements have been listed in the IDP schedule. Reference to limited cemetery provision in Overton has been added in the IDP.	A reference to limited cemetery provision in Overton will be added in the IDP.	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains Outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1208	Yes	No	Infrastructure Delivery Plan SS3.7 Item c) and SS3.9 Item h) states: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the provision of access from the roundabout adjacent to the Sherfield Park development, improvements to Thornhills, Binfields and Crockford Lane junctions" Yet according to Appendix A of the IDP no funding has been identified for these junctions. The IDP also indicates a total cost of £8m which increases to £9.5m when the necessary A33/339 roundabout works are included. The total shortfall is therefore £9.5M.	None identified.	Funding for the measures to mitigate the impact of development on the highways network at Redlands and at the East of Basingstoke will be delivered through CIL.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 2	N/A	Ms Sue Fry	N/A	N/A	609543	869	Not Specified	Not Specified	Has no objection to building affordable housing within the town or surrounding area. Is concerned that the current infrastructure is not sufficient to support the current population of the town, therefore what will happen once new homes are built. Council need to make sure that the local plan will deliver affordable housing and sufficient infrastructure such as schools, doctor surgeries, hospital, dentist, road etc.	intentionally left blank	The provision of affordable housing will be addressed under Policy CN2 which requires 40% of new homes to be affordable and the provision of infrastructure will be addressed under Policy CN5 to ensure the infrastructure is provided when it is needed. This policy is supported by the IDP which sets out the different forms of infrastructure required to support new development. This also identifies potential sources of funding to provide this, including CIL and S106.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 2	N/A	Miss Kate Kerrigan	Sentinel	Tetlow King Planning	641907	1041	Yes	No	Comments on Infrastructure Delivery Plan In Para 5.19 affordable housing should be recognised as essential infrastructure which is fundamental to development. Whilst we understand there will be utilities and transport infrastructure without which development cannot function, such is the need for affordable housing, as set out in appendix 1, that its delivery within a development should be prioritised as essential. This is to ensure that its provision is not reduced because of other factors. Delivery of 300 affordable units per annum is welcomed, however the viability assessment recognises that achieving 40% from all developments could be difficult. Concerned that higher levy's will see affordable housing challenged due to wider financial commitments. Of utmost importance will be ensuring the CIL rates are not set at a level which will be detrimental to the delivery of affordable housing.	Comments on Infrastructure Delivery Plan Amend paragraph 5.19 so affordable housing is recognised as essential infrastructure which is fundamental to development.	The Government excludes the provision of affordable housing from the Community Infrastructure Levy. Development proposals will be considered against the affordable housing policy in the Local Plan and will be secured by S106 Legal Agreements. The proposed CIL rates have been set at a level of achieving 40% affordable housing without rendering the development unviable. CIL is subject to a separate public consultation.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding.
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Martin Small	English Heritage	N/A	642684	917	Not Specified	Not Specified	English Heritage suggest that the council should examine whether any heritage-related projects should be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In preparing its CIL Charging Schedule, the council should be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on the viability and effective conservation of historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF means that it will be necessary to ensure that the conservation of heritage assets is taken into account when considering the level of the CIL to be imposed so as to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment.	English Heritage consider it essential that the rates proposed in areas where there are groups of heritage assets at risk are not such as would be likely to discourage schemes being put forward for their re-use or associated heritage-led regeneration. In such cases, there may be a case for lowering the rates charged. In addition, English Heritage encourage the council to assert in their CIL Charging Schedule their right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances where development which would benefit heritage assets and their settings may become unviable if it was subject to CIL. We also urge local authorities to then offer CIL relief where these circumstances apply.	The proposed rates have been based on the viability study taking into account the types of development expected to be delivered through the Local Plan and not on the heritage assets of an area. The council is yet to decide whether or not to offer discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances. This will be considered through the preparatory work for CIL.	No change	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn and Resolved.
Appendix 2	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1140	Yes	No	Infrastructure Development Plan SS3.7 Item c) and SS3.9 Item h) states: "Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including the provision of access from the roundabout adjacent to the Sherfield Park development, improvements to Thornhills, Binfields and Crockford Lane junctions" Yet according to Appendix A of the IDP no funding has been identified for these junctions. The IDP also indicates a total cost of £8.0M which increases to £9.5M when the necessary A33/339 roundabout works are included. The total shortfall is therefore £9.5M. Ensure funding is in place before development starts.	intentionally left blank	Funding for the measures to mitigate the impact of development on the highways network at Redlands and at the East of Basingstoke will in part be delivered through CIL.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 2	N/A	Mrs Judith Shelley	N/A	N/A	786765	847	Yes	Yes	intentionally left blank	Road Infrastructure Suggest that a single carriage way main road is built from the A339 to the A30 circling the development to the west of the town. This would replace the old Roman Road - Kempshott Rd route for traffic between the north west e.g. Reading, Newbury to Winchester. The convenience of which was seriously reduced by the closure of the Sainsbury's roundabout exit. Such a road would also greatly advantage both old and new residents in the west of the town. It would produce a barrier between the housing developments and the agricultural land to the advantage of both. It would also draw traffic away from the road system within Basingstoke itself.	The Transport Assessment provides clear and robust evidence to support the Local Plan. The document identifies a number of highway improvements that could be implemented to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan growth. The Transport Assessment provides a high level assessment of the impacts of implementing a full Western Bypass. However, it is officers view that a full western bypass will not be required in this plan period (up until 2029), but that a partial link road (B3400 - A339) should be implemented to enable the development of the Northern part of the Manydown site. Policy SS3.10 provides the policy basis for securing the partial link road over this plan period and for securing land to enable the delivery of a full western bypass in the future. This is also reflected in the draft IDP.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1152	Yes	No	Glossary should include the definitions for 'Strategic Gaps' and 'Pollution'.	Add definition of 'Strategic Gaps' and 'Pollution' to glossary.	Paragraph 6.12 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan provides a definition of Strategic Gaps and therefore this is not required in the Glossary. Policy EM12 of the Local Plan provides sufficient definition of the types of Pollution that the policy is referring to under the supporting text.	No Change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	977	Yes	No	Muse Developments raises objection to the definition of edge of centre for office uses contained in Appendix 3 of the draft local plan on the basis of how it affects the application of draft local plan policies SS8, EP1 and EP3 to Basing View. As currently drafted, the combined effects of the definition of edge of centre for office uses and policies SS8, EP1 and EP3 are inconsistent with and have the potential to frustrate the local plan vision and objectives for the economy and regeneration of Basing View in particular. It is clear that the definition of edge of centre contained in Appendix 3 of the draft local plan, in combination with the proposed working of Policies SS8, EP1 and EP3, does not properly reflect the local plan strategy and objectives for the economy and Basing View in particular and has the potential to undermine them. See full response (attached) for additional comments	Proposed change: It is proposed that the definition of edge of centre set out in Appendix 3 is amended to read as follows: "For retail purposes, a location that is well connected to and within easy walking distance (i.e. up to 300 metres) of the primary shopping area. For all other main town centre uses, this is likely to be within 300 metres of a town centre boundary. For office development, locations outside the town centre but within: i) the Basing View Employment Area, including Gresley Road, or ii) 500 metres of a public transport interchange, including railway and bus stations, within the urban area should be considered as edge of centre" The proposed change is considered to make the local plan sound by ensuring that is positively prepared and effective (i.e. deliverable and flexible).	A paragraph has been added to the supporting text of Policy SS8 to provide additional explanation on the edge of centre uses at Basing View. The current definition of 'edge of centre' in Appendix 3 is taken from the NPPF and is therefore compliant with national policy.	No change.	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr Pete Errington	N/A	N/A	658243	601	Yes	Yes	HCC as Minerals Planning Authority welcomes the reference to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan on page 9 and looks forward to liaising with BDBC to ensure the Minerals Safeguarding Areas are shown on the Local Plan proposals map	intentionally left blank	Support noted. The council is aware of the HCC Minerals and Waste Plan and has had regard to this in it's site assessment work. In addition, the Minerals and Waste Plan forms part of the council's Development Plan as indicated on page 9 of the Local Plan. As per the draft National Planning Practice Guidance the Minerals Safeguarding Areas will be defined on the Local Plan Policies Map.	Add the Minerals Safeguarding Areas to the Local Plan Policies Map, and following text to glossary: Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA) These are shown on the Local Plan Policies Maps. These are defined in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – October 2013, as follows: "The MSA is defined by minerals and waste planning authorities. They include viable resources of aggregates and are defined so that proven resources of aggregates are not sterilised by non-mineral development. The MSA does not provide a presumption for these resources to be worked." Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is required (as set out in the NPPF) to identify the MSAs in the Local Plan (see the Policies Maps), however, the specific policies to which the MSAs relate are set out in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – October 2013, which forms part of the council's Development Plan.	In response to representation and as required by the National Planning Practice Guidance.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Appendix 3	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	1033	Yes	No	The proposed definition of isolated is overly restrictive and inconsistent with the typical meaning of 'isolated' as being 'remote' and the wording of the NPPF. The current first sentence of the definition intimates that any development that is separated from the SPB (of which there are 5) is isolated, this prohibits any development in the Countryside. The second sentence is superfluous in that 'isolation' should be considered in the context of the built environment not necessarily the proximity to public transport and other facilities. In the current form the definition would prevent, e.g. the provision of new housing within a settlement in the countryside which had a village school where that school required more pupils because there were no public transport links.	We request that the policy wording is amended to: in the context of new residential development in the countryside where there is a significant separation between the proposed dwelling and the nearest e)v) requires that the proposal does not relate to isolated development.	Agreed amend part of the glossary to be more consistent with the NPPF. Change wording in policy from 'settlement policy boundary' to 'settlement' in line with the NPPF. The reference to distance from public transport in the definition is taken from the Institution of Highways and Transportation <i>Planning for Public Transport in Developments</i> recommends that new development should be located so that public transport trips involve a walking distance of less than 400m from the nearest bus stop or train station. In addition, the definition has allowed a 1km distance from the nearest services and facilities when in fact the IHT's <i>Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot</i> recommends that developments should be placed at least a 'desirable' distance of 500 metres from schools. Furthermore, the definition should include the reference to special circumstances which are referred to in Paragraph 55 of the NPPF.	Change wording in policy from 'settlement policy boundary' to 'settlement' in line with the NPPF, and list the special circumstance that apply to isolated homes.	Response to rep and consistent with NPPF.	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 3	N/A	Miss Lucie Stone	The Manydown Company Limited	Bidwells	753731	1053	Yes	No	Please see attachment and responses on SS6 and APP3	<i>intentionally left blank</i>	Add to glossary.	Change wording in policy from 'settlement policy boundary' to 'settlement' in line with the NPPF, and list the special circumstance that apply to isolated homes.	Response to rep and consistent with NPPF.	N/A	Withdrawn and Resolved.
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	288	Yes	No	The Glossary defines the term "Parish Plan" but the plan does not provide a Policy related to Parish Plans.	Either remove the term from the glossary, amend the glossary to state that the term is an anachronism or amend the plan to include a policy that provides a clear statement on the status of parish plans.	Remove definition from the glossary as the term is not referred to in the main text of the Pre-Submission Plan.	Remove definition of 'Parish Plan' from Appendix 3 and remove reference to Parish Plan' from the definition of 'Parish Plans' from the definition of 'Community Plans'.	Response to rep.	N/A	Resolved.
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr Julian Jones	Dummer Parish Council	N/A	784667	288	Yes	No	The Glossary defines the term "Parish Plan" but the plan does not provide a Policy related to Parish Plans.	Either remove the term from the glossary, amend the glossary to state that the term is an anachronism or amend the plan to include a policy that provides a clear statement on the status of parish plans.	Remove definition from the glossary as the term is not referred to in the main text of the Pre-Submission Plan.	Remove definition of 'Parish Plan' from Appendix 3 and remove reference to Parish Plan' from the definition of 'Parish Plans' from the definition of 'Community Plans'.	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 3	N/A	Mr James Gagg	N/A	N/A	787747	1230	Yes	Yes	Hampshire County Council, as Minerals Planning Authority welcomes the reference to the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan on page 9 and looks forward to liaising with Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council to ensure that the Minerals Safeguarding Area identified in the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan is shown on the final Local Plan Proposals Map, as required by the draft National Planning Policy Framework Guidance.	Identify the Minerals Safeguarding Area on the local plan proposals map.	Support noted. The council is aware of the HCC Minerals and Waste Plan and has had regard to this in it's site assessment work. In addition, the Minerals and Waste Plan forms part of the council's Development Plan as indicated on page 9 of the Local Plan. As per the draft National Planning Practice Guidance the Minerals Safeguarding Areas will be defined on the Local Plan Policies Map.	Add the Minerals Safeguarding Areas to the Local Plan Policies Map, and following text to glossary: Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA) These are shown on the Local Plan Policies Maps. These are defined in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – October 2013, as follows: "The MSA is defined by minerals and waste planning authorities. They include viable resources of aggregates and are defined so that proven resources of aggregates are not sterilised by non-mineral development. The MSA does not provide a presumption for these resources to be worked." Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is required (as set out in the NPPF) to identify the MSAs in the Local Plan (see the Policies Maps), however, the specific policies to which the MSAs relate are set out in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – October 2013, which forms part of the council's Development Plan.	In response to representation and as required by the National Planning Practice Guidance.	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Appendix 3	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		Update glossary in light of changes made to the overall plan and policies.	To ensure all key terms are in the glossary.	N/A	N/A
Appendix 3	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Update glossary in light of changes made to the overall plan and policies. Include "care homes, Extra care housing, Heritage Assets, Local distinctiveness, Local Nature Reserve, Minerals Safeguarding Area, Nursing home, Retirement communities, sense of place, sheltered accommodation, significance (in relation to Heritage Asset)	To ensure all key terms are in the glossary.	N/A	N/A
Appendix 4	N/A	Miss Heather Allen	Croudace Strategic	N/A	786614	825	Not Specified	No	It is considered that the standards currently hold limited weight and, whilst they may have been signed-off by Cabinet, they do not constitute 'adopted' planning policy. We have a number of concerns with the proposed standards, primarily relating to: Justification for the upper end of the standards (i.e. "expected standards"); and Implications of the "expected standards" on BDBC's ability to meet proposed housing target. It is evident that the calculation of existing open space provision in the borough at the time the LNR was completed (2007/8) included a wider range of green type spaces than would normally form part of your average housing development. To apply an average figure, which included the typologies listed, to individual housing sites is misleading and is not comparing like-for-like. However, sites may not include vast areas of biodiversity areas or green corridors that reflect the site included in the assessment set out in the LRNA.	Whilst "expected" standards may be a "target" the Council can use to monitor the average provision of MFGS across the two areas of the borough (Basingstoke Town and rural areas) as a whole i.e. including significant public spaces, highway verges, vast SINCs etc.; it cannot be applied as "open space standards" nor is it 'consistent with national policy'. In this regard, it is considered that current "minimum" standards should represent "expected" standards for individual housing sites and the current "expected" standards should become "target" standards across the two areas of the borough. Note 1 and 2 included with the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Appendix 4, which currently only allow variation below "expected" standards where it is fully justified in relation to local need, existing deficits, site constraints and other council circumstances need to be amended accordingly. LRNR is out of date and needs to be updated once new national methodologies have been established.	The Borough Council has undertaken extensive research and consultation into the Open Spaces Standards as a part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and considers that these are an appropriate basis as to which to judge planning applications against. In setting an 'expected' together with 'minimum' standards, it is considered that there is a degree of flexibility in order for applicants to justify any departure from the 'expected' standards. This includes consideration of local need, existing deficits, site constraints and other council priorities.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 5	N/A	Mr Lance Flannigan	Muse Developments	Nexus Planning	621278	967	No	No	In the absence of a clear indication that Appendix 5 will not apply to Basing View, a holding objection of Appendix 5 is raised on behalf of Muse Developments Limited. With regard to local compliance, the legal status of including a masterplan and development brief protocol as an Appendix to a local plan is unclear, especially since: a) Its status in relation to an adopted statutory local plan is unclear. There is not a single reference to the protocol in the main body of the local plan itself or any indication of its purpose or relationship with the local plan. b) Paragraph 1.2 of the protocol refers to a requirement for masterplans and development briefs prepared to accord with the protocol to be approved by the Council before the submission of a planning application. In the absence of any indication of the approvals procedure or the status of the approved document, the lawfulness of such a process is uncertain. See full response for further information	For the reasons set out above and in the absence of any justification, it is considered that the inclusion of the protocol at Appendix 5 of the local plan is harmful to main aim of the planning system to deliver sustainable development. On this basis, Appendix 5 should be omitted from the Local Plan.	Appendix 5 is now referenced within Policy SS3 which relates to the Greenfield housing allocations.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 5	N/A	Mr Jeremy Farely	Wates Development Ltd	Genesis Town Planning	787807	717	Not Specified	Not Specified	Wates Developments Ltd supports the need for masterplans to be produced for all the housing sites allocated for development in Policy SS3 - Greenfield Allocations of the Local Plan, and as detailed in Policies SS3.1 to SS3.11. As parts of Policy SS3.10 for Manydown are considered too detailed and include aspects that will be considered at the detailed Masterplan stage, consideration should be given to inserting a new clause in Policy SS3.10 that refers to the need for detailed masterplanning and community engagement which will take place following the adoption of the Local Plan and prior to the submission of a planning application.	Consideration should be given to inserting a new clause in Policy SS3.10 that refers to the need for detailed masterplanning and community engagement which will take place following the adoption of the Local Plan and prior to the submission of a planning application.	Such wording is contained within the wider SS3 policy and supporting text. Change made to policy SS3 to incorporate reference to Appendix 5.	Refer to Appendix 5 within Policy SS3.	Response to rep.	N/A	Remains Outstanding
Appendix 5	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	update 2.1 to read "Masterplans are to be produced for a number of the housing sites allocated for development in Policy SS3 - Greenfield Site Allocations of the Local Plan, and as set out in the relevant individual site policies. Masterplans are also to be produced for those sites which come forward in accordance with Policy SS2 - Regeneration".	Factual update	N/A	N/A
Map 1a - Manydown Site Allocation	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Show additional area that is to be included within the site allocation	Factual update	N/A	N/A

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Map 1a - Manydown Site Allocation	N/A	Mr Mark Biles	HCC	N/A	700350	1046	Yes	No	Policy Map 1a Removing the unjustified restrictions within clause (g) will enable the allocation to be delivered entirely north of the railway line, as a unified, comprehensive development which provides the best opportunity for a cohesive, sustainable community. The landowners consider the allocated land to the south of the railway (parcel 6a) to be peripheral and segregated, and recommend its removal from Policy SS3.10. Since parcel 6a has been assessed by the LPA as being potentially suitable for development, the Local Planning Authority may wish to consider allocating it as a reserve site or simply keeping it within the settlement policy boundary, to provide some flexibility in housing delivery and account for any Borough-wide shortfalls during the Plan period. This, together with the implications of other comments in this landowner representation, would lead to a number of modifications to the allocation boundary shown in Proposals Map 1a (as shown on the attached Figure 3).	Suggested modification 1. Amend the proposals map in line with the redraft of clause (g) as set out above 2. Identify the Worthing Conservation Area 3. Identify the Manydown Country Park as a separate allocation and label accordingly 4. Correct the Country Park boundary to accurately reflect the existing restrictive covenant 5. Show an indicative alignment for the link road between the A339 and B3400, based on the submitted JMP transport study 6. Delete parcel 6a from Policy SS3.10 and consider the potential to include the land within the settlement boundary or as a reserve site.	Agree to amend the country park boundary in map 1a to reflect the existing restrictive covenant. As a consequence also amend the 'Area within which masterplanning will take place' in Map 1a to ensure this area does not overlap with the restrictive covenant area. The map will also be amended to remove the reference to clause g). The Worthing Conservation Area is already shown on the existing proposals map of the Adopted Plan and will be shown on the policies map as the Local Plan progresses through the process. Comments relating to the countrypark are considered elsewhere in response to HCC's concerns. It is not considered necessary to show an indicative alignment for the link road at this stage as this will be determined through masterplanning. Parcel 6 will continue to be allocated, but this is for a lower yield in response to highway concerns.	Update Map 1a as follows: - Amend the country park boundary; remove the area annotated as the location within which development will be limited; Amend the 'Area within which masterplanning will take place' in light of the above	In response to representation	N/A	withdrawn/agreed with change
Map 1f - Basingstoke Town Centre	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1106	Yes	No	Policies map 1f The Local Plan should clarify the basis upon which the Town Centre Boundary has been determined, and how policy EP3 applies to retail and other main town centre use developments within that area given the difference in edge-of-centre definitions between those uses (see NPPF Annex 2).	no detailed site assessment of sites for development opportunities with the town centre boundary.	The Town Centre boundary has been defined based on national guidance and the Local plan evidence base and has been expanded to include areas with redevelopment potential. The supporting text outlines how the policy will be applied.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Map 1f - Basingstoke Town Centre	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Show existing town centre boundary and how this is proposed to be changed instead of final proposed boundary	Factual update - in line with the T&C Planning Regulations 2012	N/A	N/A
Map 2- Town Centre Boundary	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1109	Yes	No	Policies map 2 The Local Plan should clarify the basis upon which the Town Centre Boundary has been determined, and how policy EP3 applies to retail and other main town centre use developments within that area given the difference in edge-of-centre definitions between those uses (see NPPF Annex 2).	no detailed site assessment of sites for development opportunities with the town centre boundary.	The Town Centre boundary has been defined based on national guidance and the Local plan evidence base and has been expanded to include areas with redevelopment potential. The supporting text outlines how the policy will be applied.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Map 2- Town Centre Boundary	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Show existing town centre boundary and how this is proposed to be changed instead of final proposed boundary	Factual update - in line with the T&C Planning Regulations 2013	N/A	N/A
Map 3- Primary and secondary shopping frontages	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1110	Yes	No	Policies map 3 The 2009 RSU (4.5) considered that the town centre comprises three areas: (1) Festival Place and the Walks, (2) The Malls and (3) 'Top of the Town'. The Malls area is described as including the railway station to the north and extending east to "include the multi-storey car park, along with the Crown Heights located at Alencon Link", It (11.47) concludes by recommending that the PSF should comprise all of Festival Place and The Malls and that the SSF should comprise the Top of the Town Area. It does not contemplate definition of Crown Heights as comprising the SSF. Whilst the Top of Town provides a diverse range of main town centre uses, Crown Height is a residential building comprising very limited town centre uses at ground floor level and restricted development opportunities. Festival Place Unit Trust do not consider that Crown Heights falls within the definition for a SSF.	Crown Heights does not comprise SSF and should be removed from the SSF policy designation. To be consistent with national policy on shopping frontages	Crown Heights is included within the secondary frontage reflecting its links to the town centre and the retail use on the ground floor.	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Map 3- Primary and secondary shopping frontages	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Slight alteration to the boundaries	To correct errors	N/A	N/A
Map 4- Primary shopping area	N/A		Festival Place Unit Trust	N/A	787467	1112	Yes	No	Policies map 4 The Churchill Plaza site and adjoining land is suitable for redevelopment to accommodate much of the identified retail need in a location which would ensure that such a retail development would have a beneficial effect on the centre's vitality and viability. It is likely to become available for redevelopment in the early part of the Plan period and should be identified as an allocated redevelopment site within the planned expansion of the PSA. The suitability and availability of the Council's Central Short Stay car park off Red Lion Street should be similarly considered for allocation.	The Churchill Plaza site and adjoining land should be identified as a potential site for the future expansion of the PSA. It is suitable for major retail-led development and other uses, and is likely to become available during the early part of the Plan period. The Council's Central Short Stay car park site, opposite Red Lion Street, should be similarly assessed. As Crown Heights should be excluded from the SSF, it should, as a consequence, be excluded from the PSA. To be consistent with national policy on allocating sites and PSA & SSF designations, and responding appropriately to the Local Plan retail evidence base.	The Primary Shopping Area defines the area where retail development is concentrated. Churchill Plaza is currently in an office use and therefore its inclusion within the Primary Shopping Area is unjustified. It is included within the Town Centre boundary and therefore would be considered as edge of centre for retail proposals. If the site was to change use this should be tested through the sequential test where the factors raised by the respondent can be considered appropriately. There is currently no certainty over deliverability of the Churchill Plaza site given its current use and ownership and therefore it would be inappropriate to allocate the site within the PSA. Crown Heights is included within the secondary frontage reflecting its retail use on the ground floor	No change	N/A	N/A	Remains outstanding
Map 4- Primary shopping area	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Slight alteration to the boundary	To correct error	N/A	N/A
Map 7a - Basingstoke - Oakley Strategic Gap	N/A	Mr Rodney Scott	Oakley and Deane Parish Council	N/A	461222	477	Yes	No	The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Oakley does not fully take account of the Manydown development as proposed in the plan and possibly future development beyond the plan period. The proposed gap is only to the east of Oakley and leaves the north east and south east without protection. The gap as currently defined does not therefore meet 6.12 and 6.13 of the policy for all of Oakley.	Suggested extension on Map 1a.	Amend Basingstoke - Oakley Strategic Gap similar to that suggested. Amendments will further ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is maintained. Also, see the response to representations policy SS3.10.	Amend Basingstoke - Oakley Strategic Gap similar to that suggested.	Response to representation.	Post Map change	Superseded with updated representation.
Map 7b - Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap	N/A	Ms Susan Turner	Newnham Parish Council	N/A	132338	374			Newnham Parish Council supports the change to the Strategic Gap around Old Basing proposed by CountryWatch. More detailed reasons are given in the CW submission. Changes to Strategic Gap. Proposals Map 7b. Old Basing: North of the rail line extend the gap to include all land between Swing Swang Lane / Bartons Lane / the proposed gap southern boundary / Old Basing SPB / rail line. South of the rail line extend gap to include all land between the proposed gap / rail line / Old Basing SPB, including Basing House. South of A30 add Crabtree Open Space / Plantation bounded by A30 / Old Basing SPB / M3 / M3 link to Black Dam roundabout.	Increase the Strategic Gap between Old Basing and the town as outlined above.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested. Amendments will further ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is maintained.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested.	Response to representation.	Agreed.	Remains outstanding
Map 7b - Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap	N/A	Mr Peter Bloyce	SOLVE	N/A	786050	1064	Yes	No	Supports the change to the Strategic Gap around Old Basing proposed by CountryWatch. More detailed reasons are given in the Countrywatch submission	Increase the Strategic Gap between Basingstoke and Old Basing (Policy Map 7b) as follows: North of the rail line extend the gap to include all land between Swing Swang Lane / Bartons Lane / the proposed gap southern boundary / Old Basing SPB / rail line. South of the rail line extend gap to include all land between the proposed gap / rail line / Old Basing SPB, including Basing House. South of A30 add Crabtree Open Space / Plantation bounded by A30 / Old Basing SPB / M3 / M3 link to Black Dam roundabout.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested. Amendments will further ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is maintained.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested.	Response to representation.	Agreed	Remains outstanding

Policy/Paragraph Number	New (if changed) Policy/Paragraph number of revised Pre-submission Local Plan	Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Unique Person ID	Comment ID	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	Comment	Suggested change	Response	Recommended change	Reasoning for change	Outcome of MAP	Current Status
Map 7b - Basingstoke - Old Basing Strategic Gap	N/A	Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	N/A	130498	1178	Yes	No	Contrary to the statement in paragraph 6.15 no assessment of the strategic gaps has been prepared. The Basingstoke - Old Basing strategic gap (Policy Map 7b) should be extended to include land north of the rail line, south of the rail line and south of A30. These three areas: 1. satisfy the aims of Policy EM2 and the elements of Para. 6.13; 2. are well used for leisure activities and include the historic remains and grounds of Basing House Ancient Monument; 3. are clearly of an open and undeveloped nature. 4. are omissions from the proposed Gap contrary to the aims of Policy EM2, and which are inexplicable when judged against the included areas in Map 7b; 5. are omissions which seem incongruous when seen against the proposed Gaps in Maps 7a,7d,7e which hug the boundaries of SPBs. Questions the principle of the Tadley-Baughurst strategic gap (map 7e).	Amend the Basingstoke - Old Basing strategic gap (Policy Map 7b) as follows: 1. North of the rail line extend the gap to include all land between Swing Swang Lane / Bartons Lane / the proposed gap southern boundary / Old Basing SPB / rail line. 2. South of the rail line extend gap to include all land between the proposed gap / rail line / Old Basing SPB. 3. South of A30 add Crabtree Open Space / Plantation bounded by A30 / Old Basing SPB / M3 / M3 link to Black Dam roundabout. Regarding Proposals Map 7e Tadley - Baughurst, Country Watch notes the fact that the SHLAA v7 contains 8 sites for some 1070 dwellings within the proposed Strategic Gap which remain to be tested against Policy SS7. This is the only proposed strategic gap where anomaly exists. CW therefore queries whether the future solution to that anomaly damages the case for this strategic gap.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested. Amendments will further ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is maintained. Regarding the comment on Tadley - Baughurst strategic gap, the policy and defined boundaries address the particular issues and circumstances of the Borough such as the pattern of development that exists in the Borough and several settlements being close together. It is therefore justified that a policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements and maintain the separate identity of settlements is justified. The local community and many representatives are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is required. No sites have been allocated in Tadley. Not allocating sites in Tadley does not prevent development from coming forward in consultation with the OVR. The Tadley - Baughurst strategic gap is required to ensure that windfall developments do not impact on the coalescence and separate identity of the settlement.	Amend Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap as suggested.	In response to representation.	Agreed	Representation regarding paragraph 6.15 remains outstanding. Agreed with change to Map 7b.
Map 7c - Basingstoke - Sherbourne St John Strategic Gap	N/A	Mrs Penny Mayo	Sherbourne St John Parish Council	N/A	677508	433	Yes	No	Strongly support the policy and agree that a strategic and clear gap is necessary between settlements. However, the current proposed strategic gap between Basingstoke and Sherborne St John (as shown in Policy Map 7C) is insufficient and not effective.	Extend the boundary of the Basingstoke and Sherborne St John strategic gap to include land north of Elm Road (South west of the village) and the land adjoining Rooksdown including Weybrook Park golf course - as illustrated on the map supplied by the respondent. This amendment will prevent coalescence and protect the separate identity of the settlement of Sherborne St John. The strategic gap will then be fully compliant with policy EM2.	Support is noted. Amend Basingstoke - Sherborne St John Strategic Gap as suggested. Amendments will further ensure that the separate identity of the settlements is maintained.	Amend Basingstoke-Sherborne St John Strategic Gap as suggested.	Response to representation.	Agreed.	Remains outstanding
Map 7d - Basingstoke/Chineham - Bramley/Sherfield on Loddon Strategic Gap	N/A	Anthony Durrant	Bramley Parish Council	N/A	637355	305	Yes	No	Map 7d is misleading as it does show the "German Road estate". Whilst it is appreciated that the policy is about settlement coalescence it is misleading to show the MOD camp as a strategic gap.	The map must be amended accordingly.	Factual amendment to the strategic gap has been made to exclude the German Road development from the strategic gap boundary.	Remove the German Road development from the strategic gap.	Response to representation - factual change.	Agreed	Remains outstanding.
Map 8a - Area N and Beggarwood	N/A	Grainger plc	Grainger plc	N/A	785596	470	Not Specified	No	Grainger plc submitted representations to the previous Core Strategy supporting the council's identification of Area N in Basingstoke as an urban/brownfield housing opportunity. Grainger plc are owners of this site and support the future residential development of this land. This site is available, achievable and suitable for residential development and can be readily delivered to contribute to the council's 5 year land supply. However, policy EP1 identifies an area listed as 'Beggarwood' as an Employment Area and the Pre-Submission Local Plan Policies Map confirms this. This designation is in spite of Grainger having provided the council with clear marketing evidence indicating that the site is unsuitable for employment use, and yet the employment designation remains. Therefore, the policy is not justified, effective or in accordance with the NPPF, which does not support the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of that use.	Area N at Beggarwood should be deleted as an employment allocation in policy EP1. The plan should identify Area N as a housing site.	The updated Employment Land Review identifies the available supply and demand of employment floor space in the borough and forecasts the requirements of employment land and floor space over the Local Plan period. The majority of employment growth can be delivered by regenerating existing employment sites and building out undeveloped sites that are allocated for employment uses. However, the Council is aware that the site has been allocated for employment uses for some time with minimal interest. In light of the findings of the Employment Land Review and views of the commercial agents forum we are satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the site coming forward for its allocated use.	Area N and Beggarwood have been deleted as employment allocations.	Response to rep and NPPF compliance.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Maps 8a - 8f	N/A	Tesco Ltd	Tesco Ltd	N/A	85986	711	Yes	No	Reserve our position to progress objections to this policy on the basis that it may be the intention of the Council (contrary to the explanatory text in the emerging Plan) for the defined Employment Areas to be extended beyond those set out on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. Object on the basis that the extent of such land has been (or is to be) extended. This is not supported by the evidence base and is not consistent with the approach of the NPPF.	Delete any additions to the defined Employment Areas.	There Council has inserted one new employment allocation at Hatch Industrial Park (Old Basing) in light of the evidence contained within the Employment Land Review, notably that there is demand for modern industrial / warehousing stock in the borough. Some employment allocation boundaries have been amended (reduced in size) whilst others have been removed. The proposals map will indicate which sites are designated as strategic employment sites. Consultation on these proposed changes will enable the respondent to comment as appropriate.	Updated maps of strategic employment allocations to be included in the Plan.	response to rep and clarity.	N/A	Remains outstanding
Maps 8a - 8f	N/A	Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Show existing allocated employment areas as adopted local plan and proposed changes	Factual update - in line with the T&C Planning Regulations 2012	N/A	N/A