

# Summary of Consultation

## Local Plan Update Issues and Options

### Contents

*\*Click on sections/questions below to jump to relevant part of document.*

Contents .....	1
<b>Local Plan Update Issues and Options .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Section 1. Background to consultation.....	7
Section 2. Introduction.....	7
Section 3. National and Regional Picture.....	7
Section 4. Key Issues .....	8
Question 4a: Do you agree with the key issues that have been identified .....	8
Question 4b: Are there any other issues which you consider to be central to the LPU? 10	
Section 5 – Climate Change .....	16
Question 5a: Which option is the most suitable energy standard for new homes and non-residential buildings? Should all types and scales of development be required to meet these standards?.....	17
Question 5b: Should the council require a minimum proportion of carbon to be reduced by: improvements to the building’s fabric and/or; on-site renewable or low carbon energy?.....	21
Question 5c: Are there any other options we should be considering? .....	24
Question 5d: Should the council introduce a requirement for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM standard. If so, which level should it be set at? .....	25
Section 5.3.4: Water Efficiency .....	27
Question 5e: Are there any specific viability issues to consider when setting requirements for non-residential buildings/uses? .....	28
Question 5f: Other than by meeting BREEAM standards, how should applicants demonstrate that they have considered sustainable design and construction in their development? .....	29
Question 5g: Are there any other options we should be considering? .....	31
Question 5h: Would you support the introduction of a specific policy on design measures that would mitigate climate change, support adaption, and embed sustainable design requirements? What should this include? .....	32
Question 5i: Would you support the above options for delivering low carbon and renewable energy and associated infrastructure? .....	36
Question 5j: Are there any other options we should be considering? .....	38

Question 5k: Should the Local Plan Update encourage or require large scale developments to connect to a district heat network where opportunities to do so have been identified?.....	39
Question 5l: Should the Local Plan Update include suitable criteria for assessing planning applications for battery storage and its associated infrastructure? .....	41
Question 5m: Which option or options for sustainable transport and movement would you support? .....	43
Question 5n: Is there a role for Park and Ride at Basingstoke and where could such a facility be located? .....	44
Question 5o: Are there other forms of transport that will be important to plan for in the future? .....	45
Q5p: Do you support a review to facilitate a dedicated transport hub by Basingstoke railway station? .....	46
Question 5q: Are there any specific considerations that need to be taken into account as part of this review, including the suitability of other land uses?.....	47
Section 6 – Creating Beautiful Places.....	48
Question 6a: Do you support the identified list of important elements relating to design and layout set out in paragraph 6.2.2? .....	48
Question 6b: Are there any other priorities or additional design related issues which the Local Plan Update should address?.....	50
Question 6c: Do you have any views on how these design priorities should be achieved? .....	54
Question 6d: Should the Local Plan Update be more visual and include examples of the type of designs supported? .....	55
Question 6e: Are more specific policies needed? For example, focusing on particular types of development (e.g. housing). .....	57
Question 6f: Are there any specific design priorities relevant to particular areas in the borough, for example Basingstoke town centre?.....	59
Question 6g: Do you agree that the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) should be included as a policy requirement in the Local Plan Update? If not, why is this? .....	60
Question 6h: Do you have any views on the size of new homes which have been built in the borough in order to inform the evidence base relating to this issue? .....	62
Question 6i: Are there any other options that should also be considered, for example other homes standards such as a Home Quality Mark? .....	62
Question 6j: Is there any more that the Local Plan Update could do to support the creation of safe and healthy communities? .....	64
Section 7 – Developing a Spatial Strategy.....	66
Question 7a: Do you agree with the key elements of the spatial strategy listed in paragraph 7.2.1?.....	66
Question 7b: Are there other considerations that need to be taken into account in developing the spatial strategy? .....	70

Question 7c: Should land in employment and retail use be considered for new homes where it is vacant or underused? If yes, which locations should be considered?.....	74
Question 7d: Should more new homes be delivered in Basingstoke town centre? If yes, via what sort of developments (e.g. new blocks of flats, adding additional storeys to existing buildings) and in what locations?.....	75
Question 7e: Would you support the principle of high-density development in suitable locations in the borough? If yes, in what locations?.....	76
Question 7f: Would you support the inclusion of additional tall buildings (over six storeys) in Basingstoke? If yes, what locations would be most suitable? .....	77
Question 7g: Would you support the introduction of minimum density standards to uplift the density of residential developments? Please explain your answer. ....	78
Question 7h: Which option or combination of options would you support for greenfield development? Please explain your answer. ....	80
Question 7i: Are there any other options that should be considered [in respect of Greenfield development and 7h]? .....	84
Question 7j: Do you support the approach of grouping settlements by size, role and provision of services and facilities to inform decision-making for where future development should be located?.....	86
Question 7k: Do you support the proposed categories and the settlements identified in the table above? .....	88
Question 7l: Do you have any views on the introduction of new SPBs for the five settlements (Bishops Green, Ecchinswell, Headley, Highclere and Silchester) which do not currently have SPBs?.....	90
Question 7m: Do you have any views on the suitability of future growth at Tadley, given its unique circumstances?.....	91
Question 7n: Do you agree that the factors listed above should be considered when determining suitable levels of growth in settlements?.....	92
Question 7o: Are there any other factors that should be considered, and why? .....	94
Question 7p: Which option or options would you support? .....	97
Question 7q: Are there any other options which should be considered? .....	100
Question 7r: Which option or options would you support?.....	100
Question 7s: Are there any other options which should be considered?.....	103
Question 7t: Do you have any other comments about how the current approach to neighbourhood planning (in Local Plan Policy SS5) has worked? .....	103
Paragraph 7.9 – New Homes in the Countryside.....	105
Section 8 – Economy.....	106
Question 8a: Which option or options would you support for strategic employment areas?.....	106
Question 8b: If you support Option 2 and/or 3, which areas do you consider are the most suitable for reuse? What other uses would be most appropriate?.....	107
Question 8c: Are there any other options that should be considered for growth in the future? .....	108

Question 8d: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's office sector and why? .....	109
Question 8e: If you think a combination of the above options is most suitable, please indicate which options you favour and why? .....	111
Question 8f: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	112
Question 8g: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's industrial sector?.....	113
Question 8h: Are there any other options that should be considered.....	114
Question 8i: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's storage and distribution sector? .....	115
Question 8j: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	117
Question 8k: Should the Local Plan Update include a policy which enables economic development proposals to come forward to address needs not currently identified? ..	117
Question 8l: Is there anything more that the Local Plan Update can do to help future proof the borough's economy, for example in relation to increased home working? ...	118
Question 8m: Which option would you support for Basing View? Please explain your answer. ....	119
Question 8n: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	119
Question 8o: Which option would you support for the rural economy? Please explain your answer. ....	120
Question 8p: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	121
Question 8q: Which option would you support for tourism? .....	122
Question 8r: If a more proactive approach is taken to tourism, should this be limited to certain locations and types of tourist accommodation? .....	122
Question 8s: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	123
Question 8t: Do you agree with retaining the current retail hierarchy?.....	124
Question 8u: Should any new centres be identified?.....	124
Question 8v: Do you think the boundaries of any Town, District or Local Centres and Primary Shopping Areas (as defined in the current Local Plan) need to be extended or reduced? If so, which and why? .....	124
Question 8w: Should the Local Plan Update retain the lower threshold for when an Impact Assessment for out of centre retail is required? If not, what should the threshold be?.....	125
Question 8x: Would you support the replacement of out of centre retailing to other uses (for example, change of use to residential)?.....	125
Question 8y: Do you have any comments on the future role of Basingstoke town centre? .....	126
Question 8z: Do you have any comments on the regeneration of the Basingstoke Leisure Park, including suitable future uses? .....	126
Section 9 – Natural and Historic Environment.....	127
Question 9a: Are there any areas of land which should be designated as a new Strategic Gap? If yes, please explain where and why? .....	127

Question 9b: Are there any Strategic Gaps which should be deleted? If yes, where and why? .....	129
Question 9c: Should any existing Strategic Gap boundary be updated? If yes, where and why? .....	130
Section 9.4 Green Infrastructure and Local Green Spaces .....	131
Question 9d: Would you support the designation of Local Green Spaces through the Local Plan Update and neighbourhood plans? If not, why is this? .....	133
Question 9e: Are there any specific areas that you consider meet the criteria and should be designated? .....	134
Water Quality (paras 9.5.1 – 9.5.5) .....	135
Flood Risk (paras 9.6.1 – 9.6.2) .....	136
Question 9f: Should the Local Plan Update require more than 10% biodiversity net gain? .....	137
Question 9g: How should off-site compensation measures be coordinated and/or located? .....	139
Question 9h: Are there any other key elements of biodiversity net gain that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update?.....	140
Question 9i: Are there any particular issues relating to air quality that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update? .....	142
Section 9.9 Heritage .....	144
Section 10 – Meeting Housing Needs.....	146
Question 10a: How much discount should be applied to the rent level on rented affordable homes to ensure they are able to meet local needs?.....	146
Question 10b: Which low cost home ownership products could be most suitable in the borough?.....	146
Question 10c: Are there any principles that should inform the types of products that we seek? .....	147
Question 10d: Should the Local Plan do more to support the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas? If so, how?.....	148
Question 10e: Which option would you support for homes for older people and those with support needs? (accessibility standards) .....	149
Question 10f: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	150
Question 10g: Which option (or combination of options) would you support for specialist accommodation?.....	150
Question 10h: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	151
Question 10i: Do you have any views on the following issues: What types of sites are most suitable for specialist accommodation; and should the policy distinguish between different types of specialist accommodation and the needs of different types of occupiers? .....	152
Question 10j: Which option would you support for the size and mix of market housing? .....	152
Question 10k: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	153

Question 10l: What considerations should be taken into account in informing an appropriate mix? .....	153
Question 10m: Should the Local Plan Update set out specific policy requirements for Houses of Multiple Occupation? If so, what should these be? .....	154
Question 10n: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for self-build plots? .....	155
Question 10o: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	156
Question 10p: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for gypsy and traveller pitches? .....	156
Question 10q: Are there any other options that should be considered?.....	157
Section 11 – Infrastructure.....	158
Question 11a: Which option would you support for the provision of new infrastructure? .....	158
Question 11b: Are there other infrastructure issues that should be considered? .....	160
Question 11c: What types of infrastructure are the most important in the future planning of the borough, particularly in thinking about large sites? .....	161
Question 11d: Are there specific infrastructure issues in your local area to be aware of? .....	162
Question 11e: Which option would you support for the council’s approach to essential facilities and services? .....	162
Question 11f: There is an opportunity for the Local Plan Update to define what would be classified as an essential facility or service. What facilities and/or services do you consider should be defined as essential within the Local Plan Update? .....	164
Question 11g: Are there any uses which you consider to need more specific policy requirements, either for their provision or protection/retention?.....	165
Question 11h: Which option would you support for the provision of new facilities and services on new developments? Is there more that the Local Plan Update could do to ensure that new development fosters strong communities and meets the needs of residents? .....	166
<b>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (including Appendix 1) .....</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Settlement Study (Part 1) .....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Site Assessment Methodology .....</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>Comments on Previously Promoted Sites .....</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Newly Promoted Sites .....</b>	<b>257</b>

# Local Plan Update Issues and Options Consultation

## Duty to Co-operate

- A number of specific points were made by stakeholders, relevant bodies and neighbouring authorities relating to duty to co-operate and joint working matters, these comments are covered within the relevant sections below.
- In general terms Wokingham Borough Council and Winchester City Council commented that they look forward to continuing to work together on issues of common interest, such as any large-scale developments that may affect both districts.
- Transport for London and Southern Gas Networks responded to the consultation advising that they have no comments to make at this time.

## General comments

- Several respondents including Aster Housing Association would like to see the Council improve determination timescales with regard to planning applications and design codes.
- Bloor Homes (in relation to Land at Basingstoke Golf Course) requested that any emerging policies set out in the Local Plan Update (LPU) do not apply to Reserved Matters applications as any changes at this stage would have implications in terms of viability, cost and delivery for existing schemes.

## Section 1. Background to consultation

- One planning consultant stated that although this section indicates that adoption of the Plan is envisaged in 2023, Winter 2024 is more likely. They were of the view that the average time to adopt a Local Plan from publication is two years and therefore, the timetable envisaged in the diagram is not considered realistic. In addition, the plan period should run until March 2040.
- Chineham PC questioned whether the consultation will be rendered irrelevant pending current legislative changes through the White Paper.

## Section 2. Introduction

The following detailed comments were made:

- Paragraph 2.2.1 - within the environmental bullet point, the aim should not just be to protect and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment but also to ensure a radical reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.
- Paragraph 2.2.4 should also state that Horizon 2050 includes the commitment to reduce carbon emissions and to ensure that the use of renewable energy will be prevalent, and the borough will generate the energy it uses.

## Section 3. National and Regional Picture

The following detailed comments were made:

- Paragraph 3.1.2 should also mention that the borough has declared a climate emergency and committed to be carbon neutral by 2030. The wider national requirements should also be highlighted
- Paragraph 3.1.3 - Given the climate emergency declaration, the Borough's own commitment to be net zero by 2030 and the stipulation within the NPPF for the radical reduction of greenhouse gases this should also be included as part of the LPU.

## Section 4. Key Issues

### Question 4a: Do you agree with the key issues that have been identified?

There was general support for the key issues identified (80 respondents). This included support from Maria Miller MP, Cllr McCormick, Kingsclere, Sherfield on Loddon, Cliddesden, Mapledurwell and Up Nately, East Woodhay, Sherfield Park, Bramley, Newnham, Old Basing, Chineham and Upton Grey Parish Councils and Pamber PC and NP Group. Many of the housebuilders/developers including AECOM – BDBC/HCC/SMV, Turley, Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates, Falconer Developments, Vistry, Bewley Homes, Sovereign Housing, Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon Homes. Support is also given by National Trust, CPRE, North Hampshire CCG, Sport England, Southern Water, HCC and WBC.

#### General:

- 1 respondent commented that it is unclear if numbering reflects relative importance, another suggested that they should be ordered by importance with Key Issue 1 be 'providing the right housing'.
- East Woodhay PC were concerned that the key issues need to be followed by all council departments.
- 1 developer was of the view that the scope of LPU should be refined to focus on identifying sustainable locations for growth rather than design methods or bespoke standards as these are being addressed elsewhere. The key issues identified should not be seen as a justification to increase the scope of the LPU, beyond those areas which a LP should reasonably concern itself with.
- 3 respondents promoting land for development considered that the issues the adopted Local Plan seeks to address remain largely similar to those outlined now and that it is logical for current spatial strategy to be carried forward into the new LPU. They also referred to their particular site promotions;
  - Southern Manydown considered to meet key issues (particularly climate emergency) and supports larger scale development referenced in NPPF para 72)
  - Advocate the application of Garden Community Principles for all forthcoming proposals –synergy between Portsmouth Estate and vision for Upper Swallick and the council's identified key issues.
  - Consider the developments they provide are in line with council issues and they advocate the Healthy New Towns principles.

#### Key issue 1 – Tackling climate emergency:

- Southern Water specifically supported key issue 1 as it aligns with their own aims to protect water quality.
- 1 developer also supported this key issue.

#### Key Issue 3 - Protecting environment and heritage:

- CPRE provided particular support for key issue 3
- Southern Water specifically supported key issues 3 as it aligns with their own aims to protect water quality.

#### Key Issue 4 – Meeting the needs of all:

- 1 affordable housing provider provided support for key issue 4 but suggested it is not forthright enough about provision and diversity of housing tenures in 'meeting the needs for all' – silent on any other tenure with the exception of AH and self/custom build
- Whilst agree with issue identified 1 developer stated there should be flexibility to take account of viability and local circumstances.

#### Key Issue 5 – Providing the right housing:

- A number of respondents (including site promoters, developers and affordable housing providers) referred to the importance of the LPU remaining focused on addressing the borough's future local housing needs in particular in light of the continuing national housing crisis.
- Flexibility to respond to the changes proposed to the planning system in the Planning White Paper also highlighted.
- 1 respondent stated that the provision of housing needs to be balanced with the maintenance of rural surroundings and that unnecessary new housing development should be avoided.
- A number of respondents noted the consistent under delivery of development, particularly housing
- Cllr Cubbitt suggested need to address the number of extant planning permissions as the failure of developers to deliver in a timely manner is a key issue.
- CPRE suggested there needs to be a tighter definition of 'brownfield' to ensure it relates to sites of former commercial or industrial activity rather than relying on NPPF definition which does not exclude residential gardens in rural areas is particularly concerning.
- Tadley TC were of the view that some issues currently do not get implemented as intended – for example identified housing needs are not being met as developments often providing wrong housing mix and tenures.
- One developer referred to the large number of deliverable sites that will need to come forward and that many will need to be greenfield in category 2 and 3 settlements, outside of settlement boundaries in order to meet this need.
- Southern Water specifically supported key issues 5 as it aligns with their own aims to protect water quality.

#### Key Issue 6 - Facilitating Infrastructure Delivery:

- HCC welcomed the opportunity to continue working together to support these aims and ensure issues are resolved, particularly in respect infrastructure delivery and any additional schools places to ensure these are provided in a timely manner and located to ensure they promote active travel and seek to reduce reliance on the car.
- 1 developer set out support for the timely delivery of the Western Link Road and stated that this should be safeguarded in policy to enhance the strategic road network for sites to the south west and minimise the impact of the developments on existing residents and direct connections to strategic road network and M3 motorway.
- 1 site promoter supports this key issue

#### Key issue 7 – supporting economy and centres:

- 1 site promoter supports this key issue
- 1 respondent doesn't support the Leisure Park as a regional leisure destination

#### **Question 4b: Are there any other issues which you consider to be central to the LPU?**

##### General:

- 25 responses from various stakeholders, developers and those in the community suggested reviewing policies in light of Covid and Brexit to understand the impact they have had on the borough along with incorporating resilience to future pandemics.
- Hart District Council gave general support for key issues identified including climate change. They went on to suggest that the evidence base that has informed this consultation is made available. This is expanded upon by another respondent who was of the view that there will inevitably be a requirement for some compromise between some of the objectives and the evidence base provides the appropriate mechanism for balancing these objectives. This should be acknowledged more clearly.
- 1 respondent stated that the 'duty to cooperate' is not mentioned and should be as it significantly influences the LP and its process.
- Sport England suggested focussing on increasing and maintaining physical activity, health and wellbeing and would support a specific key issue on this aspect.
- Cllr Cubitt commented that the key issues are excellent but the council needs to address the number of extant planning permissions in the Borough as the failure of developers to deliver the planning permissions they have been granted in a timely manner is a key issue.
- 1 respondent suggested that the council needs to reduce time taken to prepare the LP or proposed development will not be delivered until well after 2030.

- Sherfield on Loddon PC requested additional points are added as issues; recognising that there is a conflict between retaining a village's rural identity and the development of large-scale housing across the borough, avoidance of a 'one size fits all' approach to deciding the future of village communities, the preservation of the rural identity of the borough and its village communities' and the avoidance of coalescence of village communities by maintaining Strategic Gaps.
- Sherfield Park PC requested reference to Tadley being the second largest settlement is included.
- Old Basing PC disagreed with government's proposed algorithm for calculating the housing number and don't think it should be used.
- Bramley PC considered two further issues need to be added: a. The impact on population demographics ensuring the needs of those in social housing can be sustainably met within the immediate location. b. Ensuring that sites granted permission are built out in a reasonable timescale as has been seen in Bramley.
- Cliddesden, Mapledurwell and Up Nately and Newnham PCs suggested three new key issues are identified:
  - 'Wildlife Habitat, Networks and Ecosystems' to meaningfully consider wildlife and biodiversity which should be afforded a higher status
  - Recognise need to protect valued landscapes which provide high levels of amenity and support the local populations' physical and mental wellbeing
  - Review policies in line with Covid and Brexit
- 1 respondent referred to there not being enough waste facilities – falling behind Winchester City in this respect – need to vastly improve recycling facilities through the LPU
- The MOD request a policy on MOD establishments recognising the brownfield nature of MOD sites as there is a need to protect operation defence sites so that non-military or non-defence related development within or in the areas around a MOD site will not be supported where it would adversely affect military operations or capability.
- 1 site promoter states that living and working locally is a new trend which needs to be considered and their site in Echinswell could help to facilitate this.
- The need to site a new hospital near to the M3 Junction at Dummer should be included in preference to a warehouse distribution centre. The hospital would be a better outcome for Basingstoke, rather than a distribution centre that will bring increased lorry traffic pollution and only low quality jobs.
- Proposals to spread retail from the town centre into the leisure park area appear flawed and would not support sustainable transport.
- The need for a more strategic approach to retail sites around the town as new retail sites appear to spring up wherever a site becomes available, meaning that planning for sustainable transport is very difficult.
- 1 respondent states that the key issues (particularly key issue 1) omit the following:

- Recognition that communities need to be more involved and engaged in the management of their areas
- There also needs to be an emphasis on educating children about the outdoors and protecting the environment
- The role of communities in delivering services should be expanded with incentives and rewards for actions
- Should plan for major new areas of forest and other habitats
- Publish plans for natural green infrastructure (urban and rural ecological networks), nature recovery networks etc
- Need commitment to target setting for nature and measuring changes, including conversion of amenity land to habitat and changes in species diversity and abundance
- Need a benchmark of change since 1970 in species and habitat losses (similar to State of Nature) in order to show the scale of problems in Basingstoke
- Credibility issue – the council need a clear target and process for reversing environmental degradation or the rapidity of the impacts
- Need a genuinely ambitious plan which is environment focused
- 3 respondents including Upton Grey PC agreed with paragraph 4.7 namely that policy should concentrate on the regeneration of Basingstoke itself – it has large areas in need of investment.
- Consider that some site promotions contradict with the desire to enhance the environment (as stated in key issue 3)
- Omits emphasis on the need to locate and design homes or commercial buildings in ways that diminish car dependency and need for new roads
- Area-wide co-ordinated transport management, with “Movement Routes for all”
- Prioritise wellbeing with co-ordinated linkages and dependencies in “Zone Planning”
- Natural resources management and resilience
- Highest quality home build standards in all aspects
- Energy Saving Implementations area-wide and in all housing
- Access to green infrastructure, local green space and biodiversity
- Eliminate all environmental pollutants and “re-wild”
- Provide “activities for all” to also attract tourism and money into the local economy
- East Woodhay PC requested details of “proactive steps” being taking to resolve the housing supply shortfall.

### Key Issue 1 – Tackling the Climate Emergency

- A number of respondents suggest this issue should be central to the LPU as making changes across the borough to mitigate the level of emissions must be highest priority and incorporated ambitiously in the Local Plan. They expanded on this as follows:

- legally binding targets which commit the UK to a net zero by 2050. Must ensure the local plan is also aligned with the NPPF which states that: the planning system should “help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions” and that “plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change”
- The plan needs to support councils own declaration of a Climate Emergency, and provide regulations and standards that will ensure that we can reach own target for the borough to be carbon neutral by 2030 and our 2050 vision that states that we will generate all the energy we use and protect our valued countryside.
- Basingstoke Transition Network feel climate emergency should be expressed and embedded more deeply – like Reading BC approach

Respondents also highlighted a number of additions or clarifications to be covered under key issue 1 including the following:

- Importance of “future proofing” with regards to Climate Emergency Response and Climate Change Mitigations
- Old Basing PC emphasised steady growth over rapid development as this is not compatible with climate agenda
- Cllr McCormick referred to supporting leisure, including cultural and sports facilities and promoting cycling and walking as green alternatives to the car.
- Chineham PC suggested including electric vehicles as petrol and diesel sales will end by 2030.
- Kingsclere PC suggested inclusion of achieving zero carbon development
- All new development energy efficient and built to zero carbon standards (Passivhaus mentioned as an example), as ‘energy efficient as possible’ is not good enough for policy requirement to 2038 (which is beyond the target for the borough to be carbon neutral) – refer to Norwich City Council developments over 100 homes
- Should be putting in place a positive approach to renewables and trying to ensure a strategy is in place to generate 100% of the energy used within the borough and getting community and energy suppliers onboard
- Ensure new developments incorporate renewable energy to generate the energy they use (e.g. solar panels and roof tiles)
- Review climate change policies and practices in other leading green boroughs/towns both in the UK and abroad to identify other areas of good practice that can be implemented.

#### Key Issue 2- Focussing on place shaping and design

- A number of respondents referred to the role of traffic and transport stating the following regarding this key issue:
  - Omits emphasis on need to locate and design new homes or commercial buildings in ways that diminish car dependency and need for new roads

- There is no mention about safety (maybe it is implied), but several existing roads in the borough are single tracks with passing places and these will be rendered unfit for purposes and will become dangerous as more homes are built off them and increases in traffic.
- Railway bridges are too narrow in places and not designed for increased traffic
- It would make more sense to build properties where there are more facilities, including transport links
- 3 respondents including Upton Grey PC also refer to the need to improve consistency in approach to good design. They state that rigor should have been applied to quality of design appropriate to the place, scale and character
- Ensure that all new developments are beautiful and enhance the region
- Sport England would like to see more emphasis on the protection, enhancement and creation of sport and recreation facilities to meet locally identified need.
- 1 site promoter refers to the need to consider the inclusion of community cohesion and resilience and opportunities for community facility improvement.

### Key issue 3 – Protecting and enhancing environment and heritage

- A number of respondents referred to raising the profile and putting the environment at centre of policy making as per the pledge in the Environment Bill and policy paper on the Nature Recovery Networks
- 2 respondents referred to the need for detailed data and monitoring with ecologists working alongside planners.
- 2 respondents referred to proactive integrations of nature and wildlife beyond mitigation and BNG.
- 9 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately, Newnham PC referred to supporting the wildlife trust's call for 're-wilding the planning system' wildlife habitats and corridors need to be integral to all planning policy (within, between, old and new developments, greenspace, open countryside and protected landscapes – everywhere)
- Clarification that wording should be 'wildlife, habitat, networks and ecosystems'.
- Chalk streams should be included within the list of Environmental Assets
- 8 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately and Newnham PC referred to developer contributions should be explicitly required for wildlife habitats and networks
- The National Trust were concerned that this key issue misses irreplaceable habitats. They provide key opportunities in terms of BNG along with a chance to enable the council to consider them alongside priority habitats to secure the Lawton principles of 'bigger, better, more joined up'.

- Request that LPU policies contribute positively in terms of green infrastructure and new development – for example, in terms of whether brownfield sites will be prioritised for development
- Candovers PC and one other respondent would like to have seen more emphasis on the importance of the protection of conservation areas and their settings alongside AONB as part of the key issues.
- Candovers PC also requested greater emphasis on ensuring that any new settlement on greenfield land does not lead to sprawl and infill at a later date with particular regard to developments in neighbouring boroughs.

#### Key issue 4 – Meeting the needs of all

- 1 respondent suggested that providing the right housing is fundamental to the LP in light of Covid –which highlighted inequalities, isolation and the need for market to provide a variety of tenures – for example homes for the elderly and those in need of support, specific housing allocations for variety of tenures.
- Given the planning reforms it may be a requirement for the Local Plan to plan more strategically for rural housing, rather than rely on Neighbourhood Plans.
- Tadley TC stated there is a need for more bungalows for downsizers and improved infrastructure, in particular water drainage and mobile coverage is poor.
- North Wessex Downs AONB referred to the importance of ensuring a supply and delivery of affordable homes where there is an identified need.
- Need better representation of older person accommodation.

#### Key issue 5 – Providing the right housing

- Be more specific about the needs of the elderly and ensure they are represented.
- Needs of urban and rural communities must be integrated.
- West Berkshire Emergency Planner was not convinced that the safety of the population can be accommodated if the wording ‘meeting’ local housing needs implies more housing. Whilst each application will be taken and reviewed on its own merits, the population density within the DEPZ area is already at its limits and therefore the statement needs to be reviewed to reflect this to be more accurate.
- 6 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC suggested should focus on alternatives to greenfield sites and how to redevelop areas for people and wildlife by avoiding greenfield land.
- Bullet 3 should be strengthened to require a spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy to be developed as part of the LPU, to guide development in the borough and allocation of housing in appropriate locations. This includes the review of SPBs so they can be adjusted for suitable sites.
- Store and use water collected – consider rainwater harvesting options – the borough is 156,800 acres and 1” of rain is 25,000 gallons per year.

- Important to have an integrated water resources plan which protects chalk rivers and uses rainfall wisely
- Southern Water recommended inclusion of a key issue that would address the requirements of para 182 of the NPPF namely for planning policies to ensure that new development must be adequately separated from treatment works to safeguard amenity of future occupiers – consider rewording key issue 5 to include ‘in the right location’ , ‘to protect the amenity of future residents’.
- Upton Grey PC and four other respondents referred to the following additional issues; avoid speculative development encroaching on countryside, maintain identity of rural villages, maximise use of brownfield sites, regeneration of 1960s Basingstoke as a priority, major development within or adjoining villages in less sustainable categories should not be permitted, major housing should occur in places with good railway connections.

#### Key issue 6 – Facilitating infrastructure delivery

- Kingsclere PC suggested include reference that HCC and neighbouring authorities be proactive in seeking improvements to existing road network.
- 1 respondent suggested this issue should also include green infrastructure.

#### Key issue 7 - Supporting the economy

- Regeneration supported, but turning ‘dead’ areas into housing may not be the right answer
- National Trust expressed view that this section is very urban focused and could be linked better to sections 8.7 and 8.8 and an overall aim (especially given the longer terms impact of Covid pandemic which is driving greater home working and use of local facilities along with people holidaying within the UK).
- The site promoters for Southern Manydown confirmed that their promotion includes a dedicated Employment Quarter (30 ha of employment land located near to M3 and London Southampton Mainline and potential for 45 ha healthcare campus for a hospital facility).
- 1 site promoter suggested that the Council should not miss the opportunities which exist in the more rural communities for investment and economic regeneration in terms of sustaining employment and retail.
- Need to consider new additional sites and locations for economic development including storage and distribution floorspace to ensure the borough attracts investment.

## **Section 5 – Climate Change**

### **General comments on Climate Change section/approach:**

- 14 site promoters and the HBF referred to the recent Government consultation on proposed changes to Building Regulations regarding uplifts to energy efficiency standards and Proposed Future Homes Standard, any

policy relating to energy efficiency in the Local Plan needs to reference national policy and should be flexible to allow for such policy changes and any cumulative implications as a result.

- Bloor obo Mactaggart and Mickel referred to the challenges of moving to higher fabric standards and low carbon heating systems, particularly in relation to supply chains of such systems, a lack of trained installers and low product availability, consequently flexibility to recognise these challenges and not to expect these changes to come into force quickly will be required.
- Persimmon Homes also supported the LPU to go beyond current requirement, however new policy requirements need to be realistic, not hinder development and be deliverable.
- This point was reiterated by Tetlow King obo Aster Group who advised that the council need to be wary of the ways in which such policies could impact development viability which may restrict the provision of affordable housing.

**Question 5a: Which option is the most suitable energy standard for new homes and non-residential buildings? Should all types and scales of development be required to meet these standards?**

Option 1 – all development should be net zero

- Support was received from 23 respondents including Kingsclere PC, East Woodhay PC, Pamber PC, Candovers PC, Overton PC, MP Maria Miller, Natural England.
- The following more detailed points were made:
  - All types and scales of development should be required to meet zero-carbon, in order to achieve the Government’s target of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 and climate emergency declaration. Any other standard would result in the council not meeting these requirements.
  - The LPU needs to include a range of policies (including zero carbon development) to ensure the most sustainable energy standard for new homes and non-residential buildings is delivered
  - Want to see modern, carbon neutral, homes that are gross carbon neutral (rather than net) and that are fit for purpose for the next 100 years.
  - West Berkshire Council suggested that option 1 is a minimum, but if possible carbon positive would be better.
  - This point is echoed by other respondents who suggested should go further and require carbon-negative proposals
  - NPPF para 148 and 149 are relevant as this requires a radical reduction in emissions and also supports the net zero target
  - Overton PC suggested that not being net zero will be more expensive in the long term as the council will need to retrofit in future

- Reading Borough Council requires major new build homes to be zero carbon, the council is behind, the council should require the same high standards and policies. Norwich City Council also built hundreds of passivhaus net zero, so this should be achievable for the council now.
  - This should be set alongside other policies; the council should aim to be among the leaders in uplifting energy efficiency standards and go beyond building regulations.
  - Natural England suggested this should include the potential approach of collecting financial contributions to offset residual carbon emissions elsewhere in the borough.
  - HCC property services suggested zero carbon in use, rather than net zero carbon.
  - Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates argued that where the council seeks higher standard, through planning policy, it will need to justify robustly with convincing evidence.
- 9 respondents (including site promoters/developers, Chineham PC and Highclere NPG) raised concerns about option 1 making the following detailed points
    - Turley obo Bargate suggested that zero carbon is difficult to achieve and often requires buying into a carbon offset scheme which will not achieve benefits locally.
    - Highclere NP stated this is of very little value unless it addresses lifetime carbon footprint, which is unlikely to be capable of being produced by the construction industry for many years.
    - Chineham PC considered option unrealistic because of the difficulty of defining and measuring what is meant by “zero”. Would this include, for instance carbon emitted by access to and from the building?
    - Barton Wilmore obo Taylor Wimpey suggested this approach is not compliant with national policy or guidance which is clear that LPAs cannot set standards higher than the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.
    - Persimmon explained that policies requiring developments to achieve net zero carbon by 2030 need to provide a phased process up to 2030 to ensure there is no duplication or contradiction with the requirements of other regulations (namely the Building Regulations)
    - Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes stated it is unrealistic to require all new development to reach net zero carbon

Combination of Option 1 (net zero development) and Option 2 (uplift 20% building regs)

- Support received from 7 respondents including SOLVE, and Bramley PC, the following detailed points were made:

- AECOM obo HCC, BDBC, SMV stated that there are viability implications for Option 1 and 2 which need to be considered and subject to viability modelling as per the PPG.
- Option 1 where national planning policy permits, option 2 where national planning policy does not permit option 1
- Option 1 should be taken if we are in a state of 'emergency', however careful analysis of what contributes to the carbon footprint is needed for the lifetime of a development. This may be unrealistic and ambitious, and therefore option 2 might be a better option in the short term.
- There should be no restriction in size or type of new development except in conservation areas.
- All new developments (of all types and scales) should reach carbon neutral in time and an uplift above building standards is a good step towards this.
- SOLVE argued that Option 1 should be required for all greenfield development, otherwise option 2 for existing homes, and mixture of 2/3 for businesses.

#### Option 2 only (uplift 20% of building regs) as minimum

- Support received from 17 respondents including North Waltham PC, Chineham PC and Highclere NP, SoL Pc, Old Basing and Lychnpit PC, Sheffield Park PC, Home Builders Federation. They make the following more detailed points:
  - Should also apply to non-residential buildings of all types and scales.
  - Shouldn't apply in specific heritage situations.
  - 'Approximately 20% above' could be interpreted in many different ways.
  - Persimmon argued this could be achievable but need to understand the real implications in terms of design and demands on service providers.

#### Phased approach - Option 2 should be undertaken until 2025, and then option 1 should be used.

- Support received from 145 respondents including Ellisfield PC, Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Weston Patrick and Weston Corbett Parish Meeting). They made the following more detailed points:
  - All existing housing across the borough should be assessed, with the worst tackled first with incentives to improve.
  - The policy approach should not preclude or discourage innovative developments which exceed the minimum standard.

- Turley obo Bargate commented they are already striving to achieve energy efficient standards above the level required by Building Regulations so option 2 would be achievable
- Upton Grey PC suggested there should be an exception for specific heritage situations.
- Chineham PC suggested option 2 would have the best chance of success. Strict planning conditions imposed for future extensions or modifications.
- Falcon Developments referred to an overarching set of objectives which should be set along the lines of Option 2 (on a case by case basis), the energy standards should look to include an aspiration to work towards net zero development. This is more achievable in time, in line with construction method improvements.

### Option 3 – continue with current approach and require new development to meeting Building Regulations or future equivalent

- Support received from 21 respondents for this option, largely from the development industry (housebuilders/developers including the HBF). They made the following detailed points:
  - Some respondents were of the view that updating Building Regulations instead of local authorities setting standards removes ambiguity and standardising the approach nationally is simpler and more transparent, furthermore an uplift in building regulations is likely to happen over time.
  - Any energy standards above Building Regulations would need to be tested for their viability and the additional costs which may be significant making sustainable development unviable and increase construction costs.
  - A number of respondents took the view that this option represents a continuation of the current approach and is most appropriate in line with Future Homes Standard.
  - Cllr Cubitt stated that would need to ensure it adheres to future equivalents and we are not behind the curve or prevented from implementing them at a future date.
  - Local policies should be forward focused, ensuring properties delivered over the earlier Plan period are ready to meet future energy standards without unnecessary and costly retrofitting.
  - Sovereign referred to the government's current consultation on 'Improving the Energy Performance of Privately Rented Homes in England and Wales' which references the intention to publish a Heat and Buildings Strategy later this year, the LPU should make reference to this and support and deliver development that is prepared for emerging standards and infrastructure priorities.

- Highclere PC suggested not sufficiently ambitious.

General comments on the approaches suggested in 5a:

- Woolf Bond Planning obo JPP Land, Pro-Vision obo Mat Raymond Farming stated that all options should be considered against potential viability (especially when reviewed cumulatively).
- Savills obo Miller Homes and Savills obo Society of Merchant Venturers referred to the aims of the policies being set out, but not being prescriptively set – this ensures flexibility for appropriate viable development to come forward which takes account of site-specific circumstances.
- Falcon Developments suggested a blanket option for energy standards is both unrealistic and undeliverable.
- Savills obo Miller Homes, Savills obo Society of Merchant Venturers supported the principle of providing clarity through a policy.
- Highclere PC argued that none of the options address the lifetime carbon footprint.
- Historic England confirmed that listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempt from the need to comply with energy efficient requirements of the Building Regulations where compliance would unacceptably alter their character and appearance, a point reiterated by Highclere PC.

**Question 5b: Should the council require a minimum proportion of carbon to be reduced by: improvements to the building's fabric and/or; on-site renewable or low carbon energy?**

- Support received from 48 respondents including SoL PC, Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Pamber PC, Overton PC, Falcon Developments, Persimmon Homes, Bramley PC and SOLVE which supported the use of both approaches (fabric first and on-site renewable and low carbon energy). They made the following more detailed points:
  - 1 developer suggested that approach needs to be checked for feasibility and viability and balanced accordingly, also needs to be suitably evidenced.
  - 11 respondents referred to the Fabric First principle as best practice and the most effective way of minimising carbon emissions as enhanced fabric and energy efficient measures should be used first before making use of low carbon renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy. It ensures carbon savings are locked-in for the lifetime of the building, requires less maintenance and places less reliance on the occupiers than on-site renewable or low carbon energy options. Expanding on this, a number of respondents suggested that

on-site renewables should only be compulsory for large developers, and on an optional basis for small scale development.

- Hart DC expanded on this suggesting a requirement for developments over a certain threshold, such as 10 or more homes or 0.25 hectares where there is a requirement to achieve 20% of the energy consumption (regulated and unregulated) from renewable or low carbon technologies, such as PV solar panels, thermal heat pumps and combined heat and power, document could have greater emphasis on this.
  - Basingstoke Transition Network stated that insulation should not be traded off against renewable energy generation or use: it is an absolute necessity.
  - They went on to comment that the council should be encouraging renewable energy microgeneration and use in homes, in line with the Horizon-2050 aspiration that the borough generates all the energy it needs.
  - Thakeham stated that building fabric can only go so far, the council should increase its target to 31% improvement on Part L in order to future proof the policy and make it in line with the current proposed Future Homes Standard, which is the proposed next step in Part L of the Building Regulations.
  - Appearance of buildings should not be compromised.
  - Highclere NP suggested moving all construction towards Passivhaus principles would contribute more reduction of the lifetime carbon footprint.
  - Old Basing and Lychpit PC and Chineham PC suggested policy should be able to specify lower energy materials from the start. When completed, on-site energy should be used as much as possible with such things as solar roofs and heat pumps being designed in from the start.
  - Pamber PC and Pamber NPSG commented that the energy uplift should be 20% for all new developments.
  - Candovers PC were concerned that renewable energy source mitigation should not result in the degradation of the rural landscape.
  - Thakeham and Natural England stated where zero carbon cannot be met on-site, an off-setting scheme would be supported provided it was transparent and of benefit to community. Offsetting should be kept to a minimum and be used to fund improvements within the vicinity of the site. There may be instances such as ground source heat pumps which create noise that need to be located away from homes.
- 
- 21 respondents opposed option 5(b) which requires a minimum proportion of carbon be reduced, including Sherfield Park PC, Bell Cornwell obo Basron

Developments Ltd, Bell Cornwell obo DDE Vivian's Children Settlement, Home Builders Federation, Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes and Phillips Planning Services obo Cooper Estates Strategic Land Limited.

- 5 respondents from the development industry stated that the council should just require building regulations (subject to FHS and Planning White Paper). They go on to say that it isn't appropriate to prescribe the way in which developers should reduce carbon.
- 5 respondents requested policy should remain flexible to allow a mix of energy efficiency measures to be determined at application stage to allow for site specific circumstances, and different housebuilder's techniques and house types.
- 1 respondent requested an overarching policy is established within the LPU which sets specific targets to reduce energy consumption in line with national targets and the climate emergency.
- 3 respondents refer to there being no prescribed requirement to use a particular Quality Mark, as long as the relevant standards are met.

General comments on the approaches set out in 5b:

- 1 respondent supported being carbon negative and building the distributor network for future needs.
- 3 respondents promoting land for development referred to the use of a lean, clean, green approach.
- 1 respondent noted that any policy approach to reduce carbon through residual measures must be accompanied by a means for developments to offset off-site and in lieu from the outset of the adoption of the LPU.
- Bloor suggested the additional cost implications of monitoring and measuring such requirements must be factored into any decision.
- The wording 'Where it is not feasible' to achieve on site creates a potential loophole for developers to use, there should be no loopholes.
- Turley obo Frasers were of the view that challenges of adapting buildings should be recognised as retrofitting renewable energy infrastructure to existing buildings is more complex and often more costly than incorporating them into new building designs from the outset and certain technologies cannot be retrofitted due to the age of a buildings infrastructure.
- Turley obo Frasers stated that planning policies should retain sufficient flexibility to ensure viability of development is not undermined.
- 1 respondent recognised that on-site renewable and low carbon technologies changing over the lifespan of the plan.
- One of the best ways for the council to deliver the commitments set out in Horizon 2050 is to ensure all new builds (and any major converting or extending of existing buildings) incorporate improved efficiency and on-site renewable energy generation, also using pre-fabricated or partly pre-fabricated houses to Passivhaus standard.

### Question 5c: Are there any other options we should be considering?

- 3 respondents including the HBF didn't think there were any other options.
- A number of respondents suggested alternatives which are set out below:
  - 3 respondents including Bramley PC suggested mandating and/or financially supporting rooftop solar with storage on all commercial and business premises.
  - 2 respondents including Highclere NP suggested all new homes and major alterations to existing homes, should have an accessible electric vehicle fast charging point or as an absolute minimum, infrastructure provided where a fast charging point could be quickly installed in the future.
  - T3 respondents including, Natural England and Chineham PC suggested reductions in car travel should also be considered through the design of neighbourhoods.
  - The Woodland Trust commented that natural solutions have been omitted, in particular a policy to support new tree planting and woodland creation should be included. Noticeable absence of a coherent tree planting plan, despite it being a major plan of the Government's plan to achieve zero carbon status by 2040. Should require all new developments to include a minimum 24% tree canopy cover – this would cost little yet make a major contribution to zero carbon aims.
  - Carbon-negative proposals.
  - Grey water harvesting/recycling to be required on all new developments.
  - District Heat systems or ground and air source heating to be installed throughout all new developments.
  - Barton Wilmore aobo Taylor Wimpey and four other respondents referred to the ability to mitigate and minimise energy requirements through the proposed design and layout i.e. placement of trees and orientation of dwellings to be have south facing roofs.
  - Sheffield Park PC would have liked to see incentives for improving existing housing energy standards.
  - 3 respondents referred to all buildings being required to meet passivhaus standard incorporating renewable energy also limiting overheating in dwellings due to solar gain and should be achieved by passive design measures.
  - 2 respondents including Overton PC suggested consideration should also be given to improving standards in existing buildings/retrofitting, particularly in the council's existing housing stock.

- Wilful energy wastage should be a punishable offence, either through national legislation or local fines.
- Direction should be given and incentives placed on the efficient supply and use of electricity throughout the borough.
- Overton PC suggested EPC ratings are given for every building and every building should be a minimum of a C level.
- Natural England advised that policies should seek measure to help natural habitats across the borough adapt to the effects of climate change. Addressing issues on habitats and protected sites that will exacerbated by climate change such as fire risk, reduction of water resources, flooding.
- Howard Cole obo Portsmouth Settled Estates supported a policy framework which provides flexibility to allow for future and emerging technology.
- Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes suggested collection of financial contributions via S106 or CIL mechanisms may be an appropriate way to offset emissions where on-site measures cannot be achieved.
- Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates considered use of ‘smart’ technologies in new development, effective and efficient use of resources goes through the whole life cycle of a home not just construction.

General comments on the approaches suggested in 5c:

- SoL PC referred to the issue of ensuring uninterrupted and adequate power supplies.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC suggested limiting rapid development.

**Question 5d: Should the council introduce a requirement for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM standard. If so, which level should it be set at?**

- Carter Jonas obo Catesby stated any approach should be suitably evidenced
- The introduction of BREEAM was supported 176 respondents.
- 5 respondents thought BREEAM should be introduced at the highest, most ambitious level including East Woodhay PC, Chineham PC and Overton PC
- 165 respondents were supportive of introducing BREEAM ‘Excellent’ inc SoL PC and Newnham PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Pamber PC, Weston Patrick and Weston Corbett Parish Meeting, Overton PC, Bramley PC Basingstoke Transition Network and SOLVE. They made the following detailed points:
  - Examples from other Councils such as West Berkshire Council that require BREEAM excellent unless in exceptional circumstances since

2012 and Reading which requires major non-residential developments or conversions to residential meet BREEAM 'Excellent' were sited.

- There is some concern that it should not be at an extra cost to developer.
- Pamber PC and Pamber NPSG suggested a rating benchmark of 'Excellent' instead.
- These standards also need to be applied to any refurbishments or extensions of any existing buildings.
- BREEAM excellent should be introduced as a minimum for all non-domestic buildings over 500m<sup>2</sup>.
- Overton PC provided example, the new GP surgery in South Ham.
- 3 respondents including Upton Grey PC had a preference for 'very good' as baseline with specific targets in specified regeneration areas.
- Southern Water supported a requirement for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM standard of good or higher for water efficiency. In order for water efficiency measures to achieve any meaningful savings, such requirements should be applied to all new development, not just residential.
- Thakeham suggested that developers of non-residential buildings are only responsible for delivering the 'shell and core' of the building to BREEAM 'Excellent' with a separate requirement for the 'fit out' of the building as this is often undertaken separately.
- Chineham PC suggested whenever possible BREEAM should be added as a condition to planning permissions.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC agreed with BREEAM current standards.
- Turley obo Frasers referred to difficulty in retrospectively fitting and adapting existing building stock to include renewable energy infrastructure.
- Savills obo Thames Water referred to the varying policy approaches. Water efficiency standards of 110 litres per person per day is applied through building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring the standard, BREEAM water-efficiency credits for non-residential must not exceed maximum water use of 105 per litres per head per day (excluding 5 litre allowance for external water consumption). Could lead to confusion.
- Natural England supported a policy that will deliver measures to increase sustainability of development over the Plan period, including reduced consumption of water, energy and other natural resources and waste.

A number of respondents objected to the use of BREEAM:

- Bloor noted that as national guidance restricts sustainability requirements that a Local Plan can set for new homes, it is not justified to set a BREEAM standard for non-residential development.
- The local education authority did not consider it necessary for BREEAM to be levied on new schools or expansions to existing schools as they adopt a very

stringent policy of providing new accommodation to the highest standards of sustainability that aligns itself fully to the principals of BREEAM.

- Barton Wilmore obo Taylor Wimpey and four other respondents suggested that the council need to monitor the outcomes of the Planning for the Future consultation which proposes to incorporate such detailed policies within national policy. The council should consider the financial impact of these requirements on future development proposals alongside other policy requirements sought.
- Savills obo Society of Merchant Venturers SMV and AECOM obo HCC, BDBC, suggested viability testing and engagement with the development industry is required and any standards should be accompanied by appropriate evidence and flexibility in how they will be implemented, avoiding an overly prescriptive approach.
- Savills obo Society of Merchant Venturers suggested that the BREEAM assessment criteria are far wider than only considering energy, therefore if the council's focus is on being carbon neutral borough by 2030 its planning policies should reflect these aims – it is not clear how achieving a BREEAM standard will be targeted sufficiently to help achieve this aim.
- HCC property services suggested using alternative equivalent standards such as those based on an embodied carbon (CO<sub>2</sub>, kg, sqm) metric as advocated by the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge.

#### **Section 5.3.4: Water Efficiency**

##### Support for water efficiency:

- Although there was not specific question on water efficiency standards, five respondents set out their support for water efficiency standards including Southern Water and Savills obo Thames Water.
- Southern Water and Thames Water supported the council's intention to retain the optional technical standard for water efficiency of new build of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d)
- Southern Water is aiming to reduce average per capita consumption across the supply region to 100 l/p/d by 2040, therefore support the council should it wish to introduce any tighter water efficiency standards.
- Thames Water suggested LPU should include requirement for refurbishments and non-domestic development to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits and must not exceed maximum water use of 105 per litres per head per day (excluding 5 litre allowance for external water consumption).
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC agree with limiting water use, standards should not be reduced.
- The Environment Agency has designated the Thames Water region to be 'seriously water stressed' which reflects the extent to which available water

resources are used. Future pressures on water resources will continue to increase and key factors are population growth and climate change.

Oppose water efficiency:

- Cllr Cubbitt is strongly against the council imposing further water rationing to 110 litres per person per day, standard should be 125 litres per person per day and no less.
- SOLVE don't agree with 110 litres per person per day because people quickly replace measure when they occupy buildings.

General comments on water efficiency:

- 3 respondents promoting land for development argued that water efficiency policies should be flexible enough to accommodate future national changes which will restrict the ability for LPAs to set different levels to those set out in Building Regulations.

**Question 5e: Are there any specific viability issues to consider when setting requirements for non-residential buildings/uses?**

- 5 respondents didn't believe there were any specific viability issues including Sheffield Park PC and Overton PC.
- Of those respondents identifying viability issues the following issues were identified:
  - 2 respondents including Bramley PC state that in light of changes in working practices during COVID-19 and changes to PD rights, as far as possible all non-residential buildings should be mixed use with residential and commercial, with public transport.
  - Thakeham explained that occupiers of non-residential buildings are usually responsible for the fit out of buildings, therefore developers of such buildings should only be responsible for delivering the shell and core of the building to BREEAM excellent with a separate requirement for the 'fit out'.
  - West Berkshire Council commented that the key is for developers to know the standard required from the beginning of the project as it was difficult to achieve high standards if this is done at the last minute.
  - West Berkshire Council went on to comment that BREEAM only applies to buildings that people usually work in for a reasonable amount of time.
  - 3 respondents commented that high BREEAM standards and net zero development will avoid costly retrofit at a later date and running costs will also be lower as its difficult to retrofit existing building stock.
  - Suggested use of carbon footprint per employee – using building and travel to work.

- Conversion of non-residential buildings must be required. The following detailed points were made in relation to conversions:
  - Chineham PC commented that non-residential buildings where no planning consent is required for conversion to residential use can affect local amenities and infrastructure as much a medium sized housing development.
  - SOL PC referred to a need for uninterrupted power supply, adequate water supply, adequate sewerage disposal to protect the rivers Loddon and Test, along with consideration of traffic noise levels and reduced light pollution for occupiers.
- AECOM obo HCC, BDBC, SMV set out the possibilities for site wide large comprehensively planned new communities
- HCC property services suggested for smaller community non-residential use, encourage greater flexibility in use of the BREEAM standards or equivalent as advocated by RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge.
- Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates commented will be similar to residential, i.e. need a willing developer and a reasonable return to ensure delivery. Also need to be specific considerations for use of the building and whether it will be appropriate to meet exacting standards.

**Question 5f: Other than by meeting BREEAM standards, how should applicants demonstrate that they have considered sustainable design and construction in their development?**

- 12 respondents including Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Cliddesden PC referred to the following:
  - domestic water use and water efficiency standards 110 litres pp per day along with waste/grey water recycling technologies including rainwater harvesting. They also suggested sustainable/ low carbon building materials to be used/investigated.
  - designing in provision for and solutions which benefit the natural environment e.g. green roofs and walls for insulation. They mentioned; south facing pitch roofs, maximising opportunities for natural heating and ventilation and reducing exposure to winds and other elements, new builds with solar panels (min 3.7kWp solar PV), tree planting in streets and gardens and SuDS systems to minimise the impact of surface water runoff.
  - Designs which factor in the environmental cost of materials and construction.
  - Ability to mitigate and minimise energy requirements through the proposed design and layout i.e. placement of trees and orientation of dwellings.
- 4 respondents referred to planning new developments to have cycle highways

integrated at first development stage.

- 2 respondents suggested at design stage demonstrate air leakage testing of all dwellings, and compliance with CIBSE TM59 (limiting overheating in dwellings) compliance.
- Suggested just using Building Regulations and EPC of a means to demonstrate consideration of sustainable design and construction.
- AECOM obo HCC, BDBC, SMV stated that design and access statement, supporting sustainability/energy statement and/or planning statement are the preferred methods. Sector led certifications schemes are well understood but may carry viability implications. Additional requirements, e.g as part of validation, would be undesirable.
- Bell Cornwell obo Mactaggart and Mickel also suggested this is included as mandatory within the Design and Access statements which form an integral part of the application process for major applications, which is an approach echoed by West Berks Council and Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates who refer to a sustainable design and construction statement for all applications which could include an assessment of feasibility and viability.
- Chineham PC suggested provide the relevant information, before build (planning application) and after build to demonstrate the submitted requirements have been met.
- SoL PC suggested ensure regular and thorough inspection by Building Control to ensure proper attention is paid to Building standards.
- Upton Grey PC suggested WELL ratings.
- No new builds with fossil fuel technology as soon as possible.
- Maximum standards of insulation and/or adequate building insulation to protect against future hot summers/ heatwaves.
- Electric charging points fitted as standard.
- Solar immersion diverter (not solar thermal)
- Iso14001 supply chains
- Sheffield Park PC stated that applicants should wherever possible and economically viable, demonstrate they have not just met sustainable environmental standards but have tried to exceed them
- Turley obo Frasers referred to difficulty in retrospectivity fitting and adapting existing building stock to include renewable energy infrastructure.
- Basingstoke Transition Network stated non-residential buildings should be built to the highest BREEAM standard “excellent” (code 6) or equivalent to Passivhaus and follow best practice for carbon neutrality.
- Chineham PC also suggested BREAM for residential applications and Pamber PC and Pamber NPSG referred to using secure by design standards for security.
- Overton PC suggested sustainability should be considered and embedded at the start of a project.
- Bramley PC concerned the term sustainable should be carefully defined.

- Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes suggested encourage BRE Home Quality Mark for new residential dwellings.

### **Question 5g: Are there any other options we should be considering?**

- 2 respondents stated there were no further options.

Of those who suggested other options, ideas included:

- 3 respondents suggested the use of BRE Home Quality Mark for all new residential development, however 1 respondent noted that this not be the determinative of the acceptability of a proposed development.
- Flood protection – stop hard paved driveways.
- Requirements of less than 110 litres per day as this can easily be achieved in new building, with rainwater harvesting.
- Use approaches by bioregional <https://www.bioregional.com>
- Approaches by LETI [LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide](#)
- Assess the carbon used to make building materials and in building construction.
- SoL PC believed other options will emerge in light of new Government regulations.
- Pamber PC and Pamber NPSG suggested include specific suggestions for rural development where theft can be more prevalent.
- Residential accommodation should comply with requirements of CIBSE TM59 at design stage, which limits overheating in dwellings by passive design measures.
- Use of Passivhaus standard.
- Ensuring that retrofitting options are available and affordable to all, regardless of tenure and landlord.
- Provide support to smaller social housing providers.
- Work with supermarkets to reduce their negative impact e.g plastic packaging, more ethical supply chains and affordable eco products.
- Historic England recommended a specific policy relating to the inclusion of renewable technologies within conservation areas and with regard to historic buildings and the wider historic landscape.
- Overton PC suggested for more ambitious projects, it might be better using the BREEAM methodology as a starting point and specific KPIs.
- HCC property services encouraged use of embodied carbon metric as advocated by the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge. This is more holistic policy approach in responding to climate change through design.
- Bramley PC advocated community heating systems.

**Question 5h: Would you support the introduction of a specific policy on design measures that would mitigate climate change, support adaptation, and embed sustainable design requirements? What should this include?**

- 41 respondents including East Woodhay and Chineham PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Newnham PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Pamber PC and North Hampshire CCG, Basingstoke Transition Network, Falcon Developments and Bell Cornwell obo Mactaggart and Mickel supported the policy approach namely that specific policy on design measures that would mitigate climate change, support adaptation, and embed sustainable design requirements. Their detailed points are as follows:
  - These need to be embedded into any updates of current policies in order to avoid potential conflict.
  - Suggested this could link back to ecosystem services.
  - Savills obo Miller Homes, Savills obo Society of Merchant Venturers suggested a specific policy that encourages a 'proactive approach' to climate change mitigation and adaptation through design would reflect national guidance (NPPF para 149) as well as the objectives of the Climate Emergency.
  - Savills obo Miller Homes suggested that residential development should reduce energy consumption through fabric first prior to considering the use of renewable/low carbon energy either on or off-site alongside potential off-setting measures.
  - Basingstoke Transition Network referred to the policy being strictly zero-carbon by means of design and insulation, and secondarily by means of renewable or zero-carbon energy consumption e.g. local heating from geothermal sources or non-fossil-fuelled waste heat.
  - Old Basing and Lychpit PC commented that appearance should not be compromised as a result.
  - The policy should include the requirement for developer to provide a Life Cycle Analysis of embedded carbon in the development.
  - Any design constraints must respect the character of the neighbourhood.
  - Solve stated that this should not be at the expense of greenfield over brownfield development.
  - Bell Cornwell obo Mactaggart and Mickel commented that should not be overly prescriptive as each site is different and needs a different response, flexibility is required for site specific and new technologies. The Plan should not include detail, instead detail should be within SPDs.
  - Bramley PC concerned that building control must be rigorous in their inspections.

- 9 respondents including HCC and SoL PC supported a specific policy on design matters, they provided the following detailed comments:
  - HCC commented that for transport and movement this should be instilled at the masterplanning stage of development. The hierarchy of movement should be set by outlining a set of 'development principles' whereby the design of the development is adapted to ensure the hierarchy can be achieved.
  - Design of buildings and site layouts must ensure they use energy, water, minerals, materials and other natural resources appropriate, efficiency and with care to take into account the effects of climate change.
  - Simple design steps can ensure that buildings remain conformable despite global warming. This should include all relevant features, including window shades, airtight houses with heat exchanging ventilation.
  - Modular design and construction should be favoured which would increase design quality.
  - Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd, Bell Cornwell obo DDE Vivian's Children Settlement commented that any policy should not be prescriptive as site circumstances vary so much, as does the design response. Suggested any policy is kept generic and detail is picked up through an SPD.
  
- 3 respondents including Natural England and HCC supported a policy for adaption and mitigation of climate change. Their detailed comments are as follows:
  - HCC suggested need careful investigation of flood risk of sites, wider knowledge to residents re riparian ownership, consideration of conditions for resilient homes (PLR, raised sockets, suitable flooring, residential areas on first floor etc).
  - Natural England advised consider climate change adaption and recognise the role of the natural environment to deliver measures to reduce the effects of climate change, for example tree planting to moderate heat island effects.
  - Factors which may lead to exacerbate climate change (through more greenhouse gases should be avoided (e.g pollution, habitat fragmentation, loss of biodiversity) and the natural environment's resilience to change should be protected.
  - Maximise climate change adaption and mitigate though the establishment of a Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategy, these could potentially benefit from carbon offsetting contributions, this could also link to other aspects such as nutrient mitigation for Solent European designated sites.

- 5 respondents opposed the introduction of design measures to address climate change and support adaptation. Their concerns relate principally to design being more sensibly addressed by national level measures and the need to respond to a sites specific circumstances and particular characteristics. 1 respondent suggested that it is picked up in the site assessment methodology and settlement study part 2. Another suggested that rather than specific design measures gives flexibility to the policy and futureproof.
- West Berkshire Council suggested this approach will not be needed if BREEAM and HQM have been introduced.

General comments on policy approach of 5h:

- 12 respondents commented that any policy should be suitably flexible and not prescriptive, it must allow for a reasonable case-by-case assessment, respond to specific local needs and priorities and allow for site specifics and new technologies that may come into force. Also needs to set out the financial and viability implications which need to be considered.
- Turley aobo Bargate suggested that elements in a design policy would be better placed in the appropriate parts of other policies.
- HCC Property Services expanded on this point stating that an approach to design policy is not necessary or relevant to include, as the role of adaption and mitigation to climate change is primarily aimed at existing building stock. An approach would be outside of the remit of the Local Plan because these are already taken into account in Building Regulations.
- Important policy is not repetitive and serves a clear purpose (NPPF para 16).
- Highclere NP stated that any design constraint must respect the character of the neighbourhood.
- All technology should be evaluated at the planning stage.
- Southern Water and HCC referred to effective drainage systems being the foundation of new development and to ensure existing networks are efficient and new development does not increase the risk of flooding, surface water in the first instance should not be connected to the foul network.
- East Woodhay PC referred to immediate concern regarding flooding and not building on areas prone to flooding.
- East Woodhay PC also commented that 2024 is too late to be implementing sustainability standards, they should be implemented now ahead of the LPU.
- SoL PC urged greater attention be paid to provision of water quality and sewerage disposal as well as the efficient use of electricity.
- Sheffield Park PC also suggested should encourage best practice, not mandate it, lead rather than enforce.

The following list sets out the elements suggested for inclusion in such a policy:

- 14 respondents referred to the integration of trees and the Woodland Trust note that a borough-wide target for tree canopy cover and a minimum canopy cover should be standard for development sites, in order to achieve the levels of canopy cover of 30% necessary to meet climate action plan targets.
- 13 respondents referred to design and siting – take advantage of solar gain, minimise heat loss through orientation and glazing. Use of lifetime homes approach to aid sustainability and lessen demand for new homes or ability for businesses to expand and adapt.
- 12 respondents referred to building materials – minimising carbon impact through use of locally sourced or new and innovative materials and re-use and adaptation of buildings rather than new build.
- 9 respondents suggested ensure that developments can cope with changing weather patterns and reduce water demand e.g grey water system/tanking/rainwater capture. Minimal water consumption per head. Ensure that flooding and water storage and release is adequately addressed
- 5 respondents suggested solar panels with 1 respondent suggesting that solar water heating and ground source heating is effective and cheaper in new buildings.
- 4 respondents referred to renewable or low carbon energy systems, specific suggestions include wind and water, potential for use of CHP or smaller energy generation on a site.
- 8 respondents supported designing-in solutions which benefit the natural environment e.g green roofs and use of greenspace, natural habitat and natural (porous) surfacing to mitigate flood risk. The National Trust refer to green infrastructure and open space – allowing sufficient private space, access to good quality open space and providing planting with long term benefits can create carbon capture and habitat creation.
- HCC referred to the concept of 15 minute neighbourhoods, which are designed to enable residents to access their day to day needs within a 15 minute journey of their home
- 1 EV charging point per dwelling, cycle parking and LEDS in all lighting.
- 4 respondents suggested where allotments are present or home composting is an option composting of garden and household waste should be encouraged to reduce the burden on refuse collections.
- Community heating is highly effective as a revenue source for the provider
- Southern Water and HCC stated effective drainage systems and good SUDs design should be fundamental to new development to greatly reduce surface water flooding.
- Solar heat pumps and Geothermal heating
- Hampshire County Council advised that car free development should be explored but will be dependent on the location of development and scale of active mode and public transport infrastructure provided
- Chineham PC suggested battery storage.

- Reduce traffic noise and light pollution.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC referred to solar farms on suitable sites but not windfarms
- Solve referred to mandating efficiency standards and potential peak load limiting these applications. They go on to state that the appearance of buildings is a consideration and aesthetics must be factored in.
- Eco paints to reduce air pollution
- Programable thermostats

**Question 5i: Would you support the above options for delivering low carbon and renewable energy and associated infrastructure?**

- 31 respondents including North Hampshire CCG and Chineham PC, Savills obo Miller Homes, SoL PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Pamber PC, Bramley PC, Baughurst PC, AECOM obo HCC, BDBC and SMV, Overton PC, Natural England and Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes supported both options, namely identifying area for renewable and low carbon energy and encouraging allocation through community led approach:
  - Savills obo Miller Homes commented as long as the policy incorporates sufficient flexibility and does not prescriptively set out how these requirements are met.
  - West Berkshire Council stated both approaches should be a requirement of all major housing and employment developments
  - Bramley PC believe that local allocations should only to support local need.
  - Baughurst PC suggested will require continual review
- 10 respondents including Sherfield Park PC and Falcon Developments, Persimmon Homes and Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates supported option 1 only namely to identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and their supporting infrastructure.
- 1 respondent (Falcon Developments) supported option 2 only which encourages allocation of specific renewable and low carbon energy sources through neighbourhood plans and community-led schemes as this should only be implemented if there is a mandate for Neighbourhood Plans and Community Led Schemes to allocate these provisions

General comments on the approaches suggested in 5i:

- East Woodhay PC referred to proposals only in appropriate locations, taking into consideration the impact such sites may have on the AONB, conservation areas, and countryside in general.
- North Waltham PC commented that the LPU is most appropriate mechanism for identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources as it has better access to resources and comprehensive evidence base.

- Without identifying suitable areas, it would be unlikely that much would happen.
- A good analysis of options, costs and benefits would be needed, and this would need to ensure that developments are futureproofed, even if the infrastructure was not needed at that time.
- Existing dwellings should be assessed and improved as far as economically sensible.
- Fowler stated that the LPU may identify suitable areas but it should empathise that applicants should not be required to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy and recognise that small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions.
- Thakeham were of the view that option 1 is the most efficient but option 2 changes people's behaviour more leading to more sustainable life patterns.
- Preference for wind and solar power.
- Solve referred to local energy generation not always being as efficient as large offshore or low inhabited parts of the county.
- Sovereign had reservations regarding delivering new renewable and low carbon energy at a community level through community owned renewable energy and/or district heat networks.
- The plan should accommodate existing and emerging technologies.
- Sovereign suggested policy should be suitably flexible to respond to advances in technology and provide the infrastructure in preparedness for mass low carbon energy production such as Hydrogen.
- Highclere NP suggested potential sites should be identified along the lines of proposed development sites i.e. a site proposed for housing may not be viable due to isolated location but may be viable for a solar farm.
- If the local area does not come up with any suggestions of their own, the council should have the right to impose actions.
- Basingstoke Transition Network stated that specific provision is required for onshore wind, which is cheaper and has lower transmission losses than offshore. The borough has already identified sites where the wind is sufficient: the provision needs to be there to use them.
- Basingstoke Transition Network were supportive of community renewable energy schemes
- Falcon Developments stated policy must be stronger in its wording and requirements if it is to form part of the Development Plan.
- Candovers PC suggested that renewable energy sources should not result in the degradation of the rural landscape whilst another respondent refers to the effects of pollution needing to be carefully considered (e.g. if from waste incineration).
- The size of such energy generation plants in order to be viable must support a large number of houses.

- Identification of land for energy infrastructure should be compatible with requirements to allocate sufficient land to meet housing needs and employment requirements (AECOM obo HCC, BDBC and SMV)
- Persimmon Homes suggested it is likely low carbon and renewable energy and associated infrastructure will need to be delivered through the CIL or S106 processes and the council need to be specific about their aspirations and requirements for this, including where any district networks may be located.
- HCC property services encouraged LPA to consider effectiveness of policy given the accelerated pace of on-going technological changes to the sector as well as the size threshold and type of development which renewables and if potential connection to DHN would be financially viable, desirable and technically achievable in order to be effective during the Plan period. Small scale and/or piecemeal on-site energy generation likely to become unnecessary given the context of a greener national grid, a policy is unlikely to be sufficiently flexible adapt to such changes.
- Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates referred to only being suitable for large sites.

#### **Question 5j: Are there any other options we should be considering?**

- 4 respondents suggested encouraging the use of PV arrays coupled in future by battery storage in residential units.
- 4 respondents supported the use of air source heat pumps and solar panels which can be successful in achieving energy efficiency targets without comprising on the quality of homes.
- Consider windfarms as they are the most efficient option and it is incorrect to assume all are opposed to them.
- Request as part of achieving 'net zero carbon' measures such as off-setting and allowable solutions should be detailed, as to how cost per tonne of carbon/other measures associated with allowable solutions will be calculated.
- Low carbon district heating e.g. ground source heat pumps with heat interface units in properties.
- A combination approach incorporating suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and allocation through neighbourhood plans and community led schemes would be supported.
- Chineham PC suggested building on brownfield sites
- SoL PC stated such policies need to be in place before development commences otherwise, they will be ignored by developers as too expensive.
- Sheffield Park PC suggested working with other LPAs to develop joint large-scale infrastructure.

- All development should have infrastructure for charging electric vehicles with a minimum standard of +50% above the number of provided car/LGV or HGV parking spaces.
- Public sector decarbonisation scheme, the council should be working to take advantage of the scheme to fund solar panels, heat pumps and insulation on council properties and school.
- In addition to supporting community-owned renewable energy, the council should identify potential sites and work in partnership with strategic energy generation and energy infrastructure providers to create/build renewable energy systems to power a certain percentage of our boroughs electricity requirement.
- AECOM obo HCC, BDBC and SMV suggested criteria based policy to support windfall low carbon and renewable energy schemes in the borough. They also refer to carbon off-setting/allowable solutions, sustainable transport (i.e MRT, new rail capacity, active modes), use of vacuum waste solutions (rather than traditional rubbish waste collection), freeing up road space for active modes and green infrastructure and provision of a network of electric vehicle charging stations and grid energy storage.
- Bramley PC suggested options listed are vague, BDBC should act in a more mandatory fashion, with building control enforcing where necessary.
- Baughurst PC suggested re-consider what may constitute low carbon energy within the lifespan of the Local Plan.
- In light of changes in working practices during COVID-19 and changes to PD rights, as far as possible all non-residential buildings should be mixed use with residential and commercial, with public transport arrangements planned accordingly.

**Question 5k: Should the Local Plan Update encourage or require large scale developments to connect to a district heat network where opportunities to do so have been identified?**

- 21 respondents including SoL PC, Sherfield Park PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and Overton PC), agreed that large scale development should connect to district heat network where opportunity identified unless technologically or economically unviable. Respondents referred to this being tried in the past, make comparisons with Southampton, wouldn't support at the expense of timeliness, and importance of need for flexibility.
- With regards to location, 1 respondent suggested utilising new developments to the South West of Basingstoke benefitting from the proximity to warehousing, leisure park and potential new hospital and 3 respondents suggested the Chineham incinerator would be a good location for a DHN.

- Chineham PC supported principle, but it raises difficult questions. Would connection to the network be compulsory? Who would own and sell the heat? Would there be price controls and limits on consumption?
- Bloor obo Vistry Group and Savills obo Miller Homes and Society of Merchant Venturers commented that the LPU should encourage large scale developments to consider connecting to district heat networks where they exist, as this can be an effective mechanism for carbon reduction, however there should not be a requirement to connect as opportunities to achieve carbon reduction and meet standards may be provided through other approaches with less impact on viability, therefore significant flexibility should be used/
- Basingstoke Transition Network were in favour of encouragement to use district heat networks where they “can be” as well as “have been” identified. The wording should be amended to allow for future developments.
- Use of DHN depends on the carbon emissions generated, it seems likely that the Passivhaus design standard with onsite renewable generation would be the best option with lowest emissions rather than DHN.
- The size of such generation plants needs to be viable to support a large number of houses.
- Solve argued it is not in justification of greenfield development over brownfield.
- Overton PC believe it is best driven by local communities in the first instance and supported by the council. All parishes in BDBC could form part of a local cooperative or community benefit society, where they have control over what the money from locally produced power can be spent on (as part of the community benefit fund) - e.g. – local fuel poverty schemes.

A number of respondents opposed option 5(k) namely that large scale developments are encouraged/required to connect to DHN where available. They provided the following comments:

- Four respondents stated that the use of solutions such as DHN can be unpractical due to the cost to implement, can affect the viable delivery of high-quality homes or other benefits on site.
- Five respondents stated that there should be no formal requirement to utilise district heating as may not be possible or viable for all sites
- There are only limited sites where a DHN is appropriate, i.e. in city centre sites where there is existing infrastructure to run pipes through.
- Evidence that DHN can create issues with overheating, especially on sites with buildings higher than three storeys.
- There will also be technological advances and any policy must allow flexibility to take advantage of this and other mandatory regulatory changes which all introduce cost.
- New residential developments should use ground source heat pumps instead.

- It will remain uneconomic for most heat networks to install the necessary low carbon technologies; this should only be included within a policy if a DHN is achievable.
- HCC property services only support if in relation to major non-residential development at scale, such as a new hospital or leisure centre, in order to be viable and achievable.
- Home Builders Federation stated that for the foreseeable future it will remain uneconomic for most heat networks to install low-carbon technologies.
- Baughurst PC stated that connection to a DHN should only be required or encouraged where a number of other measures have been tried first including fabric first measures, development is of sufficient density, heat network design, using low/ambient temperature loops, and where there is a route to full decarbonisation of the network.

General comments on DHN and approach as per 5k:

- If a fabric first approach is adopted, connecting to a DHN should relate to any remaining energy requirements.
- Clear awareness of viability and costs must be incorporated in any assessment.
- Each site needs to be considered on its own merits, viable DHN is dependent on a number of factors. DHN could be feasible on Southern Manydown, i.e with sharing heat/cooling loads or utilising any available waste heat processes from large developments such as the possible healthcare campus and/or employment land.
- Complex, especially where large sites would be expected to support other nearby developments and could lead to complexity in delivering the upfront infrastructure and place unnecessary burden on delivery of sites.
- Site specific policies for large sites could require this option to be explored as part of the design process, but it should not be used to encumber development of them as it may be that other options are appropriate.
- Home Builders Federation stated that all heat network domestic consumers should have ready access to information about their heat network, a good quality of service, fair and transparent priced heating and a redress option should things go wrong.
- Bramley PC commented that large developments should only be approved if low carbon energy resources can be demonstrated, and there are more efficient methods such as community heating systems using ground source heat pumps.

**Question 5I: Should the Local Plan Update include suitable criteria for assessing planning applications for battery storage and its associated infrastructure?**

- 20 respondents supported the use of suitable criteria for battery storage in the LPU including East Woodhay PC, Chineham PC, Sherfield Park PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and SOLVE. They made the following detailed points:
  - Should not be at the expense of timeliness, if these slow down progress of implementing the LPU
  - Future widespread adoption of electric cars may also present opportunities for peak evening winter/summer charge drawback
  - Should not be limited to battery storage but energy storage via other means such as compressed air.
  - Currently expensive and not very cost effective but needs to be considered in the future.
  - Should be a mandatory requirement in order to get planning permission, should be placed away from residents if not aesthetically pleasing.

A number of respondents supported a policy for battery storage:

- Battery storage will become important as energy generation becomes more distributed as less constant.
- Basingstoke Transition Network were of the view that the field of battery technology and battery storage infrastructure is developing rapidly with government incentives, and the Plan should be as open as possible to taking advantage of this where it does not contradict safety or pollution priorities.
- SoL PC suggested should ensure battery storage is in place before commencement of development.
- Should focus on removing barriers to the wide deployment of energy storage and should be a presumption in favour of approval, particularly where they support renewable energy use and smart grid development.
- AECOM obo HCC, BDBC and SMV suggested may be appropriate on new developments, as this is more desirable and efficient than surplus energy going to National Grid. These are a relatively new technology, similar opportunities may offer earlier opportunities.

Respondents queried when and how the policy would operate:

- Intentions for battery storage are unclear, query whether policy would require battery storage within all residential applications.
- Battery storage is not appropriate for individual residential properties and is more suitable for industrial centres/large commercial buildings/sustainable urban extensions as when there is more occupancy, there is more opportunity to share energy.
- Highclere NP suggested depends on the scale of the storage facility, this seems unnecessary at a domestic level. If this is required on commercial

scale then national guidelines should be used (if available), if these are absent then criteria should be included within the LPU.

- 1 respondent noted that battery storage has no cost benefit and it should be down to the non-domestic developer or the house occupier, however they considered space should be allocated for the correct size battery in future.
- Chineham PC suggested the criteria would have to include robust regulation to ensure safety, limit noise and make sure that the structures were in harmony with the local built and natural environment.
- Sheffield Park PC stated that battery storage capacity will quickly outstrip the criteria, so must be kept up to date
- East Woodhay PC commented that battery storage could have a huge impact on areas in the countryside if not controlled and considered carefully.
- Criteria should include provision for battery disposal.
- Baughurst PC suggested that typical large scale battery storage projects are pre-packaged containerised solutions requiring accompanying transformers and cabling to the grid (or the user of the power via private wire). These should not require specific planning approaches and for particularly large schemes the existing EIA approach should support planning decisions. Beyond the construction phase there is not typically a lot of traffic to storage sites, so during operational life such schemes do not present particular planning challenges.

### **Question 5m: Which option or options for sustainable transport and movement would you support?**

The consultation sought views on the following four options.

- Option 1: Meeting the needs of the car by adding highway capacity and providing parking spaces to meet demand, with minor improvements to benefit cycling, walking and public transport.
- Option 2: Focus on improvements in facilities for walking, cycling and public transport, including dedicating space on our roads for these forms of transport, including reserving land where required and considering the scope for new railway stations.
- Option 3: Establish an approach that relies on managing demand, such as the pricing of car parking spaces, greater use of technology and more home-working to reduce the need to travel by car.
- Option 4: An approach that sees an improvement to benefit all modes of transport

Support was split between options 2 and 4 as well as many suggestions for a combination of these including some elements of the other options.

Comments included:

- Maria Miller MP commented that innovative solutions to encourage people to use public transport should be explored. Inevitably people will commute in and out of Basingstoke, so it is important that there is good public transport/walking/cycling links between new housing developments and the railway station; as well as good links from the station to business areas. A new public transport hub in the town centre is essential
- Cllr McCormick suggested electric car charging in public car parks, communal residential parking and on-street. Building of more pavements and cycleways alongside busy roads, especially the main roads going in/out of Basingstoke. Building railway stations on the edge of Basingstoke (e.g. Chineham)
- Highways England supported proposals with sustainable transport measures, which manage down demand, reduce the need to travel and support alternatives to the car, such as improved public transport
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) supported a combination of Options 2 and 3 to promote sustainable transport and movement. The former 'predict and provide' approach of expanding highway capacity is no longer sustainable given the Climate Emergency. A targeted shift to 'decide and provide' is needed for a sustainable future, centred around the movement of people rather than cars
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) suggested utilising the hierarchy of movement should ensure that active modes (walking and cycling) and public transport are the easiest and most accessible modes, consistent with 15 minute neighbourhoods to enable residents to access their day to day needs within a 15 minute journey of their home, including employment, shopping, education, healthcare and leisure facilities
- Sport England supported Option 2 to maintain healthy and active lifestyles and encourage safe active travel options
- NHS North Hampshire CCG supported proposals that reduce carbon emissions and enable increased physical activity
- West Berks Council supported Option 4 - but with an emphasis on Option 2 in the urban areas

### **Question 5n: Is there a role for Park and Ride at Basingstoke and where could such a facility be located?**

The majority of respondents were supportive of a Park and Ride (P&R) at Basingstoke.

Preferred locations included:

- Chineham Shopping Centre was the preferred option
- Followed by the M3 Junction 7, and the M3 Junction 6; and
- Manydown

Those in favour included:

- Pamber Parish Council & Pamber NP Steering Group, Cllr McCormick, Trustees of the Portsmouth Estate, Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council,

Baughurst Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Overton Parish Council, Cliddesden Parish Council, Newnham Parish Council & Mapledurwell & Up Nately Parish Council. Highways England and Local Highway Authority (HCC) were also in favour.

Those against a P&R included:

- Upton Grey Parish Council - concerns about building on greenfield land
- Chineham Parish Council - P&R schemes work better in cities such as Winchester and Oxford and borough residents should be able to use public transport from their home rather than switching modes of transport during their journey

Other comments

- Highways England supported use of of Park and Ride sites to help manage travel to town centres by private car, however the positioning of these sites is critical to their impact on the Strategic Road Network
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) suggested opportunities should be considered for new strategic developments to incorporate Park and Ride facilities, together with priority measures, to ensure that Park & Ride bus services are fast and reliable. The proposed MRT network could also provide quality bus services to support Park and Ride
- North Waltham Parish Council - any P&R development needs to be placed in the context of a rapidly evolving transport landscape
- Sheffield Park Parish Council - people would always look to retain flexibility of their own transport use
- Basingstoke Transition Network - fears around loss of biodiversity and a need to use existing parking spaces more efficiently

### **Question 5o: Are there other forms of transport that will be important to plan for in the future?**

Other forms of transport raised by respondents included the following:

- Trams/light rail/electric trams
- Electric cars, bikes, buses and scooters
- Small buses of circa 12 to 15 capacity
- Uber type operations
- Hydrogen vehicles
- Autonomous vehicle shuttles/driverless buses and cars
- Mass rapid transport

Other considerations/a need for:

- Zero car parking spaces
- Electric charging points and associated infrastructure
- Safer walking and cycling routes

- Catering for those with mobility impairments

#### Comments

- Maria Miller MP commented that increasing the usage of electric cars is of great importance, not least to reduce air pollution. With increasing commuting, it is essential to get greater capacity on our trains, with investment in the Woking and Basingstoke flyovers a priority. Improved connectivity with Heathrow is also essential for local employers
- Cllr McCormick suggested electric bikes, cars, buses and HGV hydrogen vehicles
- West Berks Council referred to possibly need to consider hydrogen and electric vehicles
- Aecom/HCC/BDBC Landowners suggested the LPU should take into account emerging and new methods of transport including: e-scooters and other personal mobility devices, electric bicycles, electric/autonomous cars, carsharing clubs which allow for vehicle hiring on demand, ridesharing services such as Uber and emerging delivery services using drones or even self-guiding robots.
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) suggested reducing the number of car owners and making better use of shared or hired transport should be explored as well as low traffic neighbourhoods, filtered permeability, and car free developments. Rail should also be considered including establishing the benefits of a new station at Chineham. Other rail opportunities, for example in the west of Basingstoke should be considered, but in line with the MRT proposals, including assessing the likely demands, potential competition between the two modes and the relative infrastructure costs

#### **Q5p: Do you support a review to facilitate a dedicated transport hub by Basingstoke railway station?**

##### Support:

- The majority supported a dedicated transport hub by Basingstoke Railway Station including Maria Miller MP.
- Highways England strongly support of sustainable measures such as improved public transport to support alternatives to the car. Improving public transport has the potential to minimise any adverse impact from proposed growth on the Strategic Road Network
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) commented that the Basingstoke Town Centre Transport Study identified the benefits of a new high-quality interchange between bus services, including new MRT services and the railway station

##### Oppose:

- 1 respondent argued that transport pressure should be diverted away from Basingstoke and towards Chineham and Manydown via the creation of new railway stations there
- Basingstoke isn't large enough for MRT

General comments:

- In order to accommodate a new Hub, changes would be required to the one-way system
- Additional facilities, such as electric charging points and ridesharing services should also be considered

**Question 5q: Are there any specific considerations that need to be taken into account as part of this review, including the suitability of other land uses?**

With regard to cycling and walking comments included:

- Meaningful cycle lanes required
- Making the experience safer and nicer would encourage a shift from the car and this in turn could help to make buses faster due to fewer cars

Respondents also raised comments regarding the area outside the Basingstoke Railway Station:

- Local transport hubs needed to connect to the central hub in town centre
- Potential for electric bus / taxis in this location
- Scope for retail in this location to benefit from footfall
- Need to remove Clifton House to make this feasible and retention of town centre as main location for retail
- Consider a wider area such as that occupied by the Moose Centre

Comments also received regarding bus services / MRT included:

- Where possible MRT should use existing / upgraded links and not major new routes
- Scope to make use of smaller vehicles with increased frequencies with electric or hydrogen power
- Must ensure routes are planned for through the Leisure Park to Manydown and to serve the new hospital
- Priority needed, including for taxis in some areas

Location of development in the context of transport considerations included:

- Southern Manydown can support new bus routes and MRT, together with extending walk / cycle infrastructure
- Account should be taken of the scope to improve existing networks in smaller settlements compared to the possibilities for this in Southern Manydown, with innovative options, with higher densities and self-containment
- Build homes next to employment sites to reduce commuting
- Rural areas must be considered too, as these are frequently poorly connected

Other comments:

- Access to rail stations is fundamental by all modes
- Must consider less pollution once petrol / diesel car sales banned in 2034 as well as electric buses and taxi

- Consider hydrogen / electric buses to link with Climate Emergency
- Scope for electric car clubs / driverless vehicles including buses
- Must consider the impact of more home-working arising from Covid-19

## Section 6 – Creating Beautiful Places

### Question 6a: Do you support the identified list of important elements relating to design and layout set out in paragraph 6.2.2?

- There was a considerable amount of agreement with the list contained within the issues and options document regarding design priorities for the borough (189 respondents), including from Hampshire Highways, NHS North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, West Berkshire Council, North Wessex Downs AONB, National Trust, Persimmon Homes, David Wilson Homes Thakeham Homes, Taylor Wimpey (overall), Savills on behalf of SMV, Sovereign, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Chineham PC and Kingsclere PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Old Basing PC, Sherfield Park PC and SOLVE.
- Cllr Diane Taylor stated that she fully supported the list.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick also agreed with the list.
- Turley, on behalf of Bargate Homes stated that it is difficult to imagine how this could be incorporated into a policy without it being too prescriptive and lacking in flexibility to take account of the wide range of site-specific circumstances.
- Natural England welcomed the strong emphasis on the importance of integrating a range of green infrastructure including open spaces, natural habitats, trees etc.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) did not support the list. They stated that whilst the promoters are highly supportive of a Local Plan that helps to prioritise sustainability and deliver excellence in placemaking in terms of design, they question the efficacy of including the list identified at 6.2.2 – principally as it may not achieve the objectives for the local area. Rather than formulate a borough-wide list of general requirements for design, they suggest it may be better to rely on national guidance, and only add specific design requirements when these are specific to either Basingstoke or specific sites.
- Overton PC did not express support for the list set out in paragraph 6.2.2. They were concerned that by implication the list is seeking to encourage contemporary architecture, which they consider is not always appropriate, particularly in a village context.
- 1 respondent stated that it would be difficult to disagree with the list set out in paragraph 6.2.2, but that what is important is that the design response and the ability to meet these objectives will differ site-by-site.
- Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes and Vistry Group stated that it must be noted that not every site can justify a truly bespoke design solution, and that the design approaches used by volume housebuilders do not mean that high

quality design cannot be achieved. They also expressed reservations about lower densities and bigger amenity spaces as this would mean releasing more greenfield land.

- Taylor Wimpey stated that while they agree that the council should strive for high quality design, this should not preclude the use of standard house types as it has been a demonstrably successful approach to the efficient delivery of homes, whilst ensuring finishes and detailing are adapted to reflect the local character, materials and style of building.
- Thakeham Homes state that any policies would need to be flexibly worded in order for developments to be assessed on their own merits.
- RPS on behalf of Bewley Homes supported the aims of the list, though had concerns about the specifics. In particular, they believe there is no issue in using standard types, which is very much necessary where larger developments are concerned. The balance here is to be struck between design and deliverability. RPS would therefore recommend the deletion of 'standard design approaches' from the design mandate going forward.
- Savills on behalf of SMV stated that it is particularly important that the design guidance balances encouraging the consideration of site-specific characteristics, allowing flexibility of design standards where necessary whilst ensuring it is not overly prescriptive, which could constrain good or innovative design.
- Boyer on behalf of Mactaggart & Mickel stated that M & M are open to the use of bespoke architectural solutions and accept that in some circumstances, this is appropriate and beneficial. However, they also stated that it should also be recognised that not every site can justify a bespoke design solution, and that standard design approaches used by some housebuilders do not mean that high quality design cannot be achieved. It is therefore recommended that there is some flexibility in any design policy.
- Chineham and Sherfield on Loddon PCs believe that the true test will actually be delivering upon those aspirations, and that this will be dependent on staff being suitably trained to implement such a policy.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates set out their support for all of the aspirations contained within Section 6.
- 1 respondent stated that the list needed to go further. It was stressed that new development needed to be beautiful and to create a 'net gain' not just 'no net harm'. Stewardship of the countryside was also emphasised along with ensuring important natural assets are preserved, the development potential of brownfield land is maximised, that we support net gains for biodiversity and the wider environment and actively address the challenges of climate change.
- Baughurst PC also agreed with the text set out in paragraph 6.2.3.
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates questioned the emphasis on bespoke design solutions instead of standardised approaches. They stressed that housing needs to be provided in an efficient and viable manner, particularly if sustainability standards are to be improved. They also have concerns about prescriptiveness regarding the design of buildings.

### **Question 6b: Are there any other priorities or additional design related issues which the Local Plan Update should address?**

A wide range of issues were identified, but these can largely be summarised as follows:

- Consideration of a range of specific design considerations.
- The importance of incorporating more and better integrated natural environment related features (e.g. street trees).
- Concerns regarding highway related design issues such as parking and pedestrian/cycle paths.
- Importance of sustainable design.

A more comprehensive list of the issues raised is set out below:

- Cllr Cubitt raised that it is important to: improve noise insulation in all new housing; road widths need to be increased; that street trees are vital for achieving beautiful streets; and that it's vital that new developments are contextually driven bespoke designs which drawn on local history and tradition.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick stressed the importance of ensuring fire safety, particularly in relation to building materials.
- Hampshire Highways stated that, in reference to transport and movement the priority as listed could be strengthened by promoting, where possible, the segregation of cyclists and pedestrians as set out in the new cycle design guidance LTN/120.
- Historic England stated that they will seek a specific requirement for consideration of the historic environment within the design policies of the plan, which should seek to draw on opportunities offered by the historic environment and reflect local character and distinctiveness. This should not stymie contemporary development but should require an appreciation of the significance and character of the historic environment in producing a high standard of design. They would also welcome this in relation to any tall buildings policies.
- Historic England also emphasised the importance of streetscape, particularly given the issues of connectivity and traffic management. For streetscape improvements they draw the council's attention to Historic England's Streets For All publications: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all/>.
- In addition, Historic England stated that the retention of historic or significant shop fronts is often integral to the character of relevant buildings and that of the wider street scene. The local plan should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shop front features. This is both in terms of the positive contribution historic shop fronts make to the character of an area, but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shop owners.

- The importance of 'colour' was stressed by the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Board.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) recommended the use of detailed design codes for any future Manydown allocation.
- Sovereign stated that where specific design policies are set out, there needs to be sufficient flexibility to address changing aspirations over the lifespan of the local plan.
- Chineham PC stated that there needs to be much more innovative use of new materials and techniques in construction.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC stressed the importance of appropriate building heights and providing sufficient off-street parking.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC stressed the importance of using local building materials, providing planting, and using hedges and walls instead of fencing.
- Overton PC stated that open spaces and greenery should be included in all developments if it is practical and easily maintainable. They also stated that provision for parking needs to be greater than that already in the planning system. Use of technologies that reduces carbon emissions is essential. They also stated that the inclusion of decent sized front gardens and larger back gardens and outside space for flats should be incorporated into all new housing.
- Bramley PC stressed the importance of off-road parking spaces and for new housing to be provided on the basis of sensible density levels. They also stressed the importance of a varied approach to design.
- Bramley PC also advocated the increased use of bungalows, provided they are placed in accessible locations. They also supported a mixed-use approach to new developments, include live/work and local workspace facilities.
- Baughurst PC stressed the importance of greenery (e.g. tree lined streets) and open spaces in new development, along with glimpsed views through to the countryside.
- Basingstoke Transition Network recommended that the following is added to the list: the possibility of microgeneration (rooftop solar, solar thermal) and heat-retaining buildings; passive or active shading of south-facing windows. They also suggested that more emphasis is given to considering the impacts of Covid-19 on occupier requirements and housing design. They also recommended that consideration is given to greater use of modular construction, particularly for Manydown.
- 1 respondent emphasised a number of issues: Passivehaus/net zero; preference for brownfield land; biodiversity; nature recovery networks and green arteries; high quality, beautiful design; water use/re-use; resilience in design; flood resilience; water minimisation; accessibility and mixed-use; infrastructure; identifying and incorporating best practice.
- The design of individual buildings was emphasised, along with the strengthening of the connection with green spaces.
- The importance of green spaces was emphasised (particularly protecting such sites in Whitchurch), along with sufficient play space.

- The importance of provision for wildlife in all design and place-making matters was stressed.
- New designs should draw on traditional design features of older parts of Basingstoke.
- The need for more distinctive housing was emphasised, and it was felt that recent developments have been very bland, with not locally distinctive character.
- The desire for quality and functionality was stressed, and the need to avoid lower quality development, as that would not be likely to last well.
- Create beautiful spaces which will be loved and well-used.
- It was recommended that new development is designed on the basis of 'homezone' principles.
- The need for more sustainable architecture was also advocated, including the use of renewable energy solutions such as PV panels. Thakeham Homes were one of the advocates of this approach.
- A key goal should be to achieve quality, desirability and affordability in order to ensure that Basingstoke is somewhere people want to live.
- Aesthetic issues were highlighted, with Sherfield Park seen as being a good example of a successful scheme in this regard (though possibly in the wrong place, and not a sustainable as would be ideal).
- A distinction must be drawn between the appropriateness of the design response at urban, village and rural developments / settings.
- The need to give proper consideration to the implications of future home working was raised.
- The importance of suitable spacing between dwellings was emphasised, particularly in a rural context.
- Within rural areas it was also stressed that density needs to be lower, and it is vital to guard against coalescence. The need to protect heritage assets in rural areas was also highlighted.
- Ensuring home delivery vehicles can manoeuvre was also highlighted, which has implications for layout and highway design.
- The importance of preventing 'clone estates' was emphasised.
- The need to ensure that adequate green/open space is provided, and forms an integral part of the design process from the outset was stressed.
- A more holistic and rounded approach to development with the natural environment was requested.
- In a similar vein the need to ensure proper maintenance of green/open spaces was also emphasised, and it was felt that reliance on management companies did not work well in practice.
- The Woodland Trust stated that design guidance should incorporate the protection and extension of green infrastructure including support for SuDS in all new developments, and encouragement of green links, such as tree lines and hedgerows, to frame residential areas and connect existing habitats. They stated that green infrastructure should be protected, enhanced and

integrated into development plans, including through local tree strategies, landscape management plans or urban development briefs.

- The importance of additional allotments was also advocated.
- Reference was also made to the need to prevent light pollution.
- Ensure that new development helps reduce carbon emissions, including through sustainable access to local facilities.
- The need to have regard to the impact of Covid-19 on the town was also mentioned.
- Thakeham Homes stated that it is of the opinion that home-working as a result of the COVID-19 crisis is likely to continue as companies embrace new technology. As a result, Thakeham believes it is crucial that homeworking is considered in the design of new homes and developments. This could be through the inclusion of “home-working hubs” being installed in gardens as part of new developments or a ‘study’ being incorporated into house type designs.
- The importance of reducing the impact of car parking on the public realm was also emphasised. The prominence of cars in the public realm needs to be replaced with greenery.
- It was suggested that the council reintroduce ‘Lifetime Homes’.
- Reference was made to not getting ‘too bogged down in legacy urban forms’.
- Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Local distinctiveness and local character assessments.
- Mixed and inclusive communities.
- The need for more cycle and foot paths, and that they must feel safe for users.
- Ensure that safety and accessibility considerations are fully integrated into the design process.
- The need for the provision of EV charging points.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of Basron Development stated that in their view the Council should work with developers rather than impose what it considers to be good design as this tends to not only be subjective, but changes over time.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of Flavia Estates set out that they consider that the LP should not include prescriptive design requirements and should instead focus on strategic issues. They also stated that design responses should be site specific and not prescribed by the council.
- It was requested that new development is more durable and adaptable and cater for family ‘life-cycle’ needs.
- 1 respondent listed community, sport and other leisure facilities that bring communities together and promote health.
- 1 respondent was keen to see the principles of Basingstoke’s expansion continued, namely efficient road layouts, provision of cycle and pedestrian paths and schools in accessible locations.
- It was suggested that quality design and ‘beauty’ should always relate to the fabric and function of the building as well as appearance.

- Hampshire Constabulary emphasise that the best way 'secure by design' can be achieved is through incorporating the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) into the design of the development, and hence request that this is reflected in future policies.
- Sheffield Park PC recommended that new houses are fitted with CCTV.

**Question 6c: Do you have any views on how these design priorities should be achieved?**

- Hampshire Highways stated that to achieve the design priorities, focusing street design on 'people' is an emerging principle to be adopted by HCC. Additionally, a 'Link and Place' matrix will classify streets based on their 'link' requirements and 'place' functions.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) recommended the use of design codes.
- Design Codes were suggested by the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Board.
- Hampshire Highways also stressed the need for pedestrian and cycle design to be location specific and responsive to the needs of the different users.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC stressed the importance of stronger policy implementation and enforcement.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC recommended that this be achieved through regular updates of the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans.
- Overton PC stated that developments in villages should not be 'a one size fits all design'. They also stressed the need to ensure that design quality agreed up front is not diluted through the later stages of the planning process.
- Bramley PC stated that the current parking standards should be removed, since they are not adhered to. Furthermore, they stated that mandatory regulations should be drawn up and enforced.
- The Housebuilders Federation (HBF) stated that achieving the council's design aspirations will need to be predicated on working closely with housebuilders, as they have the best understanding of what their customers are seeking from new homes.
- The HBF also suggested that the council utilise the 'Building for a Healthy Life' Design Code.
- A suggestion was made that checklists were provided to applicants.
- The use of design coms was also proposed.
- There was a preference for being able to incorporate into decision making the track record of certain developers in terms of design quality and building standards.
- Persimmon Homes stated that design priorities should be achieved through specific policies for the different types of development. Requirements for housing, economic, retail and leisure / community uses generic policies that are open to wide interpretation will not be helpful in assisting with the preparation of schemes.

- Persimmon Homes also drew attention to the importance of design guides, particularly in light of the government's support for this approach as set out in the White Paper on the future of the planning system.
- Turley on behalf of Bargate Homes stated that while some of these design priorities could be achieved through appropriate policy, it would seem that the majority are better suited to guidance or a supplementary planning document.
- Thakeham Homes stated that they are of the view that, whilst Design Codes could be used to ensure these design priorities are achieved through providing a baseline quality of design, there needs to be a degree of flexibility. They raise concern that onerous Design Codes could potentially stifle creativity and encourage a very specific standard / aesthetic to design.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estate set out that the LPU should fully embrace the recommendations of the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission, as set out within its final report, 'Living with beauty'.
- Sport England recommended that the LPU be informed by national guidance recently published, Active Design, which intends to inform the urban design of places, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and active open spaces to promote sport and active lifestyles.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of Mactaggart and Mickel stressed the importance of utilising masterplans in order to achieve the desired design standards.
- 1 respondent stated that design priorities could be better achieved by talking to local people in proper consultation exercises in which focus groups are formed and ideas discussed. Consultation should always be fruitful and not a tick-box exercise.
- It was suggested by Upton Grey PC and another respondent that it is important that applications include information which clearly shows how new development will appear in context.
- Chineham PC stated that in order to achieve the objectives set out, there would need to be wider powers for the Planning Authority to specify and enforce design details. However, they felt that 'at present proposals seem to be going in the other direction'.
- East Woodhay expressed concern about the deliverability of the council's design aspirations.
- It was recommended that the principles outlined by the Wildlife Trust for 're-wilding the planning system' are placed at the heart of the LPU.
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates set out the following actions for helping achieve the council's design aspirations, namely: allocating locations for development with the capacity and viability to deliver the design priorities; outlining its priorities in design, but also how these are (or should be) balanced with other priorities; working collaboratively with developers to identify appropriate design solutions at an early stage in the process.

**Question 6d: Should the Local Plan Update be more visual and include examples of the type of designs supported?**

- Of those who commented, the vast majority agreed that it should follow the approach set out in this question (37 responses). This included Cllr Diane Taylor and Cllr Andrew McCormick, AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown), and also Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, and Old Basing and Lychpit PC. Hampshire Highways stated that visual examples of the types of cycle and walking infrastructure would be welcomed in the plan. Sherfield on Loddon PC said this was an excellent proposal. Overton PC, while supportive of the approach, did state that it mustn't be too prescriptive.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that this approach is supported if it adds to what is already in the National Design Guide and relevant national guidance, this would help to future proof the Local Plan and aligns well with recommendations in Building Better, Building Beautiful and subsequent proposals in the Planning White Paper which emphasise the LPAs key role in placemaking (and reflecting the fact that more generic text based development management policies may be incorporated into the NPPF).
- Many of those who did not agree with the inclusion of images within the Plan itself still supported the idea of pursuing that approach through SPDs and Design Codes.
- The HBF were not supportive of including examples of good designs, as they felt this would be an overly prescriptive approach.
- Chineham PC stated that this approach has merit if it would lessen time consuming "back and forth" negotiations with developers. They stated that care needs to be taken that such ideas would not stifle innovative design. However, there must be a balance taking into account the cost.
- Upton Grey PC agreed, but specified that this should focus on major developments and sites within Conservation Areas.
- Sherfield Park PC though that this was a potential option, but considered that it would be better to work closely with the local community in order to ensure that new designs are locally distinctive.
- It was suggested that in particular side-by-side images of 'good' and 'bad' would be useful (not necessarily in the main plan but in supplementary design guidance).
- 7 respondents said no, such images should not be included. This included David Wilson Homes. However, one of those did also state that we should expect and demand the best design, not 'chocolate boxes'.
- Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes stated that the Plan should not include images as this sets parameters that are too rigid.
- Savills on behalf of SMV were broadly supportive of the inclusion of images, but stressed that these should only be a guide which would underpin a flexible and site specific approach to design generally.
- Thakeham Homes stated that they are of the view that whilst visual examples are useful, the plan period will cover a significant period of time, in which design and material styles will change, therefore it would be better for design

related documents to be separate to the Local Plan so that they can be updated more frequently as required.

- Another respondent stated no, and that the Framework confirms that plans should set out a clear design vision and expectations. It continues to advise that maximum clarity about design expectations should be placed within design guides or codes, which are best secured as a conditional requirement of an outline planning permission or within an SPD.
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates were concerned that using visual examples would just lead to copying of the design highlighted, which would lead to a less creative and contextual approach.
- The National Trust stated that the LPU could certainly provide more examples of the types of design the LPA considers could be supported but this must be balanced with not wanting to stifle new and innovative design approaches.
- However, it was also felt by some, including DWH, that this may be more appropriately located within SPD, including good and bad examples, and including traditional and contemporary examples. The need to also consider the rural context was also raised.
- Turley on behalf of Bargate Homes stated that they would not wish to see future development designs constrained by images that were included in the Local Plan as examples.

**Question 6e: Are more specific policies needed? For example, focusing on particular types of development (e.g. housing).**

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the LPU should include comprehensive specific policies for site allocations to set out the quantum of development, mix of uses required and necessary infrastructure. They stated that flexibility should be built into large site allocation policies, recognising that these long-term projects will need to respond to changing needs and demands over a number of years.
- The North Wessex Downs AONB Management Board stressed that density should be dependent on the character of the local area, some rural settlements are characterised by high density development and others are low and dispersed.
- 1 respondent stated that the LPU should not include such policies, as it is supposed to only set high level policies. If more specific considerations needs to be set out then it was suggested that this ought to be via SPDs.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick stressed the importance of a policy on 'low carbon'.
- 1 respondent stated that the existing policies provide an adequate basis upon which to enable SPDs to be prepared that offer guidance on a particular subject matter.
- Upton Grey PC agreed that such policies should be included within the LPU.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC stated that the following issues needed to be addressed: size and adequacy of parking space; storage within homes (as well as garages); avoidance of roof space being used for living space; height of buildings in rural areas.

- Overton PC stated that separate policies are needed for residential and commercial and urban and rural locations.
- Bramley PC also stressed the importance of policies which would support rural design solutions and also achieve a varied approach to design.
- Various additional policy areas were suggested, including:
  - Creating beautiful space
  - Mandate density targets (minimum and maximum)
  - Accessible communal outside space
  - Facility targets
  - Public transport targets
  - Design for mixed use (live/work and local workspace facilities)
  - Ensure a mix of units/housing, including affordable
  - In terms of recognising and mitigating noise impacts associated with land around military bases.
  - Housing for older people.
  - Major developments.
  - A more 'holistic and rounded approach to development with the natural environment' was requested.
- The National Trust would suggest that more specific design policies relating to particular developments are not necessary but that any design policy should ensure that a clear evolution of how the design of any proposal has responded to its local environment, opportunities, as well as constraints, should be provided so that the Council's desire to create beautiful places and a high quality living environments can be achieved.
- Persimmon Homes stated that design priorities should be achieved through specific policies for the different types of development. Requirements for housing, economic, retail and leisure / community uses generic policies that are open to wide interpretation will not be helpful in assisting with the preparation of schemes.
- Persimmon Homes also drew attention to the importance of design guides, particularly in light of the government's support for this approach as set out in the White Paper on the future of the planning system.
- Thakeham Homes stated that they are of the opinion that home-working as a result of the COVID-19 crisis is likely to continue as companies embrace new technology and that as a result. Thakeham believes it is crucial that homeworking is considered in the design of new homes and developments and therefore a specific policy should be included. The policy could require the ability for "home-working hubs" to be installed in gardens as part of new building developments or a 'study' being incorporated into house type designs.
- SOLVE stated that there should be more emphasis on mixed-use development.
- 1 respondent stated that there should be policies focusing on building and communities. Presumably the reference to building means build quality. The communities issue is dealt with in more detail below.

- It was also stated that there should be particular consideration for people working from home, e.g. the importance of excellent sound-proofing, natural light, office space, green space nearby.
- There was also opposition to the inclusion of such policies on the basis that it would lead to an overly prescriptive approach, and hence hinder a varied approach to new designs.

**Question 6f: Are there any specific design priorities relevant to particular areas in the borough, for example Basingstoke town centre?**

- Cllr Cubitt emphasised the need for new design to be high quality, contextual and respond positively to the character of the surrounding area, and that design which is not good enough to be approved must be refused.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick stated that residential areas with trees should have additional solar-powered lighting at lower levels to aid pedestrians where street columns are lost in tree canopies.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the promoters would support a character area-based approach. The Southern Manydown concept plans are broken down into distinct character areas for the south, centre and north. With an approach to density that seeks to utilise District/Local Centres and transport hubs for higher density forms of development and lower in density more rural fringe areas to the west.
- Chineham PC stated that building design needs to include longevity and be fit for purpose. This should include replacing concrete facades and Grenfell-type cladding.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC emphasised the importance of maintaining the colour pallet in the Top of the Town, and also protecting key views, such as St Michaels Church.
- Overton PC stated that design within Basingstoke should be innovative, but refer to the industrial heritage of the town. They also stated that neighbourhood Plans should be key in the smaller settlements.
- Sheffield Park PC recommended that Basingstoke and Tadley would benefit from more street art, greenery, benches and outside seating areas.
- 1 respondent raised various issues, including variety, architectural detail (no flat blank surfaces), windows with vertical major axis and set-backs into the wall, use of naturally variegated construction materials (if it must be concrete, use bold textures). The locations were not specified, but presumably this relates to the town centre.
- Another respondent stated that they wished to particularly support paragraphs 6.3.2. & 6.3.3. regarding the avoidance of blank building frontages and development being sympathetic to the character of the local area.
- The need to reassess the town centre, Basing View and Chineham in light of the impact of Covid-19, particularly in relation to changing working and retail trends.

- 1 respondent emphasis Whitchurch town centre and surrounding streets, and associated with this adherence to the Whitchurch Design Statement/Neighbourhood Plan.
- Reference was made to the need for increased green space provision, however, this question was more focused on geographical areas.
- The importance of making efficient use of land was raised by Bell Cornwell on behalf of Basron Developments.
- 1 respondent said we should stop focusing on the town centre (as that is 'private enterprise') and instead focus on neighbourhood centres.
- 1 respondent stated that this would best be achieved via neighbourhood plans.
- Another respondent stressed the importance of increased provision for nature and access for people to the natural environment among and within all developments, including higher density developments in the town centre e.g. provision for tree planting, green roofs and walls, balconies for residents' own planting space.
- East Woodhay PC stressed the need for specific design policies for rural areas, as the design issues for such locations are very different to urban areas.
- Similarly, Sherfield on Loddon PC stressed the importance of rural development being sympathetic to the character of the local area.
- HCC Property Services stated that County Council (as landowner) would support specific design priorities for strategic sites that are of a sufficiently large scale to incorporate concept masterplans plans with distinct character areas. Nevertheless, the County Council would advise caution in this approach and recommend that any specific design priorities avoid duplicating existing national design guidance or existing policies or regulations such as conservation areas.

**Question 6g: Do you agree that the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) should be included as a policy requirement in the Local Plan Update? If not, why is this?**

- Of those who commented on this issue, the vast majority agreed that it should be included in the LPU (45 responses). This list includes Taylor Wimpey, Savills on behalf of SMV, HCC and Sovereign and Bramley, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council, Overton PC, SOLVE. Only 3 respondents explicitly disagreed with its inclusion. However, a number of housebuilders questioned the appropriateness, suitability and justification pertaining to the adoption of the NDSS.
- Cllr Cubitt very strongly supported the introduction of space standards, though did express a preference for the Parker Morris standard. Basingstoke Transition Network also favoured the use of Parker Morris Standards (though updated).

- Cllrs Andrew McCormick and Diane Taylor also supported the adoption of the NDSS.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) did not support the adoption of the NDSS. They stated that the PPG says that in order for NDSS to be adopted there needs to be evidence and justification in terms of the need for the standards (evidenced by the size and type of dwellings being built in the area), and that there would be no adverse viability implications or impact in terms of affordability.
- The HBF stressed that the council would need appropriate evidence in order to be able to adopt the NDSS and that if they were adopted then some flexibility should be incorporated.
- West Berks DC agreed that it should be adopted, but only as a minimum.
- Chineham PC stated that the council need something like the Parker Morris housing space standards of the 1960's and the later English Partnership standards of 2008 to apply to all new housing, public and private.
- Pamber Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Pamber PC suggested that the NDSS should be seen as a minimum, and that the council should be looking for a 10% improvement on those standards.
- Sherfield Park PC also thought that the NDSS should be a minimum standard.
- Taylor Wimpey are supportive of the use of NDSS and can commit to delivering homes that are compliant with or exceed the standards, depending on the house types used.
- East Woodhay PC stressed that this needs to be coupled with measures to ensure that house size to plot ratios do not become overly cramped.
- Persimmon Homes supported the adoption of the NDSS.
- Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes, Vistry Group and M&M stated that the NDSS should not be adopted by the council. They stated that such an approach would be inflexible, could inflate the price of properties (making them unaffordable), increase build costs and may not be suitable for every house design.
- Tetlow King on behalf of the Aster Group stated that the NDSS can only be adopted if this can be suitably justified. Furthermore, they stated that they are concerned that implementing NDSS across all residential development has the potential to result in fewer affordable homes being delivered as optional technical standards have implications for build costs and sales values, with implications in turn for development viability. There are other practical issues surrounding NDSS such as that many eligible households in Basingstoke and Deane may not desire, or require housing that meets the NDSS, as it may result in higher rental and heating costs. Overall, they state that there are occasions where it is neither practical nor necessary to achieve the standards.
- HCC Property Services stated that noting the recent covid-19 pandemic and the potential long-term demand for more flexible forms of accommodation e.g. facilitating working from home, Hampshire County Council in its capacity as landowner supports the policy intentions to use the NDSS provided the need for the standards can be justified with evidence that takes the impacts of affordability and viability into consideration.

- Upton Grey PC and another respondent stated that the NDSS should not be adopted, as it could lead to over-scaled houses, which would be detrimental to the character of the area.
- However, Savills on behalf of SMV did state that they consider that it should be recognised that there may be instances where the standards would not be appropriate/achievable.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of Mactaggart and Mickel also stated that flexibility was needed and that the NDSS may increase costs and hence prices, and can be overly prescriptive.
- Philips Planning on behalf of Cooper Estates supported the adoption of the NDSS, but did question the need for doing so, especially as they consider that it's already a material consideration.
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates while having no objection to the NDSS, stated that the council will need to be mindful of the impact upon providing units which are affordable for people to get on the property ladder.
- 1 respondent stated that the NDSS should not be adopted as it will lead to out of scale buildings in conservation areas and villages.

**Question 6h: Do you have any views on the size of new homes which have been built in the borough in order to inform the evidence base relating to this issue?**

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that housebuilders require flexibility to respond to demand and need. As such policy should remain flexible and allow the Local Planning Authority to apply their professional judgement on a case-by-case basis, in discussion with promoters.
- It was requested that all developments in the last 5 years are assessed in order to ascertain whether they accord with the NDSS.
- 1 respondent stated that housing density on recent developments is too high with too little car parking provision.
- Turley on behalf of Bargate Homes state that all Bargate Homes that have been constructed at Seven Acres meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.
- Bramley PC highlighted certain office conversions which have taken place on the basis of the PD rights.
- One response stated that the size of houses previously developed should not be the determining factor in terms of whether the NDSS can be adopted.

**Question 6i: Are there any other options that should also be considered, for example other homes standards such as a Home Quality Mark?**

- HCC recommended that BDBC consider other standards which are important for specialised development, for instance Housing for an Aging Population (HAPPI) standards of extra care housing.

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that any standards or sector-led assessment schemes will need to be understood in the context of emerging Government proposals such as the Future Homes Standard, net zero carbon in-use and net zero carbon statutory targets. A clear and coherent policy framework is required to make explicit what the requirements are and what is guidance.
- The HBF stated that new homes built by the industry already have very high satisfaction levels.
- East Woodhay PC stressed the need to ensure that the quality of new housing is as high as legally possible.
- Chineham PC stressed the importance of improving building standards, as they feel that the legislative requirements for the quality of the final product is currently well below those expected in other industries.
- Overton PC considered that a quality requirement of some kind should be included.
- Turley on behalf of Bargate Homes have stated that they would resist the imposition of homes standards through the Local Plan. They state that such an approach would go against the efforts of governments to consolidate such requirements via the Optional Technical Standards. They go on to state that such standards would increase the costs of development, and that any such requirement would need to be evidence based.
- Turley on behalf of Bargate Homes state that the Home Quality Mark (HQM) is not well understood by the industry or customer and advise against its use.
- Taylor Wimpey considered that utilising the HQM within the LPU would not be appropriate and would not be consistent with national level policy.
- Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes and M & M stated that whilst these developers agree that a high-quality build is important, the HQM should not be a mandatory requirement, as different housebuilders or developers may have a different measure to demonstrate their development is high quality.
- Boyer on behalf of Vistry Group states that no additional quality standards should be introduced, and to do so would be contrary to the government's approach to this issue.
- West Berks DC stated that it is necessary to pick one and say that others are acceptable provided they meet the standards of the one you choose.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC stated that such standards would only be beneficial if their imposition could be effectively implemented.
- It was suggested that developers should be required to commission an independent assessment of the quality of each new building.
- Lifetime homes was suggested as an option.
- 14 respondents agreed that the HQM should be utilised. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC.
- Cllr Diane Taylor stated that all new homes should be, as far as is reasonably possible, made accessible to wheelchair users.
- Hampshire County Council (as landowner) would strongly encourage the LPA to respond to the emerging National Design Code standards and White Paper

in order to be consistent with national policy (sound). In particular, the County Council in its capacity as landowner considers that walking distances to and from a range of amenities and open spaces should be achieved to create healthy and safe communities, such as in the case of Manydown.

- Bramely PC expressed concern that build quality standards are not adhered to, and that they need to be enforced and regulated with more rigour.
- One response stated that the Framework does not advocate use of any home standards, such as Home Quality Mark, however prospective applicants should not be discouraged from seeking their schemes to meet higher levels of standards, where this is deliverable and viable.
- The importance of durability and adaptability, and accommodating 'life cycle needs' was stressed in one response.

**Question 6j: Is there any more that the Local Plan Update could do to support the creation of safe and healthy communities?**

- Cllr Cubitt emphasised the importance of protecting community and sporting facilities. In particular she stressed the importance of playing fields, swimming pools and the ice rink. She suggested that an outside Lido would be very desirable. She also stressed the importance of protecting the leisure centre.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick recommended the utilisation of more outdoor exercise provision, especially outdoor gyms and play areas, covering all our housing estates in Basingstoke.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) emphasised the importance of active travel (walking and cycling) and accessibility to facilities, services and jobs.
- Natural England recommend the LPU sets out policy that links public health and wellbeing to the natural environment, and seeks to enhance green infrastructure and ecological connectivity across the town that is managed for people and nature.
- Sport England recommended that the LPU be informed by national guidance recently published, Active Design, which intends to inform the urban design of places, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and active open spaces to promote sport and active lifestyles.
- Furthermore, Sport England considers that the LPU should contain policies that address the key findings/issues of the Playing Pitch Strategy and any indoor sport facility strategy to ensure that the right sport facilities are protected, the existing provision is enhanced and the right new facilities are provided in the right location. This would ensure that the Local Plan would be informed by a robust evidence base and strategy therefore being sound in planning for sport and recreation facilities. Any emerging policies and supporting text should refer back to the strategic documentation so the links between the supporting strategies and Local Plan are clear.
- Hampshire Highways stated that the implementation of the walking and cycling measures outlined in the LCWIP will help to achieve the ambition of

healthy and inclusive communities as this will help re-prioritise the dominance of the car for short journeys.

- West Berkshire DC recommended that consideration be given to the need for the submission of a Health Impact Statement for each planning application.
- Hart DC made reference to the Healthy Life Toolkit and the NHS Healthy New Town approaches as possible options.
- Bramley PC stressed the need to ensure that communal facilities are well maintained, do not contain or generate "dark corners" and are funded to ensure the required level of maintenance.
- Kingsclere PC emphasised the impact of traffic on health, particularly in rural communities, and owing to the increase in larger vehicles such as HGVs.
- East Woodhay PC were concerned about the deliverability of such aspirations.
- Chineham PC stressed the importance of schools, village halls, community centres, medical practices and E-charging points.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC stressed the importance of the provision of public transport in rural areas, and the provision of foot and cycle paths, along with access to community facilities and services. They also stated that it is important to avoid coalescence in order to ensure that communities retain their individual character.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC stressed the importance of improving safety standards for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Overton PC recommended that all open spaces and sports facilities should be registered and included on the list of Assets with Community Value. They also suggested that open spaces should be easily accessible to all whilst protecting the wildlife of the area. In addition, they recommended that areas should be designed so they are safe to use and easy to police.
- Thakeham Homes stated that they are of the view that the council should be taking into account the Healthy New Towns principles.
- Thakeham Homes also stated that the council could engage with the Plunkett Foundation, which supports rural communities across the UK to tackle the issues they face through community business, in order to fully understand the issues faced by rural communities so that these can be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review.
- Bell Cornwell on behalf of Mactaggart and Mickel stated that the LPU should include allocations that have the capacity to provide sufficient recreational facilities, open space and green infrastructure linkages to meet the needs of existing and new residents.
- Another respondent stated that the council needed to look at the provision of community, sport and leisure facilities across the whole borough.
- Furthermore, it was considered that the approach needed to be informed by new ways of working in response to the impact of Covid-19 on the economy being informed by the importance of tackling loneliness and obesity.
- The importance of providing facilities for childcare and children's entertainment was also emphasised.

- It was also stated that there should be more rather than less library provision, because libraries can be used as a great source of continuing learning, e.g. IT skills, support in building CVs.
- The need to protect public open spaces was emphasised, in particular certain sites in Whitchurch (cricket ground and Parsonage Meadow).
- Similarly, the importance of providing sufficient play space was also emphasised.
- Ensuring the safety and usability of public open space was highlighted.
- 1 respondent emphasised the importance of providing sufficient private outdoor amenity space, especially as this also provides an opportunity to support wildlife, and in turn help support mental health. Providing space of local food production was also encouraged.
- Another respondent stressed the importance of the countryside in order to help improve mental health. They also stressed the importance of protection from flooding and also providing suitable waste facilities in order to protect from disease.
- It was stated that the LPU should provide more definition of what this greater role for the community should be.
- It was suggested that the LPU should provide more support for the creation of new large forests and other habitats.
- The importance of improved education regarding the natural environment was stressed.
- In relation to Tadley, the Town Council allude to a need for more sports facilities.
- The role of the ice rink in helping to support the local community was emphasised in one representation.
- The importance of community social infrastructure was raised, along with the need for the design of new development to support healthy communities.
- Using BREEAM standards was suggested.
- More recognition of the value of nature and the inclusion of nature corridors.
- The importance of well-connected green spaces, private gardens, and the provision of balconies was emphasised. The importance of gardens for biodiversity was also highlighted. Similarly, providing space for local food production was also raised.

## **Section 7 – Developing a Spatial Strategy**

### **Question 7a: Do you agree with the key elements of the spatial strategy listed in paragraph 7.2.1?**

- 205 respondents supported the spatial strategy set out in paragraph 7.2.1, including Sherfield Park PC, Kingsclere PC, Newnham PC, Tadley TC, East Woodhay PC, Cliddesden PC, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Pamber PC and NP Group, Bramley PC, Overton PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Upton Grey PC, BDBC/HCC, Old Basing PC, Persimmon Homes, Sovereign Housing, WBC,

Catesby, Sports England, Highclere Estate, HCC HA, National Trust, Bewley Homes, Gladman Homes, Highclere NP Group, Taylor Wimpey and Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates.

They make the following more detailed comments on each of the key aspects set out in paragraph 7.2.1:

Optimising development on brownfield/urban sites:

- 4 respondents supported brownfield regeneration opportunities over greenfield development to protect and enhance the green network and AONB including Old Basing PC, Chineham PC
- Gladman Homes stated that an approach favouring brownfield land is not a solution alone and the spatial and growth strategy should therefore be supported by suitable greenfield allocations to deliver growth and ensure settlement sustainability.
- Bewley Homes stated that if previously developed land (“PDL”) is to be considered in this way, there should be an appreciation of where known PDL sites are, and how this information relates to the sustainability of growth locations set out in the September 2020 Settlement Study Part 1. It is considered that this element is better relocated to the ‘Key Issues’ section, rather than informing the spatial strategy.
- Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates suggested that Covid has proven that high density urban living is not compatible with societal needs for personal space and green environment, therefore densities are likely to decrease, as with demand for brownfield sites.
- Basron Developments who are promoting the Camrose Stadium stated it should be allocated through the local plan process as soon as possible to boost housing delivery.
- Remains largely silent on addressing various housing tenures which need to be strongly evidenced

Allocating a mix of suitable and deliverable new housing sites in sustainable locations, which respect the pattern of settlements across the borough whilst meeting local needs:

- Vivid housing supported the allocation of brownfield land where this allows for redevelopment of existing land currently in other uses.
- Bramley Parish Council believed that this approach is of particular importance to protect the villages surrounding Basingstoke which should not just be a dormitory for Basingstoke, Reading, London and Slough.
- A number of respondents made the argument that whilst strategy should be supported by a hierarchy, it needs to do more to support rural villages (NPPF para 78) and be more explicit in ensuring that all areas are satisfactorily planned to meet local housing need. Policy SS6 is ambiguous and should be reconsidered, with greater thought given to rural communities to ensure vitality and life is achieved within these settlement areas.

- Fowler Architecture suggested new development should not be limited by reference to current or reinforcing current, patterns of accessibility to public transport or local facilities and services. Instead, the spatial strategy must offer greater flexibility to be responsive as a starting principle because there may be clear and sound planning reasons why a greater level of growth is needed for villages so that they can grow and thrive.
- SN Developments expanded on this point suggesting that taking this approach potentially excludes the opportunity for existing settlements to appropriately and sustainably expand and move-up the settlement hierarchy where development opportunities can support such a change. Ashford Hill is given as an example, as it is constraint by the characteristics of Category 5 due to population alone.
- SMV considered that the issues the current plan seek to address remain largely similar to those outlined now and that it is logical for current spatial strategy to carry this forward into the new LPU.
- With regards to site promotions Catesby particularly welcomed the second bullet point and consider the site promotion to the east of Ecchinswell Road will support the LPU vision.
- Another respondent referred to increasing the proportion of future development in cat 2 and 3 settlements with particular regard to sustainable sites adjoining SPBs.
- BDBC/HCC requested explain what 'sustainable locations' means in second bullet point – if it relates to sustainable transport reference could be made to public transport corridors and high-quality walking and cycling routes.
- Thakeham Homes requested clarification on how the council intend to balance protecting the setting of the towns and villages against meeting their housing requirement.
- A number of respondents referred to housing mix including Thakeham Homes who stressed importance of the council allocating a mix of suitable and deliverable new housing sites in suitable locations across the borough, including a range of site sizes to meet NPPF para 67 through appropriately scaled/proportionate extensions to existing villages in line with NPPF para 74 and 78
- JPP Land expected more emphasis on delivering sufficient homes to meet ongoing deficit and the affordable crisis not given sufficient weight.

Protecting and regenerating the borough's key economic assets, including the borough's most important employment areas. In Basingstoke Town this includes the continued regeneration of Basing View and the leisure park;

- Cllr McCormick commented that strategy doesn't protect the top of town retail provision which should take priority over New River Retail proposals for West Ham Leisure Park.

Ensuring an attractive and viable town centre in Basingstoke which is accessible and fit for purpose as the role of town centres continues to change, whilst preserving and enhancing its distinct character and individual heritage assets being environmentally responsible by developing a spatial strategy which protects and enhances the

borough's environmental and heritage assets, including its green infrastructure network, landscape character, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and conservation areas. The setting of the borough's towns and villages should be protected:

- Bargate Homes suggested this issue appears to include two separate elements of the spatial strategy and should be split.
- Historic England have provided detailed advice on how the LPU should be positively prepared with historic environment in mind in accordance with para 20 NPPF
- 1 respondent strongly agreed with protecting borough's environmental and heritage assets - they are what makes a place special and distinct.
- But concerns raised that the town centre may only be viable by a narrow metric and the centre is not 'attractive' and that the key elements don't go far enough
- Vivid Housing provided support for brownfield allocations which allow for redevelopment of existing land currently in other uses.

Avoiding impacts upon important biodiversity features and designated sites such as the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, and ensuring there will be no adverse impact on nature conservation interests in the borough including priority habitats and ancient trees:

- Hart District Council stated it must not be assumed that new developments within the SPA can gain access to Hart District Council-controlled SANG mitigation, although private SANG provision within Hart may also provide a solution. When considering potential development sites in BDBC within the 5km and potentially the 7km zone, the SPA and SANG issue will need to be recognised as a constraint.
- Upton Grey PC and 2 other respondents believed that SPA SANG requirement a barrier to development that should be removed.
- Need explicit reference to ancient woodland (most previous and irreplaceable habitat with unique value for biodiversity and as a carbon sink) as well as ancient and veteran trees

Protecting the borough's water environment including water sources and the water quality of the borough's rivers and waterways, and protecting internationally protected sites such as the Solent by ensuring nutrient neutrality in any development falling within the River Test and Itchen catchment:

- Cllr Cubitt suggested action not words required regarding meeting legal requirement to improve the quality of the River Loddon.

Enhancing infrastructure provision, including transport and green infrastructure, to support sustainable development and the creation of new communities whilst minimising impact on existing residents:

- Cllr Cubitt and Wates supported this issue in terms of the timely delivery of the Western Link Road for the future wellbeing of the Town and the success of new developments in south west. Wates argue this should be safeguarded in policy to help Hounsome Fields, Manydown and Basingstoke Golf course,

enhancing the strategic road network for sites to the south west and minimise the impact of the developments on existing residents and direct connections to strategic road network and M3 motorway.

- Highclere NP Group argued it is important that infrastructure is developed alongside, rather than after development.

Having due regard to constraints associated with the Atomic Weapons Establishments at Aldermaston and Burghfield which will impact upon development at Tadley.

- Constraints around AWE are unjustified
- Overton PC agreed with the point regarding AWE – this area should be reviewed to see if there are any opportunities subject to guidelines.

Other general comments:

- Sport England suggested inclusion of ‘protection of existing sports and recreation sites’ within elements of strategy
- Chineham PC suggested enforcing developers to actually build on sites that already have planning permission.
- Respondents referred to a number of the sites promoted for development including ‘Upper Swallick’ and land between Newnham and Old Basing stating that they will not uphold the key aims, particularly those relating to local character, heritage and landscape, biodiversity, infrastructure provision.
- Bewley Homes suggested council should remain alive to the changing nature of national planning system and elements introduced through the recent consultation of the Housing White Paper
- East Woodhay PC stated that key aspects of spatial strategy need to be followed by all council departments.
- BDBC/HCC suggested should also recognise opportunities for environmental net gains alongside potential to provide social infrastructure and economic growth.

**Question 7b: Are there other considerations that need to be taken into account in developing the spatial strategy?**

166 respondents said there are additional considerations which need to be taken into account. Their detailed comments are as follows:

Identifying the housing need and plan period:

- The Woodland Trust and Bewley Homes suggested that the LPU housing requirement should be reduced to the level calculated by the government algorithm/standard method whilst remaining flexible to change, should this figure change in the future.
- JPP Land suggested the plan period should be extended to 2040 as required by paragraph 22 NPPF.

Comments relating to the use of brownfield land, regeneration opportunities and urban areas are as follows:

- 8 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, and Newnham PC argued that developing greenfield sites should be a last resort.
- Bramley PC suggested residential development on redundant brownfield sites should be 'maximised' rather than 'optimised'.
- Regeneration of Strategic Employment Areas including Daneshill
- Focus new growth on brownfield sites, including north east of Basingstoke (Chineham) where sites are available, this helps to preserve the countryside and AONB
- 131 respondents including Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC and Vistry referred to the implications of COVID relating to use of commercial offices, retail sites both in and outside towns for use for regeneration and brownfield reuse sites or for reallocation to other uses due to market and behaviour changes, need for functional working from home spaces and changes with online shopping.
- National Trust also referred to Covid, including the impact on patterns of living and working and the varied recreational activities they rely on for support
- Increasing number of people working from home and online shopping is resulting in town centres changing rapidly.
- Change of use from office to residential in town centre could provide homes without need for substantial use of greenfield sites.
- Cllr McCormick highlights the importance of promoting retail and office employment in the town centre.
- Use the redevelopment of the Leisure park, Basing View and Top of the Town to increase density and evening/night time vitality of these districts.
- All new commercial, leisure and retail development should be mixed use with residential to stop creating ghost centres, and stop urban sprawl.
- All possible routes for extending the Basingstoke Canal should be safeguarded given the health and commercial benefits of such a project

Several respondents commented on the settlement hierarchy and development in villages:

- JPP Land stated the starting point for the strategy to be which sites are included in commitments – such as those in NPs or with planning permission. These should form a baseline to then consider additional growth.
- Old Basing PC promoted organic growth in hamlets and villages, Upton Grey PC who suggested priority must be given to focusing major development in regeneration zones in Basingstoke and the borough's larger settlements and Highclere NP group supported an approach to concentrating development according to the sustainable location hierarchy to limit the impact on conservation areas of historic villages and protects the landscape.
- Several respondents including Wades Estate, Highclere Estate, Catesby and Bargate Homes stated that the proposed strategy is heavily based on Basingstoke and does not adequately consider role and future of other settlements. Important that the LPU makes appropriate provision for housing on smaller and more rural sites, through flexible policies, in order to support the needs of the borough and local communities and maintain the vitality of rural

settlements in line with NPPF para 178. Focussing development on Basingstoke may make it more difficult to bring forward sites which are suitable and would contribute to the sustainability of villages with fewer facilities. Locations such as Highclere and Bishops Green are cited as examples.

- BDBC/HCC suggested reflecting current LP strategy is contrary to para 122 of the NPPF as it will prejudice new, largely self-contained settlements where it does not fit within the hierarchy but can deliver its own social infrastructure and employment land. SA and Site Assessment currently doesn't consider the potential of large-scale new settlements and omits reference to Manydown's designation as a 'Garden Town'
- Bewley Homes suggested Plan needs to remain flexible to change and address Duty to Cooperate matters. Need to expand the spatial strategy to include consideration of locations which could assist in meeting the needs of neighbouring authorities, including West Berkshire and Winchester, if land availability is an issue.
- The LPU should clearly define levels of growth appropriate in the rural communities.
- Bargate Homes asked how facilities which are online or over the phone are being translated – these communities have access to online GPs and shops since Covid.
- Integrated settlements
- Sovereign Housing suggested should also include delivering new homes to address localised housing and affordable need within strategy.
- Sustainable option is to develop on land where the financial gain from new development is directly under the control of both the Borough and County Councils so that it can be opportunely invested in public infrastructure and services to the benefit of all residents of the area.
- It should be possible for the rural to provide solutions for the urban, because of its space e.g. it can grow trees.

Infrastructure was also mentioned by a number of respondents:

- Cooper Estates Strategic Land referred to planning comprehensively, by bringing landowners together and ensure connectivity between and through new places and spaces.
- Highways England set out strong support for sustainable measures such as improved public transport to support alternatives to the car. Improving public transport has the potential to minimise any adverse impact from proposed growth on the SRN.
- They go on to explain that as the Local Plan is developed it is important that any essential infrastructure required to deliver proposed allocations within the plan is identified. It would need to be demonstrated that there was a reasonable prospect of delivery of the infrastructure that is relied upon, otherwise there is a risk the Local Plan would not be sound. When identifying the preferred strategy for the spatial options, consideration will need to be given to assessing the cumulative impact of new sites that might be taken forward together with already planned growth in Basingstoke on the SRN.

- Sherfield Park PC suggested ensuring Basingstoke suburbs and Tadley have excellent public transport to employment. There is a high dependence on AWE and we should ensure a good spread of employment opportunities for all sections of the community.
- HCC stated it is important to consider the school place planning impact from new housing allocations. If possible, developments should be encouraged which allow new schools to be built of at least 2 forms of entry (420 places) which equates to 1,400/1,500 dwellings. The availability of local school places could be an issue if smaller housing numbers are considered which are not of sufficient size to warrant a new school or sustainable expansion of existing schools.

With regards to constraints the following were noted:

- Sherfield on Loddon PC and Bramley PC referred to need to retain and enhance Strategic Gaps to prevent coalescence of communities and maintain the identity of rural communities.
- Wokingham BC suggested need to avoid functional flood zones 3a and 3b needs to be clearly stated. Whilst the National Trust refer to the impacts of climate change and its impact on the location of development within the spatial strategy.
- This is echoed by East Woodhay PC who referred to avoiding increased risk of flooding when building and the highest protection should be given to conservation areas and AONB.
- The North Hampshire Downs commented that valued landscapes need to be protected and refers specifically to Cliddesden.

Other considerations identified:

- Overton PC suggested design needs to be reviewed – such as larger front gardens for parking and electrical vehicles, safe walking environments, cycle routes and enhanced biodiversity such as tree lined streets, wild areas and formal play areas within all developments.
- North Wessex Downs AONB commented the landscape policy needs to highlight the potential impact of development on dark skies.
- Sport England encouraged inclusion of ‘improving/maintaining health and wellbeing’ within the spatial strategy or linking elements that are listed in paragraph to 7.2.1 to improving/maintaining health and wellbeing.
- The Woodland Trust suggested that biodiversity considerations need to include Aichi Standards and recommended wording for the protection of ancient woodland. Furthermore, they urge the strategy to go further and propose a positive approach to seeking biodiversity net gain through Nature Recovery Networks and green arteries as a key goal of the spatial strategy, rather than a side effect of development.
- This point is echoed by other respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, and Newnham PC who referred to recognition for large scale natural green infrastructure like forests and other habitats along with the approach to ‘enhancing’ showing no ability or future plan to obtain

green infrastructure effectively. They suggest adding a key element to 'proactively create, integrate, enhance and protect wildlife habitat and corridors to support rewilding'.

- The National Trust referred to ecology and irreplaceable habitats which should be added to the nature conservation interests on which there should be no adverse impact and the strategy should look to see where greatest ecological benefit could be gained
- No commitments to restoring priority habitat or species.
- Chineham PC stated para 7.2.1 mentions AONB but not SSSI or SINCs which should also be listed here.
- Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC referred to the importance of redevelopment of areas for people and wildlife.
- 11 respondents including Old Basing PC recognised the importance of and need to protect the Loddon and Lyde Chalk Streams and river valleys.

**Question 7c: Should land in employment and retail use be considered for new homes where it is vacant or underused? If yes, which locations should be considered?**

- Over 130 respondents concerned about Upper Swallick, Wield PC, Upton Grey PC, Cliddesden PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC supported this approach. Areas specifically suggested included town centre, Chineham Business Park, Brighton Hill Retail Park, Basing View, Viabes, parts of Houndsmill and South Ham
- Fowler Architecture, Persimmon Homes and 5 other respondents referred to NPPF para 120 which supports the redevelopment of vacant and underused buildings in employment or retail as part of an overall approach to the identification of sites for housing.
- Sovereign Housing suggested where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan, they should look to reallocate the land as part of plan reviews, and in the interim support applications for alternative uses.
- Site promoters referred specifically to promoted sites BAS050, BAS051, HI006 and HI007.
- Chineham PC, Overton PC, Baughurst PC, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Bramley PC and Newnham PC supported reuse of land in Basingstoke particularly the aging industrial/retail parks in and around Basingstoke.
- East Woodhay PC commented that the definition of 'land in employment' is important and unclear if this includes rural land – barns used for conversion is acceptable but not demolition and rebuild.
- Working from home will be a legacy of the pandemic therefore the council should be considering revitalising empty or redundant sites in the industrial estates prior to consideration of countryside sites.
- Densities need informed discussion as high densities have proved very testing during Covid, mixed use most appropriate.

- Should be considered before all greenfield sites
- A number of respondents including Cllr McCormick commented on loss of employment only as a last resort. Vivid Housing suggested land in employment only where it is vacant and underused.
- Wokingham Borough Council cautioned, only if it does not impact on employment need.
- Cllr McCormick commented that retail uses should be converted to community uses where underused or vacant.
- Cllr Cubitt referred to the need to help protect Festival Place and to be innovative with regards to the town centre with mixed residential at top of the town, sheltered housing for elderly and reconfiguration and redesign of the link between Top of Town and St Michael's and the Great Wall of Basingstoke. No more high rise flats, keep at 4 storeys with more trees planted. Must ensure water resources can support development.
- Cooper Estates Strategic Land and Bewley Homes commented should approach the aim with caution and following a comprehensive review of employment land requirements, being mindful this can fluctuate and the loss could result in sites in less sustainable locations having to be sought in the future. Chineham PC, Sherfield Park PC and Old Basing PC and a number of other respondents also advised caution.
- Still remains a requirement to identify land for economic and employment generating development Local Plan should recognise areas for growth outside of existing employment areas which has the potential to support and encourage new investment in sustainable locations (M3 corridor) as per aspirations of Enterprise 3 LEP.
- Basingstoke Transition Network opposed to conversion of existing commercial buildings to residential since they are substandard, and as the town grows the commercial space will be required and should not be squeezed out; otherwise we finish up with long-distance travel to work.

**Question 7d: Should more new homes be delivered in Basingstoke town centre? If yes, via what sort of developments (e.g. new blocks of flats, adding additional storeys to existing buildings) and in what locations?**

- 31 respondents supported the delivery of new homes in Basingstoke Town Centre provided the approach is carefully considered and applied with caution including Sherfield on Loddon PC, Sovereign Housing, Cllr Cubitt, Chineham PC, Old Basing PC, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC.
- Cooper Estates Strategic Land suggested demand for this type of housing (flats with commercial at ground floor) would need to be carefully assessed
- Fowler Architecture commented that town centres have not historically contributed a significant source of housing supply and that this will need to be via flatted development and therefore flatted development outside of town centres should be limited.

- Persimmon Homes supported use of vacant and underused buildings in employment or retail as do JPP Land who referred to promoted sites BAS050 and BAS051
- Overton PC suggested mixed development on old industrial estates and unused leisure parks.
- Respondents suggested town centre and Basing View as options including Bramley PC who suggested empty offices in Basing View could be converted into flats.
- Vivid Housing supported this objective provided suitable locations such as within and adjacent to Basingstoke Town, including addition of storeys to existing development and new blocks of flats.
- BDBC/HCC referred to new District/Local centres and transport hubs, such as at Southern Manydown.
- BDBC/HCC also suggested some degree of flexibility required depending on availability of sites through SHELAA.
- Respondents suggest new developments must be
  - Sympathetic and aesthetically pleasing designs,
  - Use of carbon friendly material
  - Courtyards for flats with seating areas,
  - Trees and green infrastructure including green roofs and winter gardens
  - Planting and play areas for community space and natural surveillance
  - Meet minimum space standards and high quality – avoid developments like Wella House or just extra storeys.
  - Where it can be done to Passivhaus standards and there is no adverse impact to the site.
  - Have good public spaces
  - Heights of 10 storey could be accommodated without long distance impacts on AONB.
- Five respondents were opposed to this approach including Chineham PC and Basingstoke transition Network. Whilst Sherfield Park PC would only support if vacant or underused.
- Thakeham Homes wondered whether this would serve to provide the type of housing people want post Covid – access to a garden and countryside. This would be better placed via allocations in smaller towns and villages.

**Question 7e: Would you support the principle of high-density development in suitable locations in the borough? If yes, in what locations?**

- 27 respondents including CPRE and SMV supported the principle of high-density development in suitable locations (where it responds positively to the site context, related environmental constraints and aligns with community, retail and public transport provisions) to provide a variety of accommodation to deliver healthy mixed sustainable communities but only if substantial evidence of requirement or need.

- BDBC/HCC, Bramley PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC, Upton Grey PC, Vivid, Bewley Homes and others suggested this should be applied on a site by site context and only in the most accessible locations such as Basingstoke town centre, district and local centres with public transport – such an approach could be applied on a ‘sliding scale’ in line with retail hierarchy and along high frequency public transport corridors. SHELAA provides bottom up evidence. Villages should be specifically excluded.
- HCC Highway Authority commented that higher density development would be supported in areas that are served by more frequent and higher quality public transport, such as the emerging MRT network. Approximately 4000 homes usually supports a 10 minute bus service, and so the higher the density the greater need for higher quality infrastructure to achieve a modal shift from private car trips. The A30 and town centre are key location where this could be applied.
- Persimmon Homes suggested could be on vacant and underused buildings in employment or retail and Sherfield on Loddon PC suggest brownfield sites only
- Gladman Homes commented that should not apply a ‘one size fits all’ approach to developments as this does not allow for site specific circumstances including the local character of sites. Consider a range for minimum density.
- Sovereign commented that the approach should be balanced with seeking to deliver the homes people need in the right places. For instances there may be opportunities to increase density around existing stock to provide additional smaller units. Consider other factors (122 of the NPPF), such as housing need, local market conditions and character, when considering where higher density development might be appropriate.
- 8 respondents including Overton PC, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Old Basing PC suggested particular areas such as Basingstoke town including South Ham, Popley or Buckskin. Particular sites mentioned include Camrose Stadium and HI006 and HI007 (but only medium-high).
- Where it can be done to Passivhaus standards and there is no adverse impact to the site.
- Overton PC commented must consider space standards
- Clarity is needed on what council defines as ‘high density’.
- 5 respondents objected to principle of high density development including Sherfield Park PC.
- Cllr Cubbit was of the view that there should be no more high-rise flats, keep at 4 storeys with more trees planted. Must ensure water resources can support development.

**Question 7f: Would you support the inclusion of additional tall buildings (over six storeys) in Basingstoke? If yes, what locations would be most suitable?**

- 5 respondents supported inclusion of additional tall buildings over 6 storeys in Basingstoke.

- Sherfield on Loddon PC referred to brownfield sites and Chineham PC and Cllr McCormick commented only in the town centre. Upton Grey PC suggested between 6-10 storeys but design needs to be high quality.
- BDBC/HCC agreed if in town centre and district centres (including urban extensions and new settlements). The LPU may wish to consider impacts of permitted development rights on newly created settlements that are planned for higher densities
- Other respondents suggested immediate area around shopping centre and station in a radius of circa ½ mile
- Subject to Grenfell outcomes and need
- Only adjacent to existing high rise
- SMV and Sovereign Housing suggested should be informed by appropriate site specific circumstances however brownfield sites in town centre locations can often be optimised in terms of density.
- Site promoters referred specifically to HI006, HI007, BAS050 and BAS051 as appropriate locations for higher density development.
- 8 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC referred to importance of good quality design and superior materials and possibility of higher densities at Basing View or the leisure park.
- Only if can be done to Passivhaus standards
- Cllr Cubbit commented - no more high rise flats, keep at 4 storeys with more trees planted. Must ensure water resources can support development.
- 9 respondents objected to high density development of over 6 stories in Basingstoke including Sherfield Park PC and Old Basing PC.
- Overton PC commented that over 6 storey people need gardens and outside space.

**Question 7g: Would you support the introduction of minimum density standards to uplift the density of residential developments? Please explain your answer.**

- 15 respondents supported the introduction of minimum density standards.
- Cllr McCormick suggested higher density should be concentrated nearer retail centres. However, nearly all district centres are not suited for this.
- Persimmon Homes suggested caution should be applied and property market research undertaken to understand housing needs and whether dense blocks of flats are required. Then once this is determined, policies could be prescribed to meet this and be led by this information.
- Where appropriate to do so, having regard to character and only in sustainable locations (para 122-123 NPPF). Vistry, Sovereign Housing and others supported in principle but there needs to be flexibility for site specific circumstances.
- Only on a zoning basis e.g. Town centre High, suburbs Medium, Villages and Conservation area low, Other case by case.

- Gladman Homes commented should consider a range for minimum density but blanket approach is unlikely to be appropriate and densification should be considered as part of a hybrid strategy.
- Promoted sites BAS050 and 051 and HI006 and 007 are considered to have potential for higher density development than the current existing buildings provide.
- Bramley PC commented there should also be maximum density standards. The chosen figures should be relevant to the community.
- Upton Grey PC agreed this is important to ensure vitality and regeneration of major urban areas and to ensure housing is delivered.
- Only if green spaces and sympathetic materials.
- 26 respondents including Sherfield Park PC and Old Basing objected to introduction of minimum density standard.
- Cllr Cubbit commented - no more high-rise flats, keep at 4 storeys with more trees planted. Must ensure water resources can support development.
- Bewley Homes, Fowler Architecture, SMV, Catesby, SN Development commented not appropriate as Government have moved away from national density standards and will fail to capture the nuances of developing sites appropriate to their setting and context in line with NPPF para 126. Density should be developer led on site by site basis.
- Overton PC, Chineham PC and others commented that too much of a broad brush one size fits all policy. Housing density needs to be tuned to the local area. What might be appropriate in a city centre would not be suitable in a rural area.
- Maximum density standards should be introduced instead
- The expansion of Basingstoke has lacked a parallel development of supporting infrastructure.
- Would prefer densities to be as low as possible
- Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC and others suggested it depends on nature of area, need for trees, connecting private outdoor spaces, working from home trends, garden space for wildlife, connectivity of wildlife, consideration of terraced housing for energy efficiency and wildlife corridors and wellbeing/mental health of open space and gardens in new developments and food production as a key issue as climate changes.
- BDBC/HCC referred to South Oxfordshire's LP examination example where the Inspector resistant minimum density approach
- Bloor commented does not allow development to respond positively to the existing area.
- Catesby, SN Development suggested that the Council work with those proposing sites for allocation in the plan to agree appropriate densities that take account of those circumstances set out in paragraph 122 of the NPPF. Such an approach will also enable the Council to better understand what is actually deliverable on each site and the amount of land required to meet its development needs.

**Question 7h: Which option or combination of options would you support for greenfield development? Please explain your answer.**

- Old Basing PC against all these options
- Highways England commented that any of the options proposed will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the M3.

**Option 1: Continue the current Local Plan approach (focus future development at Basingstoke with some greenfield development at larger towns and villages)**

- 17 respondents including Barrett Homes, Taylor Wimpey, SN Development, Sherfield Park PC, Old Basing PC, Cllr McCormick Highways England and Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty supported continuation of current strategy to focus future development in the borough's larger existing sustainable towns and villages.
- Cliddesden PC suggested that additional housing can detrimentally alter the character of small villages/unique places. Question if SS5 approach is still sustainable as forces settlements to build outside the settlement on greenfield land.
- Cliddesden PC noted that smaller settlements attract considerable amount of new small scale development via windfall (and SS6 exemptions) and this should be recognised and taken into account when allocating housing numbers. Also, development of less than 5 houses should be considered in housing targets.
- Highclere Estate supported approach provided an appropriate amount of development should also be allowed for at other settlements in the borough, such as Burghclere and Highclere, to ensure that housing needs across the borough are met.
- Barrett Homes supported approach provided increase proportion of development delivered at larger and most sustainable towns in category 2
- Cllr Cubitt commented that it is imperative that the all the focus of greenfield development must be concentrated on the South West of Basingstoke with haste. All the infrastructure needed to facilitate these developments must be implemented as soon as possible.
- HCC as Education Authority commented that a balance of development, depending on the dwelling numbers involved, could provide a sustainable option in maintaining pupil numbers in the towns and villages as long as this is considered appropriately relating to the availability of school places.
- 1 respondent opposed option 1 arguing it is not working, because it is allowing inappropriate and damaging greenfield development in small villages and rural settlements.
- Houses should be sited in Category 1 and 2 settlements (as described in section 7.5.2) where there is transport infrastructure services and facilities as well as a possible creation of a new settlement/village.
- Promoters of Upper Swallick, Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates supported this option as one single landowner with deliverability and

infrastructure upfront – provides necessary diversity and delivery options but also continue to use extension to Basingstoke urban area and current spatial strategy approach.

#### Option 2: Focus all future development at Basingstoke

- Option 2 is supported by 130 respondents concerned about development at Upper Swallick, Cliddesden PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, HCC and SMV, Highclere NP Group, Sherfield on Loddon PC, East Woodhay PC, Overton PC, Upton Grey PC and Bramley PC.
- Upton Grey PC suggested be bold and ensure that high density and high quality residential is delivered as a regeneration of the town.
- Basron Developments suggested that Camrose Stadium has been demonstrated as being suitable for a care home
- If this option is not taken forward then the centre of the Borough will become a wasteland of economically redundant, outdated employment sites (B1, B2 & B8 classes) and vacant retail accommodation e.g. Brighton Hill Retail Park. Therefore, surely these areas are most suited to redevelopment as the infrastructure is already in place and should be the focus of the Council's attention.
- SN Development were opposed to option 2 as won't deliver a variety of sites to maintain supply across plan period
- The Home Builders Federation explained that they cannot comment on or promote specific locations for development but in their experience the most effective approach to delivering the levels of housing building required is to ensure a wide variety of sites are allocated both in terms of size and location. The Council should look to identify sites that will support all sectors of the house building industry and as such ensure consistent delivery across the plan period by avoiding an over concentration of development in a specific area or an over reliance on large strategic sites and for this reason option 2 would be undesirable.

#### Option 3: Continue the Local Plan approach but increase the proportion of future development at the borough's larger and more sustainable towns and villages (category 2 and 3 in para. 7.5.3).

- 18 respondents including Wates, Vistry, Wades Estate, Bargate Homes, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Sovereign Housing, SN Development, and Basron Development supported option 3.
- Upton Grey PC supported only provided focused on larger settlements.
- Greenfield sites need far greater protection to ensure they are used only as a last resort.
- Not going to be sufficient to allocate only 750 dwellings in the category 2 and 3 settlements as occurred in the adopted Local Plan when faced with a housing requirement of this scale. These settlements will need to provide a greater proportion of the overall housing quantum to ensure that development occurs

sustainably across the Borough rather than being heavily focused in one location – Basingstoke

- Purely pursuing option 3 risks excluding sustainable sites which may be sequentially preferable when considering the constraints of sites, local housing need and other material considerations
- Bewley Homes suggested continued growth at the larger and more sustainable centres, with an option for a new settlement that can look to commence during the Plan Period, but likely continue to provide delivery beyond the plan.
- Option 3 preferred as West Berkshire has suffered due to delays in the 1,500 Sandford Development (impacting local infrastructure to the north)

Option 4: Continue the Local Plan approach but increase the proportion of development taking place in and around the borough's smaller and more rural settlements (category 4 and 5 in paragraph 7.5.3)

- Options 4 most appropriate since BDBC has found itself at times without a five year HLS
- Kingsclere PC suggested considering small development of 5-10 houses in smaller settlements (and of affordable nature) as this would not place additional burden on infrastructure (roads, schools etc) and would benefit these settlements.
- Preferable to spread development across the district supported by number of respondents including SN Development and Falcon Developments.
- Fowler Architecture suggested a more dispersed delivery strategy and refer to the value of small and medium sized villages when identifying land for homes in line with para 68 NPPF.
- Englefield Estate commented that an appropriate amount of development should also be allowed for at other settlements to ensure that housing needs are met across the borough and their vitality is maintained including affordable housing in rural areas (such as Mortimer West End).
- JPP Land promoted sites in Highclere
- Seek a broader approach from council which is not focused on the existing role of settlements, if it can be justified that their location can accommodate a higher quantum of growth.
- Concerns raised about development in smaller hamlets and village including Mapledurwell and promoted sites coming forward and will set a precedent for building south of M3.

Option 5: Create a new settlement/s or village/s

- Several respondents including Cllr Taylor supported option 5.
- Any greenfield development will need to make extensive efforts to reduce the need to travel. especially by private car. HCC are working on an 'Interim Transport Position Statement' for the west of Basingstoke where the transport infrastructure and policy expectations will be set out as a basis for agreeing a sustainable approach to development in this location. It will be based on what is understood to date based on the extensive study work that is ongoing.

- Promoters of Upper Swallick, Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates supported this option as one single landowner with deliverability and infrastructure upfront – provides necessary diversity and delivery options they require but also continue to use extension to Basingstoke urban area and current spatial strategy approach.
- Highclere NP Group commented if much greater need for housing, then option 5 preferred to spreading development across the borough.
- Overton PC, Bramley PC commented should only be used if there is a much larger requirement for housing. However, the time these take to develop might make them prohibitive – Manydown is a good example of this.
- Stop developing in Bramley and start developing on places like Manydown.
- Basingstoke Transition Network commented if we must build on greenfield sites; they must not be biodiversity hotspots, and green infrastructure should come first, e.g. ancient woodland. Housing density should be determined by the Council not the developers, and should be sufficient to meet housing needs; and should include avoiding reliance on cars for transport.
- Kingsclere PC considered Bishops Green to be a possible site for larger settlement due to proximity to Newbury and Greenham Business Park amenities, employment etc.
- Issues with transport requirements (cycle and foot) on the road network for larger villages so further expansion will exacerbate transport and parking problems (private/domestic and commercial deliveries). The principles of the '15 minute city' could be used to provide much more sustainable development.
- New settlements need to be planned carefully and not simply an extension of an existing village settlement.
- Sherfield Park PC suggested given delivery of Manydown this seems impractical for LPU.
- The Home Builders Federation explained that they cannot comment on or promote specific locations for development but in their experience the most effective approach to delivering the levels of housing building required is to ensure a wide variety of sites are allocated both in terms of size and location. The Council should look to identify sites that will support all sectors of the house building industry and as such ensure consistent delivery across the plan period by avoiding an over concentration of development in a specific area or an over reliance on large strategic sites and for this reason option 5 would be undesirable.
- Do not agree with large development proposals south of the M3 - this will breach a boundary of development and will mean an increase in car usage. Respondents specifically referred to Upper Swallick arguing would not be supported by infrastructure.
- NHCCG commented that any housing developments resulting in a population increase of 2000+ residents may require addition workforce, larger developments may require additional space/estates.

General comments:

- A number of respondents including Flavia Estates, Thakeham Homes, Persimmon Homes, SN development, Gladman Homes, Catesby and Bloor suggested an approach which sees a range of site types and locations allocated will ensure the best opportunities to realise the council's aspirations and meet identified needs.
- Also need to consider employment generating development as part of the spatial strategy.
- This should relate to number needed vs settlement absorption
- BDBC/HCC suggested Southern Manydown provides opportunities to blend option 1 and 5 preventing any one of the villages being swamped by development whilst providing long term certainty for growth over the two plan periods.
- NHCCG has no preferred option. We would work closely with BDBC if any housing developments required additional primary care capacity or estates.
- Several respondents suggest greenfield development needs to be minimized.
- CPRE were totally opposed to the development of 'greenfield' sites when there are so many 'brownfield' sites available for development. Have identified 'brownfield' sites in Hampshire which would accommodate having 27,900 houses built on them.
- Basingstoke Transition Network also note that there are not enough brownfield sites in the Local Plan to meet the housing obligation, and that if specific greenfield sites are not in the Plan then developers can seize sites of their choice.
- Building on greenfield land has potential to significantly impact on protected sites and can remove or reduce public access to these spaces for enjoyment
- Villages should be protected from proposals don't protect distinct, rural character of villages.
- Site promoters provided support for specific sites including Land at Pardown (Mat Raymond Farming),
- Respondents also objected to the inclusion of specific sites including land at Bulls Bushes, Park Farm and employment uses to the north of Junction 7.

**Question 7i: Are there any other options that should be considered [in respect of Greenfield development and 7h]?**

Several other options are suggested including the following:

- Cllr Diane Taylor referred to mistakes made in the past when, during the period of rapid expansion in the 60s and 70s, communities - especially villages - were decimated, swallowed up in the drive to build at all costs. We must stop piling housing demands on villages that cannot maintain their village status if allowed to grow and grow.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC suggested refusing to implement the Government's requirement for housing as considered excessive when taken with the scale of the expansion over the past 30 years.

- Bramley PC commented if Reading can say there is no land available, why cannot Basingstoke limit growth to brownfield sites, the town centre should be considered more.
- A number of respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC referred to need for greenfield sites being reassessed in light of Covid and Brexit (therefore should be a last resort in terms of climate change) and the potential for redeveloping employment, office and retail areas as mixed use with residential. Changes to offices and employment sites should consider new patterns of working.
- Council should anticipate how central government might categorise land nationally in light of planning reforms, therefore a more forward thinking and visionary approach is needed to remove and protect sensitive and important sites to communities at an early stage but taking a more proactive robust approach compelling land owners to release more appropriate and less sensitive sites to meet requirements.
- Borough wide, all settlements should look to account for future housing
- All settlements should first be reviewed via a design brief which particularly specifies infrastructure/services.
- Land is promoted for development by a number of respondents including Taylor Wimpey promoting growth north of Chineham, and to the east of Basingstoke (sites referred to include Hodds Farm, BRAM008, Bramley Camp, and OAK001)
- Cllr McCormick argued that should not build south of the M3 as there are enough houses to the east and west of the town to meet the current targets with reserve sites to spare.
- If M3 is breached this should emphatically not be done in a piecemeal fashion.
- Bewley Homes suggested need to consider cross boundary need arising from West Berkshire and Winchester.
- A number of respondents including Highclere Estate, Fowler Architecture referred to a positive approach to housing in rural areas where relevant, in line with the NPPF (paragraph 68 suggests a more dispersed delivery strategy), which is clear that policies should 'identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive' (paragraph 78) and 'support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites' (paragraph 77). For rural communities suitable sites should be identified, with the potential for them to be delivered via a neighbourhood plan or an update to a neighbourhood plan.
- SMV suggested delivery should be subject to ongoing monitoring to ensure sufficient supply of housing throughout the plan period and the LPU approach to greenfield sites should be flexible to allow delivery of additional housing where required.
- Wades Estate suggested should not rely solely on a snapshot of services and facilities but how the LPU will respond to changing patterns.
- BDBC/HCC commented there may be alternative quantum options – for example it is recommended that all options considered incorporating a 10% over-delivery or non-implementation buffer, not just the 5 year housing land supply at adoption - Detailed trajectory of delivery provided in representation and SA should test all housing requirement options.

**Question 7j: Do you support the approach of grouping settlements by size, role and provision of services and facilities to inform decision-making for where future development should be located?**

- 57 respondents are in general agreement with the approach of grouping of settlements, including BDBC/HCC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC + Upper Swallick130 reps, Wield PC, Upton Grey PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, CPRE, HCC, WBC, Bewley Homes, Sovereign Housing, Highclere NP Group, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes, Sherfield Park PC, Gladman Homes, Cllr McCormick.
- Englefield Estate, Basron Developments, The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty and Gladman Homes agreed that focusing growth on the most sustainable settlements is logical and the correct approach in planning terms and that the level of growth should depend on the level of sustainability supporting the provision of housing in a dispersed manner across borough to maintain and enhance vitality and viability of settlements.
- Highclere Estate and SMV suggested the grouping should be subject to ongoing monitoring throughout the plan period to account for and respond to changes in provision of services and facilities.
- Persimmon Homes suggested it's a good starting point for assessing where future development should go but opportunities should be explored as to whether the smaller settlements, especially those which currently do not have an SPB could be supported and expanded sustainability. It would be better to grow existing settlements than create new ones.
- Falconer Development broadly agreed with approach but suggested this should not be the overriding determinant when selecting where to deliver forward housing when acute local housing need and supplementary information supports proposed development
- Sovereign Housing suggested policies should provide sufficient flexibility within these categories so can still seek to deliver some housing particularly where there is local demand for affordable housing in lower tier settlements. 1 respondent refers to Thornford Road promoted by Kelmshot Building Company as an example.
- The smaller villages (Category 5) should be further categorised based on their school provision. For example, the village of Burghclere has education provision and should therefore accommodate a larger proportion of residential development.
- Taylor Wimpey clarified that it is important to also recognise sites on the edge of Basingstoke, but within other Parish areas due to their physical relationship with the town itself. For example, Cufaude Farm relates to Basingstoke/Chineham but is within Bramley Parish – this needs to be picked up in Part 2 of the settlement study.
- Bloor considered that historic growth rates should also be considered. Areas with poor existing facilities should not be discounted for growth as they present opportunities for new growth and facilities.

- Bloor suggested Tadley should be reviewed for growth given it is the second largest settlement.
- Conversely WBC advised that care needs to be taken over Tadley due to proximity to AWE and the extent of the DEPZ.
- Bewley Homes expected that the Council will continue to grow proportionately, with the expectation that those Tier 1-3 settlements, (Principal Service Centre to Small Large Service Centres) see firm commitments for allocation, whilst the smaller settlements are allowed to grow more organically, though windfall sites or small proposals if appropriate.
- HCC as Education Authority stated it is important to consider the availability of school places in the settlements when considering housing allocations to ensure the provision of school places is suitable in respect to any additional pupil places needed or existing provision can accommodate pupils.
- East Woodhay PC commented that these classifications must be adhered to when considering future planning issues.
- Vistry, Catesby and Bargate Homes agreed it is a widely understood and reasonable starting point but that is important that any such categorisation also takes account of changing preferences and lifestyles, through appropriately weighted criteria and should reflect the way people live today (including Covid and post Covid environment).
- Thakeham Homes supported principle but there is outstanding information for what the implications are as a result of the hierarchy.
- Suggest a similar approach is undertaken to that by WCC in terms of allocating a housing requirement for settlements depending on their position in the hierarchy
- Kingsclere PC would like NP to have more prominence.
- BDBC/HCC, HCC Property Services agreed sound planning principle, but it should not inform where all development should take place. The potential for strategic scale development to move sites up or down the hierarchy by the end of the plan period should be explored.
- Furthermore, clarity is required as to the suitability of different levels of growth within each settlement as well as how strategic development opportunities in the SHELAA will be treated. It should also capture future opportunities, not just assess sites in their current form, which can identify potential infrastructure needs over the longer term.
- Home Builders Federation commented, whilst it is important to understand the level of services in each settlement this should not necessarily define whether development should be located in a particular settlement. The Council should not rule out the possibility that a settlement could move up the hierarchy as a result of a proposed allocation providing additional services. The Council should also consider whether further development could increase demand for existing services in a settlement securing them for the whole community in the long-term.

Several respondents oppose the approach to grouping settlements:

- SOL Parish Council does not support such an approach, as a 'one size fits all approach' ignores local identity and local decision making.
- Cllr Diane Taylor thought that labelling settlements is unnecessary and leads to overdevelopment of some areas
- JPP Land stated that population should not be a determining factor of the hierarchy as not in accordance with para 78 NPPF. This paragraph also supports villages accommodating some growth
- Overton PC stated each settlement should be taken on its own merits and not lumped into one category,
- The Manydown Company supported the LPU meeting the housing requirement in full but also having flexibility to adapt to rapid change. They suggested restricting development in Category 4 and 5 beyond affordable need is outdated. Suggested it is possible to create sustainable growth in villages in rural areas such as Monk Sherborne and Wootton St Lawrence.
- Bramley PC argued that categorising the areas based on shops, church, etc, without consideration to the position and quality of the service is wrong. Future development in Bramley is not sustainable.

**Question 7k: Do you support the proposed categories and the settlements identified in the table above?**

179 respondents were in general agreement including Kingsclere PC, Upton Grey PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Sherfield Park PC, Wades Estate, Gladman Homes, BDBC/HCC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, CPRE, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes and Cllr McCormick.

Comments supporting the position of individual settlements in the hierarchy included the following:

- Old Basing has the spirit and character of a large village and this should be maintained as such
- Old Basing should be Category 4
- Chineham should be Category 2
- Support that Mapledurwell is not identified for housing
- Suggest category 5 should be split into 2 as some are more sustainable than others. Suggest new category 6 includes Ashford Hill, Bishops Green, Ecchinswell, Headley, Highclere, Silchester.
- Suggest St Mary Bourne is included in category 5
- Support inclusion of Headley in category 5
- Highclere NP Group agree Highclere rightly placed as relying partially on Woolton Hill but mostly Newbury
- Bargate Homes agreed with position of Overton

Several respondents commented on the methodology:

- The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty suggested should be informed by Part 2 and reviewed in light of its outcomes.

- Sovereign Housing noted that the LPU should consider local affordable need and demand in lower tier settlements
- BDBC/HCC stated it is clearly a snapshot in time at the beginning of the plan period and needs to also take into account large urban extensions and new settlements.
- Suggested category 5 is named 'rural villages'
- Bewley Homes suggested need to look beyond what is an already established hierarchy to allow for areas not currently included within the hierarchy of settlements and to consider those settlements which straddle the boundary, such as Wash Water.
- Should not overlook opportunities to create sustainable locations.
- SMV commented on this basis should allocated further land around Basingstoke on greenfield land to ensure all housing needs are met
- Catesby considered the philosophy and operation of SPBs should be reconsidered to ensure they are fit for purpose as open space within settlements is important meaning development on the edge of settlements may be preferable.
- Thakeham Homes suggested the council also needs to explore the possibility of settlements moving up the hierarchy or expanding should there be development opportunities that support such changes.

13 respondents opposed the proposed categories and settlements making the following comments:

- Cllr Diane Taylor thought that labelling settlements in unnecessary and leads to overdevelopment of some areas.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council does not support the approach as it fails to discriminate between the nature and identity of local village communities.
- Bramley PC does not support as takes no account of existing conditions. There should not be any protected area, all must take a share.
- Concerned about fast overdevelopment of rural parts of the borough, specifically Large Local Service Centres such as Whitchurch as it is still principally a village in terms of nature and character.
- Cooper Estates Strategic Land argued Oakley should be in category 2.
- Old Basing PC would prefer to be category 4
- Overton PC stated Overton has very different environment to Whitchurch or Tadley – no account taken of the restrictive road network, lack of parking at station and on roads.
- Rydon Homes argued Sherborne St John should be a category 3 settlement - there is no justification for a different treatment of settlements based on whether their housing allocations came through a Local Plan or NP. Restricting new housing development to the initial categories 1,2 and 3 loses the opportunity to retain and enhance any existing services and facilities in those settlements lying within the other categories.
- Wates suggested Bramley should be a category 2 settlement as it also comprises: a secondary school within 8km; a dentist within 8km; indoor sports /

leisure facilities within 8km; a mainline railway station and a Strategic Employment Area.

- Vistry suggested definition between category 2 and 3 is less clearly defined – Kingsclere should be Category 2 based on the services and facilities listed. Furthermore, the services and amenities that may not be present in Kingsclere include those which are less dependent on proximity. For example, Kingsclere lacks a large supermarket, but this is less impactful when accounting for changing preferences regarding online food deliveries.

**Question 7I: Do you have any views on the introduction of new SPBs for the five settlements (Bishops Green, Ecchinswell, Headley, Highclere and Silchester) which do not currently have SPBs?**

- 24 respondents were in general agreement (but only after consultation with local residents) including Upton Grey PC, Highclere NP Group, Pamber PC and NP Group, Sherfield Park PC, Bramley PC, Highclere Estate, Gladman Homes, Sherfield on Loddon PC.
- Bramley PC suggested that all areas should have an SPB that allows expansion to meet a share of the need. SPBs must be given more respect in development decisions.
- Sherfield on Loddon PC recognised that they protect village identities.
- Cllr Diane Taylor commented that there is no harm even for small remote villages, if expansion is very carefully controlled and fed by local opinion.
- Englefield Estate and Highclere Estate stated that they should be drawn to allow for flexibility for appropriate future expansion, for example Tadley, Burghclere and Highclere.
- Sherfield Park PC referred to clear strategic gaps to ensure safeguard green space.
- Kelmslot Building Company promoted site ASH003 and supported amendment of SPB for Headley which encompasses site.
- Kingsclere PC agreed this would serve to give some protection against large inappropriate developments.
- CPRE agreed, but only if this was determined to be helpful in planning decisions – which should be guided by not only relevant policies that prevent eroding the rural character of settlements but also by NPs where they exist.

Several respondents opposed the introduction of new SPBs making the following points:

- SPBs should only be added where it is supported by clear evidence and justifiable through robust evidence base
- Gladman Homes are opposed to the use of settlement boundaries if these exclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. LPU should also take the opportunity to review the adopted SPBs to ensure that the Plan takes a flexible approach to growth within and on the edge of settlements.
- But it is evident that SPBs offer little protection

- Pamber PC and NP Group questioned Silchester being given an SPB - if it was to be drawn suggested this could be the extent of the conservation area.
- Fowler Architecture suggested SPBs not needed as a wider range of settlements require, and can accommodate, sustainable housing growth
- Highclere NP Group believed that while it might be possible to draw an SPB around this existing settlement, the consequent pressure for infilling would be severe. Since gaps and views are typical not only between the five Highclere settlements but within each one, this could prove extremely difficult to achieve without destroying the character of the village with its well-spaced houses. On balance it should remain as 'countryside' and fall under whatever replaces policy SS6.
- Cllr McCormick opposed to new SPBs
- Bargate Homes stated that on balance they should remain countryside due to pressures for infilling
- There is an inconsistency with Hannington mentioned in the paragraph 7.5.3
- SPBs should only be added where it is supported by clear evidence and justifiable through robust evidence base.

**Question 7m: Do you have any views on the suitability of future growth at Tadley, given its unique circumstances?**

Several respondents supported future growth of Tadley stating the following points:

- Cllr Cubitt commented that Tadley must be permitted to grow to meet the needs of the Town and is essential.
- Fowler Architecture suggested there is clear evidence of housing need in this area (200 households on housing register Nov 2018 for social rented with further 63 intermediate forms) – welcomed that approach is being revisited.
- Englefield Estate welcomed review. PAM001 and PAM017 are on the edge of the DEPZ and provide suitable locations for new development.
- Bewley Homes expected a strong move is made to consider growth for Tadley through the LPU given its size and sustainability, and lack of delivery. Tadley development should be a high-priority agenda for BDBC
- Old Basing PC and Overton PC suggested Tadley certainly has more scope for focused development to catch up with the past limited build rate
- Bramley PC considered that Tadley has better services to sustain more development and surrounding villages are as much at risk from AWE as existing residents in Tadley if there was an emergency.
- Sherfield Park PC commented that there are areas of Tadley which require redevelopment so should challenge current approach and consider re-visiting zoning to assess current and planned nuclear activities.
- Given most existing development is due to presence of AWE, this should not be an impediment

Respondents also raised concerns about future growth of Tadley:

- Sherfield on Loddon PC suggested that this should be the decision of residents in Tadley.
- Cllr McCormick commented that Tadley's biggest problem is transport infrastructure, it has no railway station. Growth in Tadley should be limited.
- Baughurst PC commented growth of Tadley/Baughurst/Pamber is currently stunted because of the impact of the DEPZ. More definition required by AWE/ONR.
- Pamber PC and NP Group would not welcome large development in Tadley as would put a strain on the infrastructure and potentially increase 'rat run' traffic through the parish.
- Upton Grey PC also suggested shouldn't review position.
- Highclere NP Group believed it is best to go with safety over new growth – unless there is a well-developed evacuation plan and good traffic modelling new development should not be allowed.
- Safeguarding the population should be key to any development
- Tadley Town Council strongly believed that there should not be any additional development apart from small scale of social and affordable housing and shared ownership for local people (within the existing SPB only)
- CPRE commented given restrictions, it is expected that any growth be limited to brownfield sites and small pockets of land where proposals are compliant with other relevant policies.

The ONR and West Berkshire Emergency Planner make the following points:

- ONR stated that development is determined under the REPPiR 2019 regulations unless West Berkshire Council emergency planner provides adequate assurance to ONR that any adverse impacts on the operability and viability of the off-site emergency plan could be mitigated. Objection will be raised to large scale developments within the outer consultation zone (OCZ) set by ONR as 8km from central point of grid reference SU595635, unless West Berkshire provide these assurances.
- WBC commented that any development would need to be mindful of the proximity to AWE and extent of the DEPZ, the requirements of the Off-site Emergency Plan and policies of the ONR This means that if an accident occurs at AWE Aldermaston the emergency services in Hampshire must be able to in the worst case example evacuate and shelter for as long as is necessary any increase in the population of the area caused by new development.

**Question 7n: Do you agree that the factors listed above should be considered when determining suitable levels of growth in settlements?**

- 180 respondents supported the factors listed including Wates, Vistry, Cliddesden PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC, Bramley PC, Sherfield Park PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Upton Grey PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, HCC, Bewley Homes, Southern Water, Highclere NP Group, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes, Baughurst PC, Gladman Homes, Old Basing PC and Cllr McCormick.

- Bramley PC suggested highway constraints are important and the impact increased traffic has on neighbouring communities. When a “service” or “criteria” has reached capacity or is adversely impacting the infrastructure and sustainability of a locality it is not considered that this is a reason not to develop.
- Cooper Estates Strategic Land, Bargate Homes, Catesby and SN Development do not agree with any approach which seeks to exclude development from locations on the basis that, that location received growth last time round. Sovereign commented if too much weight given to past growth there is a risk of future under-delivery taken forward exacerbating affordability for local people on lower incomes
- Candovers PC welcomed inclusion of managed priority habitats and important biodiversity. Some more information on how this will continue to be assessed would be useful. Also think that consideration needs to be given to each particular setting.
- Englefield Estate commented based on the factors listed, the sites at Sandy Lane (PAM001), Honeymill Farm (PAM017), Rowlands Close (MWE001) and Turk’s Lane are well placed to contribute to meeting the needs of Tadley, Mortimer West End and Mortimer (within West Berkshire) and should be considered as part of the preparation of the LPU.
- Particularly impact on environmental and heritage assets and availability of suitable sites
- The Manydown Company suggested that the full range of market housing products should be understood, including identifying opportunities for self-build and custom build housing products as they work well in smaller settlements. At the very least, the development management policies should allow for windfall development as encouraged by NPPF paragraph 68(c) to include both infill development and small sites at the edge of villages where schemes would be proportionate in scale.
- New housing will always result in a ‘change in setting, landscape or character’ and therefore the opportunities, constraints and design of site should be planned to minimise any impact on environmental and heritage assets, rather than a determining factor in why they should not come forward.
- Sherfield Park PC suggested greater focus on social rented as well as affordable rents must be included, and greater emphasis on access to natural green space.
- Southern Water agreed that whilst water or wastewater infrastructure capacity should be a consideration, it should not be a constraint. If development likely to require significant infrastructure upgrades that would take time to plan and implement so this should therefore be taken into account in planning policies related to any such sites.
- HCC as Local Education Authority commented that it is important to consider the availability of school places in the settlements when considering housing allocations to ensure the provision of school places is suitable in respect to any additional pupil places needed or existing provision can accommodate pupils.

- East Woodhay PC and Highclere NP Group considered that infrastructure capacity is not just about highways, GPs and schools – sewage and drains and broadband need to be considered
- Upton Grey PC considered it important that smaller settlements are not forced to accommodate development which will risk harming their character as has happened within recent developments – residential should be limited in smaller settlements to individual and infill plots so character can be properly controlled.
- Overton PC suggested that aspects that cannot be changed, such as road infrastructure, must be given serious consideration.
- Bargate Homes commented the most important being market and affordable need, impact on environmental and heritage assets and availability of suitable sites; the latter of which are intrinsically linked.
- Bargate Homes, Catesby and SN Development suggested infrastructure capacity should not be a reason for a settlement not to accommodate development when the planning system allows for infrastructure requirements arising from new development to be provided through CIL or obligations such as S106.
- Vistry gave a preference for meeting market and affordable need as first priority, followed by capacity (noting infrastructure capacity could be enhanced by new development) and then sites.
- Consideration should also be given to existing green/open spaces
- Availability of sites which are demonstrably deliverable should be the key consideration, Highclere Estate commented must consider availability of sites and their suitability to meet needs on a settlement by settlement basis.
- Thakeham Homes suggested reviewing viability of existing services and facilities – to ensure that there is not decline in provision where development would support certain locations and their existing provision.
- WBC suggested this list is not applicable for Tadley due to AWE DEPZ.
- Persimmon Homes commented that factors are limited and generic - More consideration should be given to expanding these and allowing for a more holistic assessment based on a settlements interaction with the wider area as well as site specific characteristics.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council argues that BDBC has failed to address such factors in the past (particularly on infrastructure).

**Question 7o: Are there any other factors that should be considered, and why?**

- Cllr McCormick referred to the distances children have to travel to school in the town area and its impact on carbon emissions, air quality and journey times and overall quality of life.
- Bramley PC suggested conservation Areas and their context (i.e. surrounding areas) must be protected as they have been in Sherfield and Dummer.
- List is not comprehensive, e.g. Ellisfield is omitted.
- The availability of sustainable transport needs to be considered when determining housing locations.

- Windfall sites in small villages should be taken into account in assessing numbers. For example, in Cliddesden, the SPB is full and sites adjacent to the SPB are limited which makes identifying suitable sites for 5 or 10 houses difficult. In excess of 20 new houses have been built in Cliddesden but never contributing the net gain of 5 sites as required to count by the local plan policy SS5.
- Public transport
- Retail availability
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council suggested these factors ignore the importance of connectivity both in real terms (Roads/public transport) and in digital terms (broadband provision).
- Biodiversity and Nature Recovery Networks and Green Arteries
- Agricultural land should not be reduced
- Affordable housing in rural areas
- Cllr Cubitt commented that building individual houses must be permitted in rural settings.
- The Manydown Company referenced the need for a broad mix of sites in the portfolio and to meet the minimum proportion of 10% of smaller 1ha sites required by NPPF para 68 – to leave these sites to NP process is not appropriate and does not yield enough smaller sites.
- Old Basing PC suggested respect for environmental and heritage assets and avoiding development in flood risk areas. Development priorities will change due to Covid-19 and climate change.
- Rydon Homes commented under the NP allocation for development at Cranes Road a requirement was that land should be set aside to provide a retail unit to serve the village. Without a larger population such a venture will fail. It is imperative that a sensible and reasonable approach is put forward to allow some growth at the larger villages which is commensurate with their function and size in order to support the existing facilities and services.
- Gladman Homes suggested that it is important that the positive impact of development on the vitality and sustainability of local services is recognised when assessing the need for growth in settlements.
- The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty argued there a wide range of factors that should be taken into account when determining suitable levels of growth in the Borough's settlements. It is considered too early in the Plan-making process to set out a closed list of factors.
- The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty suggested bullet point 5 should therefore be widened to take account of the suitability, availability and achievability of sites, rather than just their availability.
- Great weight should be afforded to development that focus on delivery of affordable housing or provide a larger % of affordable housing than required by policy to meet unmet need.
- Pamber PC and NP Group suggested consider making Little London a conservation area to maintain its rural and historic identify. Many listed buildings as well as a roman tile manufacturing site of historical interest in the village.

- Catesby referred to availability and connection to local employment locations – justification for Bishops Green development.
- Catesby suggested review local priorities for community growth, regeneration or improving resilience (e.g. helping to sustain local services, such as schools or shops).
- Safety concerns
- Highclere NP Group suggested sensitivity of local ecosystems and biodiversity
- Highclere NP Group suggested suitability for adding other services (recreation, green spaces) where larger development is planned
- Upton Grey PC suggested it is important that smaller settlements are not forced to accommodate development which will risk harming their character as has happened within recent developments – residential development should be limited in smaller settlements to individual and infill plots so character can be properly controlled
- Overton PC argued that there must be a maximum limit on how much a settlement can take in terms of development
- Bargate Homes referred to future use of technology and online/telephone services.
- SMV suggested suitability of individual sites and the list of promoted sites to meet needs of settlements is starting point not characteristics.
- Bargate Homes commented that the rate of housing supply from Manydown and the ability of Basingstoke housing market to absorb such a high level of new housing over the LPU period is a justification for an increased focus of development in the more sustainable rural areas of the borough.
- Vistry suggested need to provide a balanced portfolio of sites across borough and to maintain an ongoing housing supply. Regard should be had to the market's appetite to deliver growth in particular locations.
- BDBC/HCC suggested inclusion of urban extensions and new settlement options
- JPP Land referred to paragraph 78 of the NPPF to allow future growth in smaller villages, such as Highclere
- WBC suggested the list of characteristics includes DEPZ due to proximity with AWE Aldermaston
- Other factors should include the type, nature and size of developments proposed for each settlement so officers can think proactively and creatively about how different combinations of sites could be delivered over the course of the plan to meet the objectives.
- Burghclere PC, East Woodhay PC suggested windfall sites in small villages should be taken into account in assessing numbers
- Maintaining Strategic Gaps and the relationship sites have to the countryside
- The level of amenity they provide to adjacent neighbourhood's
- Protection of Conservation areas.
- 135 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC and Upton Grey PC referred to compliance with

Policy SS6 of the Current local plan and requested this is maintained into next LP.

### **Question 7p: Which option or options would you support?**

- NHCCG had no preferred option however we are happy to have continued discussions on any health infrastructure required and capacity and estates within primary care.
- Sovereign Housing commented all options should be balanced alongside delivering homes where there is identified local need.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council comments that none of the options are sustainable or deliverable when set against the key issues of Tackling the Climate Emergency and Protecting and Enhancing our Environment and Heritage and would destroy the existing nature of the Borough.

#### Option 1: Focus growth in a small number of large development sites accommodating over 1,000 new homes.

- 5 respondents including Cllr Cubitt and Bramley PC supported option 1.
- Highclere NP Group referred to example in West Berkshire where 1,500+ homes are proposed at Sandford where there have been impacts on infrastructure.
- HCC suggested that larger developments are likely to bring new primary schools as, ideally, they should be of a size to provide a minimum of two forms of entry (equating to approximately 1,400/1,500 dwellings). Also support development at a level that could bring sustainable primary school expansion (ideally one form of entry or 210 places, which equates to approximately 700/800 dwellings).
- Home Builders Federation commented that it is only through having a variety of sites coming forward that will ensure the plan delivers consistently in both the early years of the plan and in the long term. Focussing on a few large sites will potentially reduce choice and place the plan at greater risk of not meeting needs should these sites fail to come forward as expected.
- Barrett Homes opposed option 1 as will place undue reliance on a small number of sites/developers, few sites in the Borough can actually accommodate 1,000+ units, typically being difficult to assemble across multiple ownerships and most importantly, would likely limit development to just Basingstoke and its immediate environs since it would be difficult to identify suitable sites of this scale at the towns/villages.

#### Option 2: Focus growth on a larger number of smaller development sites.

- 6 respondents supported option 2 including Bargate Homes, Old Basing PC and CPRE if in combination with option 4.
- Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC supported Option 2 specifically for more housing on brownfield sites

- Barrett Homes preferred option 2 to option 1 as more likely to deliver timely growth in appropriate locations, although it depends on the quantity of the sites and what is meant by 'smaller'.

Option 3: Spread the development across a range of different sized sites including both sites over 1,000 new homes and smaller sites.

- 24 respondents supported option 3 including Kingsclere PC, East Woodhay PC, BDBC/HCC, Sovereign Housing, Highclere NP Group, Taylor Wimpey, SN Development, Falcon Developments, Maria Miller, Baughurst PC, Rydon Homes, Persimmon Homes, Vistry and Barrett Homes.

Detailed comments included the following points:

- There should be a mixture to deliver a homogenous outcome
- Bramley PC suggested that any development that cannot be contained in Basingstoke must be spread over every area with no exceptions unless at or exceeding sustainable capacity already. There also needs to be the scope for better infrastructure in such areas
- HCC property services supported option as it is a blended approach and multiple starts to maintain a steady delivery of housing over the plan period – also recommends a 10% over delivery buffer for all sites to provide the necessary robustness to manage unforeseen events over the LPU plan period that could affect delivery.
- Wates suggested given the Council's situation with regards to their five-year housing land supply, focus should be given to sites which can be delivered in the short to medium term. In addition, sites of less than 1,000 units would still contribute to local infrastructure provision via Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions.
- Rydon Homes commented that it is essential to provide a range of housing sites that will appeal to the largest number of agencies to deliver. The smaller sites will ensure that the authority is able to show and demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
- Option 3 would only be required if option 2 failed to satisfy delivery requirements
- Flavia Estates noted that option 3 can slow delivery and could affect LPAs ability to maintain supply.

Option 4: Include reserve sites within the Local Plan Update in order to improve flexibility.

- Old Basing PC considered option 4 creates loopholes
- Highclere NP Group supported option 4 due to historic lack of 5YHLS
- Taylor Wimpey supported option 4 to allocate reserve sites as this can support council in the delivery of homes where unexpected delays arise.
- CPRE supported this option if alongside option 2.
- Sheffield Park PC opposed option 4 as developers need to move ahead with permissions already granted.
- Bewley Homes welcomed consideration of reserve sites and flexibility in 7.7.2. Suggests a 10% buffer is considered and included on allocations within the plan, which can be spread evenly throughout the delivery period

- Barrett Homes suggested option 4 is generally be avoided because the Local Plan should be aiming to allocate only sites which are demonstrably deliverable, sustainable and sufficient to meet the Requirement, and if issues arise these should be addressed in the regular 5-year cycle of plan reviews.

Option 5: Include locations for future development in order to provide clarity regarding the locations of future large-scale allocations.

- Bramley PC suggested option 5 is also important as infrastructure must come before development.
- HCC HA supported option 5 as this could go some way to help longer term infrastructure and community planning by understanding the sequential progression of the spatial strategy.
- HCC Property Services supported option 5 as it is important as takes a longer-term view beyond the current plan in order to provide certainty for landowners' and service providers to plan for and deliver the necessary strategic infrastructure to support the sustainable growth of the borough.
- Taylor Wimpey would support this option when it is needed, however, suitable evidence would need to be provided at Examination to confirm suitability of the future location for growth as required at Hart's examination.
- CPRE opposed to option 5.
- Barrett Homes suggested option 5 should generally be avoided as 'locations' are less precise than actual allocations which are what is necessary to bring forward suitable deliverable planning applications.

A combination of options was also proposed by respondents:

- Bloor considered it important a range of options are used and a range of sites, including large strategic sites, to deliver housing in line with Government aspirations.
- 151 respondents including Flavia Estates, Wades Estate, Cliddesden PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC supported a mix of Option 2/3.
- 10 respondents including Fowler Architecture, SMV, Thakeham Homes, The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty, Highclere Estate, Gladman Homes and Cllr McCormick supported a mix of Options 3/4 as reserve sites can be identified and released to bolster supply. Gladman Homes also highlight research on permission and housing start timescales.
- 5 respondents including Overton PC, Upton Grey PC supported mix of Options 3/4/5 although more investigation is needed into the sites selected and promoted at Overton. Concern raised over land purchase clauses and profits going to original owners.

Site promoters also put forward specific sites as listed below:

- Promoted site at Land East of Trenchards Lane by Keith Abel
- Promotion by Mactaggart and Mickel
- Promotion of land at Sandy Lane (PAM001), Honeymill Farm (PAM017), Rowlands Close (MWE001) and Turk's Lane by Englefield Estates.

### Question 7q: Are there any other options which should be considered?

- 148 respondents including Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, Ellisfield PC, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC and Upton Grey PC suggested that SS6 is very important and needs to be included in full in the LPU (and the principles set out within para 7.9.2).

With regards to other options, the following were suggested:

- Cllr McCormick suggested transport
- Review UK Biodiversity Action Plan and creation of a new biodiversity through LPU.
- Prior to the consideration of rural sites, currently protected by Section SS6 of the Local Plan suggest reappraisal of the future housing requirements based on the latest government directives, analysis of sites in SHELAA to determine deliverability and reappraisal of future Regeneration/Brownfield site opportunities, arising out of Covid 19 changes in working and shopping practices.
- Lobby to the Government to reduce immigration
- Sherfield on Loddon PC promoted brownfield sites and within the town boundary to avoid damage to rural communities
- Cllr Cubitt commented that development of the south Manydown and South West of Basingstoke must be accompanied with building western bypass
- Reference to self-build needs to be reviewed
- Overton PC suggested creation of a new settlement and more development at Tadley.
- 10 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Bramley suggested review in light of Covid/Brexit changes and potential to redevelop employment, office and retail areas as mixed residential.
- Old Basing PC commented that LPA should press ahead with Manydown, not a single house built despite the fact this land was purchased for the specific purpose of housing development.
- Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC suggested mechanisms to speed up build out on land with planning permission including penalties
- Cliddesden PC referred to developing areas for people and wildlife to avoid developing greenfield sites.
- Upton Grey PC considered that residential development should be focused on zones within Basingstoke town and larger settlements (though these may be multiple sites)
- Bewley Homes suggested greater flexibility and a 10% buffer of allocations which can be spread evenly throughout the delivery period.

### Question 7r: Which option or options would you support?

- 1 respondent refused to give option as NP are ignored or overruled anyway

Option 1: Continue with the current Local Plan approach (Policy SS5) of providing the framework for local communities to deliver their housing requirements through Neighbourhood Planning.

- 20 respondents supported option 1 including Cllr McCormick, Cllr Diane Taylor, Cllr Cubbitt, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Bramley PC, Chineham PC, Overton PC and Old Basing PC who refer to the benefits of local areas deciding what/how many/type of homes built.
- Cllr Cubitt commented that Neighbourhood Plans must be respected due to the huge amount of investment and time and personal capital within the plans.
- She also requested that Oakley, North Waltham and Dummer be granted a 'stave of execution' whereby they are released from any obligation to build more new houses, to protect and preserve their character and the integrity of their settlements. 'one off' developments and small developments of up to 4 dwellings should be welcomed, particularly if affordable and with good size gardens which are sympathetic to their setting.
- East Woodhay PC and Kingsclere PC highlighted their main concern is housing land supply position and how this will impact/continue to put pressure on communities with NPs, new housing on windfall should be counted.
- Kingsclere NP considered that their NP has worked reasonably well, policies have been upheld and some applications declined.
- Highclere NP group supported approach but only on basis agreement with the parish on actual housing need
- Bramley PC suggested this can only happen through full discussions with the local community. The requirements of accommodating more development must be considered with the associated infrastructure. Officers and Government policy should not undermine NPs by ignoring legitimate NPs.
- Cliddesden PC requested stop pressuring NP groups to allocate sites.
- Several respondents suggested SS5 requires review,
- Bewley Homes supported the continued role of neighbourhood planning as they offer the ability to add additional and important layer of planning underneath strategic policies. Council needs to give a clear steer to communities with a desire to pursue neighbourhood planning, to ensure that there can be a collective vision for growth as part of the LPU. Accordingly, would recommend that the Council seeks to allocate housing at a strategic level, leaving neighbourhood plans to consider non-strategic allocations that they would like to see developed.

Option 2: Allocate all housing-led sites through the Local Plan Update.

- 9 respondents supported option 2 including Wates, Vistry, Sherfield Park PC, Rydon Homes, Persimmon Homes and Bloor Homes as the most appropriate and transparent way of allocating sites.
- Need land for modular housing – these should be reserved by the LPU

- Rydon Homes suggested this is the quickest and surest way of providing such a framework and ensuring delivery takes place as well as planning for future reform directions
- JPP Land acknowledged role of NPs (for identifying sites) however, inability to maintain housing supply means it is essential for LPU to allocate a baseline of sites within each area.
- Thakeham Homes suggested allocated sites in NP tends to be those which are least politically sensitive, as opposed to those which are suitable and deliverable. To ensure sufficient sites are allocated the council should either allocate all sites allocations through the LPU or set housing targets to those NP areas.

Option 3: Use a more flexible approach depending on the aspirations of a particular community, with the Local Plan Update allocating sites where there is no appetite to address housing delivery through neighbourhood planning.

- 16 respondents supported option 3, including BDBC/HCC, SMV, Thakeham Homes, Bargate Homes, HCC Property Services, Barrett Homes, SN Development, Pamber PC and NP Group, The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty, Highclere Estate and Baughurst PC
- Baughurst PC and Overton PC welcomed the flexibility to account for the aspirations of a particular community.
- Sherfield Park PC commented, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply, the LPU may have to intervene in terms of reviewing settlement boundaries and allocating sufficient sites. In addition, NPs do not prioritise deliverability with a number of allocations failing to come forward. It is also not the role of NP to allocate sites of strategic nature.
- Should only be used failing option 2 – it is being successfully adopted in South Oxfordshire
- As landowner HCC supported the role of NPs in helping local communities manage the way development is delivered during the plan period.
- Vistry, SMV, Bargate Homes, Barrett Homes commented if option 3 is preferred, where NP has not effectively achieved delivery, the LPU should allocate housing led sites directly.
- Thakeham Homes raised that there is a lack of scrutiny which has resulted in undeliverable sites and going forward believe there will be insufficient will and resource from communities to take NPs forward. Have also found that they only work in practice if specific minimum targets are set for NP area.
- Taylor Wimpey, Gladman Homes and others suggested role of NP should be dependent on scale of development to be allocated in a parish and role a site has in the council's strategy for delivery. Strategic scale allocations with opportunities to deliver significant infrastructure improvements for the local community are usually better managed at LP level where there are resources and expertise – however, this should still include meaningful local engagement throughout the process to ensure community buy-in and meets their expectations wherever possible. This also ensures delivery given historic uncertainty from current NP.

- NHCCG has no preferred option, are happy to have continued discussions on any health infrastructure required, capacity and estates within primary care.

**Question 7s: Are there any other options which should be considered?**

- Vistry suggested should be a review of effectiveness of NP in terms of actual delivery. Option 3 should be revised to account for the preferences of communities but also capacity to identify, allocate and bring forward feasible sites.
- JPP Land argued there has been an over reliance on larger sites within current plan – therefore options going forward should be less than 1,000 dwellings to be appropriate and robust and growth should be directed to smaller settlements / sites.
- Cliddesden PC suggested providing maximum flexibility for the community and allow the community to allocate through NPs if they wish or otherwise allow the NP team to concentrate on policies and design codes and then assess planning applications based on the LP and NP.
- Extend existing settlements
- Bramley PC suggested infrastructure and sustainable population demographics should be considered before housing numbers. The Local Plan should be able to hold developers to account and ensure promised infrastructure happens.
- Overton PC suggested complete autonomy for areas with a NP
- Sheffield Park PC commented, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply, the LPU may have to intervene in terms of reviewing settlement boundaries and allocating sufficient sites. In addition, NPs do not prioritise deliverability with a number of allocations failing to come forward. As such SS5 cannot be said to have wholly been successful at meeting identified requirements. It is also not the role of NP to allocate sites of strategic nature. Also consider NP is not working and want more local engagement to decide how development progressed.
- SOL PC would not support options with imposed development against the wishes of the local community as expressed in their Neighbourhood Plan.
- Rydon Homes commented a further option would be for the LPU to set minimum housing requirements for each Neighbourhood Plan area. The Neighbourhood Plans will then be required to identify the specific housing sites to meet that requirement as a minimum.
- No decisions should go against the wishes expressed in NPs.

**Question 7t: Do you have any other comments about how the current approach to neighbourhood planning (in Local Plan Policy SS5) has worked?**

The following comments were made by Parish Councils:

- Sheffield on Loddon PC was pleased by the outcome of the recent public inquiry which took account of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has on occasion wished that the Borough itself and its elected members took more note

- Bramley PC stated that the NP has worked through influencing design of facilities but BDBC has failed in ensuring the conditions associated with allocated developments have been met according to build timing and quality of amenities resulting from the developments as laid down in conditions.
- Overton PC commented that NPs do not have the teeth people were hoping for under current legislation and it seems will be worse under new planning guidance. Plans need more flexibility as some sites have now proved unsuitable since adoption. Neighbourhood Plans are a lot of work to undertake if they then prove to be ineffective. They can also be divisive.
- Cliddesden PC suggested SS5 is too restrictive and as a result it is too difficult to comply with. The policy should be changed to consider sustainability (e.g. access to transport and services) and to allow smaller groups of houses to count towards the target set by the council – 15 homes built in Cliddesden and they do not count towards SS5 requirement. In Cliddesden it can be difficult to find sites where groups of 5 or 10 houses can be located due to the SPB already being relatively full, the need to protect the conservation area and to preserve other landscape features.
- Cliddesden PC commented that support provided by planning policy team valuable and should be continued – with additional support welcomed such as the annual NP meetings and creation of online forum to facilitate self help support for NP. However, BDBC has a tendency to push groups to allocate sites in NPs and conversely the White Paper Planning for the Future Reform seeks to remove this – the choice should be with the NP group.
- Sheffield Park PC stated that NPs are expensive and take a long time to develop and approve. They are not a good use of scarce local precept monies. When they are adopted, they are frequently overturned due to technicalities, such as housing land supply, and local opinion is overruled.
- Highclere NP Group were of the view that NPs are ignored or overruled, or events supersede the requirements of the plans e.g. lack of 5-year HLS.
- East Woodhay PC referred to a PiP appeal decision to grant permission outside SPB is concerning. East Woodhay PC also request that developments of five units or less count towards the local housing requirement for their parish.

Other respondents made the following comments:

- Fowler Architecture suggested the sanctions arising from a failure to submit a Regulation 16 neighbourhood plan should be extended to encompass all neighbourhood areas designated at the point of adoption of the Local Plan. The wording should also be revised to make clear that the absence of a supply to meet the requirements can be resolved by the Council making allocations or approving planning applications
- Genuine delegation and input from local communities is required. To date this has been a pointless tick-box exercise
- The Oakley and Deane NP process was led by a planning group, which did not include any Deane representative. The LPU should review the method by which neighbourhood plans and areas are agreed. There need to be proper safeguards to ensure that the views of all affected residents are taken into

account, and the specific problems relating to the Oakley & Deane NP need to be addressed.

- Welcome more independence from PC and better access to the resources of the planning department
- Disappointed with the lack of objectivity in the Neighbourhood Planning Process. The assessment of sites and decisions made need to be undertaken by those who understand and can objectively evaluate the planning arguments. At the neighbourhood planning level powerful local vested interest groups tend to dominate the process.
- Cllr Diane Taylor commented that neighbourhood Planning works well, as long as housing land supply doesn't fall below 5 years. Then the injustice and lack of control is hard to accept.
- Falconer Developments commented that policy SS5 would have benefitted at the outset with stricter requirements for delivery and timeframes to achieve key milestones. Some groups/parishes have failed to begin meaningful engagement on beginning a Plan. The requirement for smaller settlements to deliver a certain amount of housing has also centred the focus on delivering a maximum of the stated dwellings, rather than planning for future requirements.
- Cllr McCormick suggested that not enough support given to some communities (e.g. Brighton Hill) in preparing Neighbourhood Plans, almost a willingness amongst council officers and the administration to make it fail, and then prioritise investment to those communities that have Neighbourhood Plans, even if their need is less great.
- Thakeham Homes suggested allocated sites in NP tends to be those which are least politically sensitive, as opposed to those which are suitable and deliverable.
- Bargate Homes stated it is positive to see so many NP coming forward across the borough, however consider that there is a lack of understanding within the community about the status of a NP as it ages as they need to be reviewed regularly and updated when necessary - therefore once 'made' they are not 'done'. With the current land supply position this emphasise keeping NP under review.
- In general NPs have provided an effective mechanism for local residents to determine if further development in their area is appropriate, the type and scale and where it should be directed.

### **Paragraph 7.9 – New Homes in the Countryside**

- 130 respondents concerned about proposed development at Upper Swallick, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC and CPRE, supported adopted Local Plan policy SS6 which is described in this paragraph requesting it is maintained in the LPU
- Bramley PC suggested SS6 must be adhered to even when there isn't a 5-year land supply and penalties for developers who don't build to completion.
- CPRE would prefer para a) in this policy to refer to 'brownfield sites' rather than 'previously developed land' and that 'brownfield sites' is defined in the

glossary. Would also like to see the word 'isolated' defined in such a way that it carries the meaning in the glossary and is not subject to dispute by those who would prefer to use their own definition or that of the court in the 'Braintree' case. Perhaps a different word could be used – 'unsustainable' for example.

- Highclere Estate suggested policy SS6 should be reviewed rather than being rolled forward, the Highclere Estate would support options which allow for small-scale suitable market housing in the countryside (outside of settlements).
- Fowler Architecture suggested the following revisions to adopted Local Plan Policy SS6:
  - Criterion (c)(vi) that the re-use of a redundant or disused permanent building must 'leads to an enhancement to the immediate setting' goes beyond paragraph 79 of the Framework. An enhancement to the immediate setting is only required where the site is situated in an isolated location in the countryside.
  - Criterion (e) should not be subject to a restriction of '*four dwellings or fewer (net)*' as limiting small scale development. This is inconsistent with the Framework and places an arbitrary restriction on the scale of development, when the locally agreed need may be greater than 4 dwellings.
  - Criterion (f) should be amended to reflect that an essential need may also arise from a circumstance where the essential need includes those taking majority control of a farm business.
  - A new criterion must be introduced to reference paragraph 79(d) of the Framework that supports new dwellings in the countryside where it would arise from the subdivision of an existing residential development. As that typology is feasible in isolated locations, it must therefore be appropriate in all countryside locations.

## Section 8 – Economy

### Question 8a: Which option or options would you support for strategic employment areas?

- The vast majority of those who commented on this question expressed support for option 3 (142), namely re-allocating some existing employment areas for other uses. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Cliddesden PC. There was only limited support for the other options (option 1: 5, option 2: 13).
- 13 respondents expressed a preference for option 2. This included Cllr Cubitt on the basis of the potential structural changes to the economic landscape in light of Covid-19, stating that redundant employment land needs to be redeveloped for high quality, tree lined housing. 1 respondent did stress the importance of this being done on the basis of careful consideration. Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Baughurst PC, Sherfield Park PC and SOLVE also supported this option.

- 5 respondents preferred option 1. This included JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services and Bramley PC.
- Bramley PC considered that option 1 is favourable. However, some re-allocation of parts of existing employment areas for other uses could be considered, but only for residential development to an existing local need. However, they also felt that the whole system is not fit for purpose as “Employment Areas” take no account of the rapidly accelerating trend for many jobs to be home-based.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that another option which should be considered is the creation of wholly new employment areas.
- 2 respondents expressed a preference for options 2 and 3, including Overton PC. 1 respondent stated that there needed to be a review of employment land and premises as per paragraphs 120 and 121 of the Framework.
- A comment was made on behalf of a site promoter (for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment) that in isolation, options 1, 2 or 3 do not sufficiently take into account the ongoing structural changes in the retail property market and the consequential ability of unviable out of town centre retail sites to contribute to the growth in good quality employment space which is needed over the Local Plan period. Therefore, in parallel with either option 1, 2 or 3, growth in industrial, storage and distribution floorspace should also be accommodated through extending or creating new employment areas in appropriate locations.
- Avison Young on behalf of Newlands stated that a balance of options would need to be followed.
- Chineham PC stated that they would not support mixing housing and employment uses, as this has not proven popular with local residents.
- 1 respondent stated that due to the increase in home-working, additional employment land would not be needed and that un-used office buildings could be converted in order to form mixed-use office and residential buildings.
- The need to ensure that the relevant policy frameworks provide sufficient flexibility to respond to current and changing business requirements was emphasised by the operator of Chineham Business Park. They also stated that additional development which serves to improve the amenity and services available is essential to meet current business needs and increase the competitiveness of the Business Park.
- Concern was expressed that existing employment areas in central Basingstoke will be abandoned, and become redundant, if the employment focus is shifted to new employment areas to the west of Basingstoke, which in turn would be detrimental to nearby settlements and the local road network.

**Question 8b: If you support Option 2 and/or 3, which areas do you consider are the most suitable for reuse? What other uses would be most appropriate?**

- 1 respondent stated that all of the employment areas are suitable for a mix of uses.
- 1 respondent identified South Ham and Houndmills as being suitable for re-use.

- Cllr Cubitt also recommended that Houndmills be redeveloped for housing, with the existing businesses relocated to the Junction 7 area. She felt that this would reduce problems with air quality, lorry pollution and transport congestion. This would provide an opportunity to create wonderful living space near the train station, shopping and existing housing.
- Upton Grey PC stated that dated and less successful employment sites should be re-used for housing.
- Overton PC stated that run-down industrial estates could be used to build new mixed use industrial/office/housing developments. They also stated that it is important to retain viable areas for employment use.
- Sheffield Park PC stressed the importance of ensuring that the borough could provide high quality, flexible office space with good quality digital capability.
- Bilton Industrial Estate was suggested by Cllr Andrew McCormick as being potentially suitable for residential redevelopment.
- Savills on behalf of SMV stated that the southern Manydown/SMV site promotion should be recognised as another option for providing employment land.
- The Central 37 site between the Eli Lily site and the railway station was promoted for redevelopment as housing.
- 1 respondent stated that the council should re-allocate

**Question 8c: Are there any other options that should be considered for growth in the future?**

- It is Sport England's contention that the Council should consider D2 sports uses; fitness clubs, gyms, climbing centres and five aside centres, to be acceptable on employment/office sites (and not just residential units) as they do create sustainable employment opportunities and provide work experience and qualifications. When sports facilities are designed in as part of an employment part e.g. Wolverhampton Business Park or Harwell Science Park, it creates a better and more sustainable working environment and therefore an attractive area for business to locate in or relocate to. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that there are usually more employment opportunities generated through a commercial gym, e.g. David Lloyd Gyms, or commercial football, e.g. Football First, or a gymnastics club (D2 uses), than a 500,000m<sup>2</sup> B8 use.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that Southern Manydown has the potential to provide a mix of different employment uses with excellent links to Basingstoke town centre and nearby employment areas. Should a healthcare campus come forward, there may be agglomeration opportunities associated with the B1/B2/B8.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates set out that the first step in fostering an enterprising community is to develop places that both attract and stimulate entrepreneurial activity through an integrated community. Equally, encouraging the design of new developments to deliver a range of mixed uses will assist in the clustering of enterprise. They also stated that as

part of the Portsmouth Estate's legacy development principles, Upper Swallick Garden Community will provide high-quality accommodation for new and small businesses to grow, with space for support services to strengthen innovation.

- The possibility of connecting Manydown with MRT and rail would make It an attractive location for businesses and workers seeking to relocate to new jobs in the region. Southern Manydown has the potential to deliver additional high-quality employment floorspace to build on Basingstoke's existing strengths.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services stated that they believe that additional town centre locations ought to be reclassified as strategic employment areas. In particular the area known as Station Approach which links Basing View business park to the town centre, retail and leisure amenities as well as the mainline train station which is occupied by a number of secondary offices requiring regeneration.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services stated that Viables Business Park is designated a strategic employment area. However, they consider that Viables could be released in whole or part and provide land for residential development. As land-owner of both Viables and Basing View, they are not seeking the reduction of employment land, but rather that it is reallocated to more appropriate town centre location such as Station Approach.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick recommended augmenting local retail, especially food, hospitality, click & collect, for industrial and office areas.
- Hampshire Highways stated that Chineham, apart from the District Centre, is remote from a number of other facilities and is car dominated in terms of trips to the site. It could be accessed much more sustainably through the MRT network once established or via greatly enhanced walking and cycling facilities currently being assessed as part of a Modal Shift Strategy for East Basingstoke as well as through MRT studies and the LCWIP.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC suggested that development should be focused on existing sites.
- Overton PC stated that Overton Mill, if closed, could be demolished and turned into housing.
- Bramley PC stressed that financial inducements for particular forms of development should not be offered.
- The site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment stated that Options 1, 2 and 3 do not take into consideration that the demand for good quality industrial, storage and distribution floorspace could be provided through allocating new or extending existing employment areas in appropriate locations.

**Question 8d: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's office sector and why?**

- Of those who commented, the vast majority supported options 1 and 4 (149 and 150 respectively), namely focusing office development on existing office

areas and also the town centre. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Cliddesden PC. A limited number supported the other options (option 2 (new employment areas on edge of Basingstoke): 4, option 3 (new mixed use developments): 7 and option 5 (more protection for existing offices): 4).

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that developments such as Southern Manydown could offer such facilities to complement Basingstoke town centre and other existing office clusters e.g. business parks. Therefore Options 2-4 should be explored further.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services recommended option 4, they support office development in the town centre where there is already a critical mass of secondary offices in need of regeneration. This is a more sustainable solution because of proximity to amenities etc.
- The feeling was expressed that office space demand will plummet as post-covid work from home persists. Consequently, it was considered that the best approach would be to retain existing centres only, with suitable buildings converted to mixed use live/work.
- With regard to Basing View, Cllr Cubitt states that this site must be 'visionary', and protected for office uses. She stated that no housing should be provided on the site, owing to concerns regarding isolation and pollution. She also stressed the need to provide more parking on the site.
- Chineham PC supported options 1,2,4,5.
- Overton PC expressed support for options 3 and 4, on the basis that they consider that large offices may not be the preferred option moving forward, and that hence smaller offices, well related to housing and/or facilities and services and public transport may be preferred.
- 4 respondents preferred just option 1. This included Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE.
- 3 respondents expressed a preference for option 3. This included Hampshire Highways who stated that providing office development with housing at the edge of town could help bring about shorter distance travel, providing the types of employers which match the local skillset.
- Comments were provided which explained that it was felt that with the central transport hub location proposed adjacent to Basing View and the relative ease of connectivity to Chineham Business Park, the concept of providing new office developments in remote locations appears to be flawed. Consequently, it was felt that BDBC need to carefully review if a significant increase in accommodation will actually be required.
- Taylor Wimpey stated that a balanced approach across all 4 options would be needed in order to ensure there is a variety of office space to meet differing needs/scales of business. They also consider that providing housing next to important business parks will help sustain those by providing workers within easy reach of those employment destinations.
- 1 respondent stated a preference for all four options.
- 1 respondent expressed support for options 3, 4 and 5. It was stated that new office space should be provided as part of the new housing allocations. This office space should reflect the needs of workers, e.g. it might be serviced

offices that home-workers could hire for meetings, etc. Residents should have opportunities to work close to their homes.

- 1 respondent stated that the total amount of office floorspace should remain the same, if not more than at present. If office floorspace is to be used for another function, the same amount of office floorspace should be created elsewhere.
- 1 respondent expressed support for options 3, 4 and 5.
- 1 respondent stated that due to the increase in home-working, additional office space would not be needed and that un-used office buildings could be converted in order to form mixed-use office and residential buildings.
- If new employment areas are provided then Highways England stressed that they strongly recommend an approach which assesses and identifies the transport implications of employment uses and seeks to minimise any potential impacts to the Strategic Road Network. It is important that any essential infrastructure required to facilitate the delivery of proposed employment sites are identified and when and where the infrastructure is needed and that this is set out in the plan and its supporting evidence base.
- Basingstoke Transition Network stressed that whichever option is selected, the approach should be predicated on reducing reliance on the car and increasing active travel.
- Sheffield Park PC preferred a combination of options 1, 3 and 5.

**Question 8e: If you think a combination of the above options is most suitable, please indicate which options you favour and why?**

- The feeling was expressed that office space demand will plummet as post-Covid work from home persists. Consequently, it was considered that the best approach would be to retain existing centres only, with suitable buildings converted to mixed use live/work.
- Savills on behalf of SMV stated that there should be a flexible approach to future proposals for new office development, that responds to needs and looks to locate those offices in sustainable locations such as new district or local centres.
- Gladman Homes emphasised the impact of Covid-19 and the increased emphasis on homeworking, meaning that a combination of options would be needed. Gladman stated that the accessibility to main centres of employment will not necessarily be as important as building sustainable communities which people genuinely want to live in.
- 1 respondent expressed a preference for options 2 and 3, in order to try and help reduce traffic congestion within the more central areas of the town.
- 1 respondent preferred option 1 but considered that a mixture of the other options would also be acceptable in order to provide variety.
- Upton Grey PC and Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE stated a preference for options 1 and 4.
- Overton PC stated that Option 2 would make it easy for employees to reach employment but probably by car unless the public transport/walking/cycling options were in place. Option 4 would be ideal with the correct

infrastructure/public transport in place to provide accessibility, but Option 5 might provide security for existing businesses.

- It was suggested that the council should allow smaller incubator and flexible office space alongside residential-led mixed use developments around the town.
- Sherfield Park PC preferred a combination of options 1, 3 and 5. However, they felt that option 3 would only be acceptable if the buildings are compatible with the surrounding area, have adequate parking and access to public transport and the local road systems. Such office developments should also be small scale.

#### **Question 8f: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Maria Miller MP emphasised the impact of Covid 19 on the economy in terms of increased homeworking and the inevitable impact this will have on the office sector. These issues need to be considered through the LPU process.
- Cllr Andrew McCormick recommended promoting local office hubs and satellites for universities, especially research.
- Overton PC suggested the development of smaller 'hot-desking' sites for local working.
- Bramley PC stressed the need to have regard to the likely impact of Covid-19 in terms of reducing demand for office space in the future.
- Fowler Architecture and Planning state that none of the options recognises the need for office accommodation which may arise in rural areas as part of the establishment of new businesses, or expansion of existing employers. An additional option should be considered to facilitate small scale office accommodation in the rural parts of the borough, within or in close proximity to villages. Such an option would be in-keeping with the general flexibility required to recognise the shift in the scale and location of office demand away from larger developments typically found in town centres or larger office areas.
- The feeling was expressed that office space demand will plummet as post-covid work from home persists. Consequently, it was considered that the best approach would be to retain existing centres only, with suitable buildings converted to mixed use live/work.
- The importance of ensuring that all of the employment areas can be accessed via sustainable transport was emphasised.
- 1 respondent stated that all new properties should include a ground floor office, which would also be capable of being used as a bedroom by disabled residents if needed.
- The importance of flexible office premises set up for multiple users was raised in one response.
- 1 respondent stated that the LPU should allow smaller incubator and flexible office space as parts of or alongside residential-led mixed use developments around the town, as led by the market.

- The need to consider the needs of small businesses and the self-employed was raised, as they are likely to be in need of co-working office accommodation.
- Upton Grey PC supported smaller scale incubator and flexible office space as parts of or alongside residential-led mixed use developments around the town.

**Question 8g: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's industrial sector?**

- This question did not attract a standard response from any interest groups and so the responses were much more evenly spread. Of those who commented, the majority supported option 1 (16), namely focusing on existing employment areas, followed by option 4 (10), which entailed no specific allocation but allowing sites to come forward on a flexible basis. Option 2 received some support (8 comments), namely providing any required floorspace on new sites outside of/on the edge of Basingstoke or elsewhere. The least favoured choice was option 3 (5), namely providing the required floorspace within housing allocations.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the promoters recognise that Options 1-3 could all help to encourage general and light industrial development in the right locations within the borough, provided they are planned sensitively and cognisant of neighbouring land uses and site-specific factors. Southern Manydown is envisaged to be a housing-led Garden Community, however, it will include a variety of employment floorspace including B1/B2 (where appropriate and there is market demand) alongside more traditional District Centre and Local Centre uses and other uses.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services stated that subject to demand, new industrial stock ought to be located on the edge/out of town and away from residential use. Existing industrial sites closer to the town centre could be reallocated for residential use.
- Savills on behalf of SMV expressed support for options 1 and 3. They also stated that SMV/Southern Manydown provides a well located opportunity for the provision of a range of employment premises, including industrial.
- Bramley PC generally favoured option 3, but did also support options 1 and 4.
- Chineham PC and Overton PC expressed support for option 4. Overton PC also thought that option 1 should be considered.
- 4 respondents stated that option 2 would seem logical if demand could not be met via option 1, but this was considered to be unlikely. The site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment also stated a preference for option 2, and that their site would be an excellent opportunity for pursuing that option. Sheffield Park PC preferred option 2, provided there would be no detrimental impact on nearby dwellings.
- 1 respondent preferred option 1, 2 and 3.
- 8 respondents advocated the utilisation of options 1 and 4, on the basis that given the lower level projection estimates for industrial floorspace, a flexible

approach would allow for shifts in the requirements, however existing sites should be first redeveloped to improve the available space. Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE supported this option. They felt that option 3 would not be appropriate.

- In relation to option 3, Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes stated that the appropriate location for industrial floorspace is not considered to be within housing sites. Bloor consider that if this option were to be taken forward it would be important to allow flexibility at the application stage. This option is likely to only be appropriate on very large strategic allocations such as Manydown where there is sufficient site area to ensure any industrial floorspace is well separated from new homes and that it can be accessed separately.
- If new employment areas are provided then Highways England stressed that they strongly recommend an approach which assesses and identifies the transport implications of employment uses and seeks to minimise any potential impacts to the Strategic Road Network. It is important that any essential infrastructure required to facilitate the delivery of proposed employment sites are identified and when and where the infrastructure is needed and that this is set out in the plan and its supporting evidence base.
- Baughurst PC stated a preference for option 2.
- Basingstoke Transition Network specified that the focus should be on re-using existing sites/brownfield land as much as possible and that new sites should only be utilised if they are accessible via public transport.

#### **Question 8h: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Cllr Andrew McCormick recommended that the borough try and cater for technology orientated businesses, owing to Basingstoke's proximity to London and the Thames Valley.
- Savills on behalf of Highclere Estate stressed that the council should also consider the opportunities provided by parts of the borough in close proximity to other strategic road networks, such as the A34 (and its wider connections to the M3, M4 and M40). They highlighted the sites they are promoting in this regard.
- A preference was expressed for using brownfield land in the first instance.
- Upton Grey PC and 1 respondent stated that the best-located existing industrial employment areas within Basingstoke should be retained, (option 1) but those that are less ideal should be released for other development.
- The importance of ensuring the industrial uses do not cause pollution, and the need for appropriate accessibility for large lorries was mentioned in responses.
- The need for an industrial strategy for the next 75 years was also raised.
- Chineham PC stressed the importance of needing to reconsider all projections in light of the impact of Covid-19 on the economy.
- 1 respondent stated that the best-located existing industrial employment areas within Basingstoke should be retained, (option 1) but those that are less ideal should be released for other development. They also stated that some

new employment land is likely to be needed for flexibility, on a case by case basis.

**Question 8i: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's storage and distribution sector?**

- This question also didn't receive any comments from interest groups and so the number of comments was lower and more evenly spread. The majority of those who commented on this question preferred option 1 (17), namely providing the required floorspace on the edge of Basingstoke.
- Of the 17 respondents who preferred option 1, this included Cllrs Cubitt and McCormick, and also Bramley PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC and Sheffield Park PC. Avison Young on behalf of Newlands recommended this option, as it provides the best opportunity to deliver sites which are close to the strategic road network. The site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment also stated a preference for option 1, and that their site would be an excellent opportunity for pursuing that option.
- 6 respondents expressed a preference for option 3 (i.e. relying on a policy to allow the required sites to come forward in a flexible manner), including Cllr Diane Taylor, Baughurst PC and Overton PC.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the promoters recognise that Options 1-2 could help to encourage new storage and distribution, if planned sensitively and cognisant of neighbouring land uses and site-specific factors. Southern Manydown is envisaged to be a housing-led Garden Community, however, it will include a variety of employment floorspace including B8/Sui Generis (where appropriate and there is market demand) alongside more traditional District Centre and Local Centre uses.
- It was expressed that the proposed new "distribution centre" at the M3 junction near Dummer is 'ill-conceived', and that in order to be acceptable, it needs to be highly sustainable (in terms of the building) and connected with the public transport system, ideally the railway line.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services stated that storage and distribution space ought to be allocated on the edge of Basingstoke, but away from residential uses and with good access to road/motorway network. It is accepted that demand for distribution is likely to increase with the increase in online retail etc.
- Avison Young on behalf of Newlands stated that they would not rule out the opportunity to provide storage and distribution uses as part of larger-scale residential / mixed use development (option 2), although they agreed with the consultation document that it may not be appropriate in all circumstances.
- With regards to option 3, Avison Young on behalf of Newlands stated that it is not considered that this approach should lead the strategy for new storage and distribution uses in borough. It is considered, however, there is a place for a replacement to existing Policy EP1 which allows for additional storage and distribution proposals to come forward under certain conditions (including

where existing allocations in the new Local Plan cannot accommodate identified needs).

- 3 respondents supported option 2, namely providing the required floorspace via strategic housing allocations.
- 3 respondents preferred options 1 and 2. This included AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC Manydown. Savills on behalf of SMV stated that they recognise that Options 1-2 could help to encourage new storage and distribution, if planned sensitively and cognisant of neighbouring land uses and site-specific factors. They also stated that the SMV/Southern Manydown site provides a well-located opportunity to provide employment premises, including B8.
- 1 respondent stressed the importance of ensuring that storage and distribution uses are not present within the town centre.
- 1 respondent stated that none would be preferable.
- CPRE Hampshire stated that while they do not have strong views on this subject, they may object to any large-scale storage and distribution if this would have a detrimental impact on any valued landscapes or settlements.
- Fowler Architecture and Design stated that storage and distribution warehouses not generally suitable within housing development due to nature of access for HGV and significant traffic.
- In relation to option 2, Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes state that the appropriate location for storage and distribution floorspace is not considered to be within housing sites. Bloor consider that if this option were to be taken forwards it would be important to allow flexibility at the application stage. This option is likely to only be appropriate on very large strategic allocations such as Manydown where there is sufficient site area to ensure any storage and distribution floorspace is well separated from new homes and that it can be accessed separately.
- 1 respondent did not support the provision of additional storage and distribution sites as this use does not provide good quality jobs. There were also the concerns about the impact such sites have on residential areas.
- Basingstoke Transition Network did not support the provision of additional storage and distribution sites.
- Bramley PC stated that the proposed storage and distribution centre at Junction 7 was an ill-conceived idea. If it is to be provided then it needs to be more sustainable.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE stated that none of the options were supported.
- Another respondent also stated that no additional space is required.
- If new employment areas are provided then Highways England stressed that they strongly recommend an approach which assesses and identifies the transport implications of employment uses and seeks to minimise any potential impacts to the Strategic Road Network. It is important that any essential infrastructure required to facilitate the delivery of proposed employment sites are identified and when and where the infrastructure is needed and that this is set out in the plan and its supporting evidence base.

- Pamber Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Pamber PC stated that storage and distribution uses in rural areas should be very strictly controlled owing to concerns regarding the impact upon the local road network.
- Concerns were expressed strongly about developing a large storage and distribution site to the west of Basingstoke, owing to the detrimental impact on nearby settlements and the local road network.

**Question 8j: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Maria Miller MP stated that there is already considerable capacity pertaining to the distribution sector in Andover. It will be important to ensure that capacity is used before new capacity is agreed, particularly at J7 on the M3 where such a development might compromise one of the potential new hospital sites.
- East Woodhay PC stated that agricultural facilities should not be used for 'industrial' purposes. In rural areas they would be opposed to barns being used as drop-off / storage points – for example for load splitting.
- Savills on behalf of Highclere Estate noted the comments in paragraph 8.5.3. They stated this is supported and the council should consider the opportunities provided by parts of the borough in close proximity to the A34 strategic road network, which is well connected to the M3, M4 and M40. They highlighted the benefits of the sites they are promoting in this regard.
- Chineham PC noted that sites are already being promoted around Junction 7, but wondered if sites would also be available around Junction 6.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE stated that new development should be provided on brownfield sites.
- Bramley PC proposed 're-purposing' existing empty sites.
- A preference was expressed for using brownfield land in the first instance for storage and distribution sites.
- 1 respondent stated that the approach should be based on the regeneration (redevelopment) of Daneshill, on the basis that this area already has good access to J6 of the M3 (much better than J7) and more directly on to the A33.
- It was stated that placing such development at J7 is short sighted and directly contrary to the council's climate emergency strategy.

**Question 8k: Should the Local Plan Update include a policy which enables economic development proposals to come forward to address needs not currently identified?**

- 16 respondents stated that such a future proofing policy should be included. This list included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Chineham PC, Overton PC, Sheffield Park PC, and also Sovereign. Only 1 respondent expressly stated that such a policy should not be included.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that it would be prudent to have a form of employment windfall policy to be considered for opportunities that may arise over the plan period. However, should the

Planning White Paper result in development management policies becoming nationalised, the LPA will need to consider if there are any locally significant factors that may justify the need for specific Local Plan policies.

- Taylor Wimpey stated that the council should recognise, when assessing locations for growth, the opportunities that arise from developments that can accommodate space for co-working or small business if needed, particularly in light of the changing in working patterns experienced by COVID.
- Fowler Architecture and Planning stated that a criteria-based approach to flexibly respond to changing demands for economic growth will be essential for the LPU to meet such needs in all locations in the borough.
- 1 respondent stated that it should not.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE considered that this issue should be addressed via future updates to the Local Plan.

**Question 8I: Is there anything more that the Local Plan Update can do to help future proof the borough's economy, for example in relation to increased home working?**

- The importance of super-fast fibre-optic broadband was stressed by Cllr Cubitt. East Woodhay PC and Sherfield Park also stressed the importance of high quality broadband, and digital access.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the LPU policy should seek to reduce the need to travel and support homeworking; provide 'work from close to home' hubs and to take advantage of future technology improvements. The stated that the concept at the heart of the Southern Manydown promotion can aid with the delivery of this approach.
- Basingstoke Transition Network strongly agreed with the suggestion in the question concerning supporting future homeworking.
- Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE stressed the importance of facilitating homeworking.
- Similarly, Overton PC recommended that the LPU seeks to facilitate improvements to broadband facilities.
- Bramley PC also stressed the importance of high-quality internet connections. They also advocated providing localised co-working facilities.
- West Berkshire DC stated that increased space standard would assist in relation to home working as would a policy on superfast broadband.
- In relation to Tadley, the Town Council emphasise the need for improved broadband facilities in Tadley, particularly in light of the increase likelihood of homeworking becoming more prevalent.
- Fowler Architecture and Planning stated that a policy response that offers encouragement towards proposals that help facilitate home working practices would react well to the likely shift in working practices. It will be important for the policy response to not limit, or offer encouragement to, home office working, as there will be other typologies of home working practices in other economic areas that could be accommodated in residential environments.

**Question 8m: Which option would you support for Basing View? Please explain your answer.**

- Of those who commented on this question, the vast majority of respondents (149) expressed a preference for option 3, namely a policy supporting a more flexible approach to the uses permitted on the site, including uses such as retail and residential. This includes AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown), Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, Overton PC, and also Gladman Homes. Hampshire Highways also recommended that a mixed-use approach be pursued, including the provision of residential, as they felt this would 'the reduce car dominance of the site' and help spread out vehicle movements over the course of the day. Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE supported this option, though they did stress the need for future proof to be incorporated.
- JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services stressed the need for option 2 (detailed policy approach for individual plots/buildings) to be the preferred solution as this would give clarity, particularly in relation to the requirement for 300 residential units. However, the planning restrictions currently in force which presume in favour of office use, including Policy SS8, should not be relaxed and the critical mass of offices preserved and enhanced. This should be supported and complemented with ancillary retail/food and beverage amenities. They stated that it is vital that regeneration on Basing View as a grade A regional office location is encouraged.
- 5 respondents had a preference for option 1, this included Chineham PC.
- Upton Grey PC supported option 1, but also with limited use of option 3 (a more flexible policy).
- Sherfield Park PC preferred option 1, though they said that retail could be included within the area.
- Cllr Cubitt stressed the importance of protecting the site for office use and provided parking which meets market demand. She also emphasised the need to prevent the provision of other uses such as more hotels, residential and retail. She also highlighted the need to improve the arrival experience via the railway station.
- It was felt that with the emerging trend of working from home, this called into question future office requirements. Therefore, flexibility regarding the re development of the area was identified by some as being essential. The location is a prime opportunity for future residential development due to: it's location to close to the central transport hub in the town; it's proximity to retail and leisure amenities; it's suitability for supporting some medium to high rise development.
- Bramley PC stressed that a flexible approach would be needed.

**Question 8n: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Cllr Andrew McCormick identified the need for an additional transport route east from Basing View crossing Ringway to connect with Daneshill and Basing.
- Hampshire Highways stated that improved walking and cycling linkages are required from Basing View to the railway station and the town centre (and strategic links thereon) and this could be achieved by altering Eastrop roundabout to provide pedestrian and cycle priority and also MRT links to the site.
- Chineham PC stated that its currently too soon to confidently assess the most appropriate way forward, owing to the current level of economic uncertainty. They also stated that the approach taken needs to involve consideration of transportation issues such as park and ride.
- Old Basing and Lychpit and SOLVE considered that the site should be mostly focused on office use, though with some leisure and hospitality provision and high density residential development.
- Overton PC feel that Basing View provides a significant opportunity for the provision of new housing.
- 1 respondent suggested a public transport link with the railway station.
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the provision of more retail in Basing View.

**Question 8o: Which option would you support for the rural economy? Please explain your answer.**

- Of those who commented on this question the vast majority of respondents stated a preference for option 1 (23), namely maintaining the current policy approach. This list included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Baughurst PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, SOLVE, Pamber Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Pamber PC, Sherfield Park PC, Upton Grey PC and Overton PC. There was also some support (7 comments) for increasing the level of protection for existing rural businesses (option 3).
- 2 respondents preferred option 2, namely increasing the level of policy support for the rural economy. This included Cllr Cubitt, who stressed the need to support the rural economy and encourage economic development in an efficient and helpful manner, especially in light of the economic impact of Covid-10.
- Savills on behalf of Highclere Estate stressed the importance of supporting the rural economy in order to accord with the NPPF. They stated that options 1, 3 and 4 should not be utilised as they would contradict the supportive approach the NPPF takes towards the rural economy.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC stated that Southern Manydown would be located on the west of Basingstoke directly adjoining the countryside and nearby to a number of rural settlements. The employment and community facilities available at Southern Manydown will be accessible to the villages in close proximity to the development, thus supporting the more rural locations of the Borough. Southern Manydown's excellent transport links will enable

residents to access facilities available on-site or get into Basingstoke quickly and without the need to drive.

- East Woodhay PC preferred options 1 and 3, as they were concerned about the impact on the rural road network which may flow from expanding the rural economy.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council expressed support for option 1 in order to avoid needless industrial development on valuable agricultural land which would further harm the environment.
- CPRE Hampshire were one of the respondents who agreed with option 1, as they consider that the rural economy is already functioning effectively.
- Savills on behalf of the Englefield Estate explained that the NPPF does not limit the specific scale of new development that should be supported, as proposed by Options 1 and 4. Similarly, the NPPF does not restrict rural employment uses, as proposed by Option 3, but rather supports diversification. Options 1, 3 and 4 should therefore not be taken forward in the LPU. Instead the LPU should be based on supporting appropriate sustainable growth in rural areas in accordance with the NPPF.
- Fowler Architecture and Planning (who also preferred option 2) stated that the policy response should better reflect the clear emphasis of the Framework that economic growth is appropriate in all locations. There are agricultural and land-based rural enterprises that must be located in the countryside, but there are also other enterprises that require or thrive from their location in the countryside. As a consequence, a more expansive approach to the policy response is recommended that seeks to support the expansion of, and the creation of new business premises, in the countryside.
- 3 respondents expressed a preference for option 4.
- Of the 7 respondents who expressed supported option 3, this included Bramley and Chineham PCs.
- The importance of the rural economy was stressed in one response, which also made reference to needing to ensure that sufficient space is found for this sector.
- There is a need for small low-cost rental property that will encourage new small businesses supplying locally sourced and produced products.
- 2 respondents (who favoured option 1) stated that there is no justification to vary from Section SS6 of the current plan when producing an Updated Plan. They feel that the current arrangement adequately supports the rural economy.
- 2 respondents expressed a preference for either 1 and 3 or 3 and 4.
- Chineham PC stated that if option 2 were to be pursued then the approach taken would need to be very careful.

#### **Question 8p: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Bramley PC stated that the council must support the retention of agricultural land to provide local food supplies and contribute to the UK food supply.

- Support was expressed for suitable measures which would support home working.
- The need for a masterplan in relation to the rural economy was advocated.
- The impacts of Brexit were also stressed owing to the significant impact this would have on farming.

**Question 8q: Which option would you support for tourism?**

- The majority of those who commented on this question supported option 2 (18), namely providing more policy support for the borough's tourism sector. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Chineham PC, Overton PC, Sherfield Park PC, Upton Grey PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and The National Trust. Furthermore, The National Trust request that the option considers not only new tourist development but also the expansion and diversification of existing tourist facilities. Savills on behalf of Highclere Estate also supported this approach.
- The reasons given included that it was considered that the borough has many underused tourist attractions.
- 7 respondents expressed support for option 1 (retaining the current policy). This included Bramley PC, East Woodhay PC and Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE. JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services also preferred option 1, they stated that they see the regeneration of the Leisure Park with its current facilities as an important ingredient to attract tourists to Basingstoke.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that the promoters do not have a view on which option is preferable, however, they would welcome exploring such matters with the LPA and other key stakeholders involved with encouraging visitors to the Borough e.g. charitable heritage-based organisations, custodians of green infrastructure etc. Manydown's location in respect of the North Wessex Downs AONB and several regionally important heritage assets, alongside its extensive green infrastructure proposals, offer the potential to leverage the natural and historic assets within and close to the site.

**Question 8r: If a more proactive approach is taken to tourism, should this be limited to certain locations and types of tourist accommodation?**

- 5 respondents, including the Sherfield Park PC and the National Trust, expressed a preference for no restrictions.
- The National Trust consider that it would be difficult to limit tourism to certain location and types as tourism can cover a wide variety of services and facilities and given the time period of the LPU these may change and evolve.
- The National Trust also suggest that any new policies could look to support the development of existing facilities and encourage the development of new opportunities, especially if they are located in sustainable areas or could provide sustainable means of access.

- In addition, The National Trust consider that the type of tourism the Borough can offer needs to be able to respond to changes in the demands of the user and the evolution of the tourism industry and rural economy generally.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that town and district centres would offer the most suitable locations for tourist accommodation. Large allocations with the potential to include several different uses offer greater scope for placemaking (and tourism) than smaller wholly residential urban extensions.
- Basingstoke Transition Network stressed the importance of supporting local tourism, places which people can visit without have to resort to harmful travel.
- Overton PC didn't think there was any need to impose restrictions on tourism development.
- Bramley PC suggested focusing on providing high quality healthcare provision.
- 1 respondent stated that that there should not be any limitations, as there are lots of opportunities in the form of the AONB, heritage assets and characterful settlements, and attractive tourist accommodation would help bring economic activity into rural areas.
- Concern was expressed that if sites WHIT008, 009 and/or 010 were to be developed then this would be detrimental to tourism in Whitchurch.
- 1 of the supporters of a more positive approach did stress the importance of providing suitable walking and cycling trails in order to encourage days out, and the provision of suitable facilities to support tourism, such as car parking.
- 3 respondents agreed that the suggested restrictions should be imposed.
- Fowler Architecture and Planning stated that policy EP5 is restrictive and prohibits the creation of new schemes for tourist development in the countryside, as the focus is on expanding existing sites, or first being established through the conversion of an existing building. A more proactive approach should be taken to tourism recognising that a rural and countryside location will be essential to such uses and the establishment of a new tourism enterprise should not be limited to certain locations and types of accommodation. They consider that the current policy sets too high a bar for new development.

#### **Question 8s: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Cllr Andrew McCormick stated that there should be more promotion of Fort Hill as an Iron Age Scheduled Monument. In addition, he stated that there should be more promotion of the A30 as a heritage road from London to Land's End similar to Route 66 and other routes in the US. It would also require working with other local authorities on the route, e.g. Salisbury and Exeter.
- 1 response referred to the importance of letting tourism grow organically.
- Reference was also made to the need for the sector to be supported with resilient infrastructure.

- Nature reserves and related activities. Benefits include: greater interest generated, low cost to residents and new sources of skills and local rewarding employment.
- Upton Grey PC supported the pursuit of 'active leisure and destination tourism'.
- Chineham PC suggested that additional hotels would be beneficial, for both tourists and business travellers.
- 1 respondent suggested that the council support 'activities for all' in order to help encourage tourism.

#### **Question 8t: Do you agree with retaining the current retail hierarchy?**

- The vast majority of respondents (12) agreed that the current retail hierarchy should be retained.
- However, 3 respondents suggested that it could be premature to make strategies for town centres at this time as the full effects of Covid were not known. It was suggested that the vitality and viability of the centres would need to be monitored, and any contraction managed.
- Noted the importance of local shops alongside the centres in the retail hierarchy. These can help to minimise the need to travel.
- It was suggested that the hierarchy should be renamed to remove the word 'retail' – given the centres' broader range of uses.

#### **Question 8u: Should any new centres be identified?**

- The majority of respondents (9) said that no new centres should be identified.
- However 4 respondents (all promoting strategic scale sites) suggested that the proposed centres on strategic sites should be identified as local centres. This would ensure the retail impact of the centres would not require assessment at the planning application stage, and allow them to easily adapt in the future, thus making those new communities more sustainable.
- Cllr McCormick identified opportunities to develop the retail provision on the A33 north of Basingstoke (connecting Dunelm and Aldi) and on the A340 near the hospital.
- 1 respondent expressed concern about identifying new centres at this time due to uncertainty about future retail demand in light of impacts of Covid.
- 2 respondents noted the importance of retaining local shops and post offices outside the designated centres, including within rural communities.

#### **Question 8v: Do you think the boundaries of any Town, District or Local Centres and Primary Shopping Areas (as defined in the current Local Plan) need to be extended or reduced? If so, which and why?**

- 3 respondents considered that no change was required.

- 1 respondent indicated that the retail provision should reflect post-pandemic shopping habits, with a possible reduction in the need for retail floorspace in the centres, and a potentially greater need for local shops.

**Question 8w: Should the Local Plan Update retain the lower threshold for when an Impact Assessment for out of centre retail is required? If not, what should the threshold be?**

- 3 respondents supported the current threshold (which is set below the nationally-set threshold, and allows the impact of smaller schemes to be assessed). This was justified by the vulnerability of the borough's centres arising from Covid.
- 1 respondent indicated that the threshold should be as low as possible to support local shops and discourage out of centre development.
- 1 respondent indicated that the threshold should be raised (no reason was given).
- 1 respondent suggested it was too difficult to be certain until the impacts of Covid and changes to the use class order were understood.

**Question 8x: Would you support the replacement of out of centre retailing to other uses (for example, change of use to residential)?**

- The majority of respondents (10, including the landowner of an out of centre retail park), supported the principle of replacing out of centre retail floorspace with other uses.
- However, it was noted that this did not apply to local shops (particularly in villages). These provided a benefit to the local community and minimised the distance necessary to travel for essential items.
- The landowner of Brighton Hill Retail Park reported that it was difficult to maintain sufficient occupancy to keep their site viable, particularly given the proximity of St Michael's Retail Park. They stated that there was no physical or infrastructure-related reason why it could not be redeveloped for an alternative use.
- 1 respondent stated that out of centre rents should be allowed to naturally fall, and this would then encourage local businesses to occupy them rather than national retailers.
- 1 respondent noted residential development could be an important part of regeneration to support the post-Covid recovery. Another commented that residential should only be permitted as part of a mixed use redevelopment.
- 3 respondents said no (that they did not agree that out of centre retailing should be replaced). 1 cited concerns about infrastructure and two did not give a reason for this.

**Question 8y: Do you have any comments on the future role of Basingstoke town centre?**

- It was identified that the Local Plan needed a strong town centre first policy to ensure it remained the focus for retail, social infrastructure, and cultural/leisure uses. Any strategy would need to be informed by an understanding of post-Covid shopping and working patterns, and recent changes to permitted development rights.
- Cllr Cubitt suggested that a more visionary approach was required for the Top of Town, with a high quality environment that celebrated the area's heritage, with sheltered housing and tree-lined streets. She also suggested that the one way system should be changed.
- 4 respondents identified the Top of Town's potential for local/individual shops. It was suggested that rents needed to be reduced to incentivize this. It was also suggested that the size of the outdoor market should be increased.
- 2 respondents suggested that the town centre needed to offer something unique to stop it becoming a 'clone town' (like, for example, the canal that was proposed 20 years ago).
- 4 respondents said that they thought the town centre should become more mixed use and focus upon entertainment, arts and leisure. Two respondents noted the importance of high density residential.
- Respondents thought that the council should encourage and support live entertainment during day and evening.
- In terms of its physical form, two respondents said that the town centre needed some more green space, and suggested that Festival Place should be remodelled to provide better connectivity to other parts of the town centre.
- 1 respondent stated that parking needed to be improved (highlighting, for example, the access to Festival Place car park).
- HCC Highways noted the importance of any future town centre land use plans being developed in tandem with transport plans. Examples of this related to car parking strategies and MRT priority.
- It was suggested that The Malls should be converted to residential use to rebalance supply and demand for retail floorspace.
- The promoter of a major residential-led site stated that it was important to identify areas for residential development that were well connected to the town centre, so its residents could provide additional footfall.

**Question 8z: Do you have any comments on the regeneration of the Basingstoke Leisure Park, including suitable future uses?**

- 1 respondent supported the regeneration proposals with enhanced leisure facilities and a retail outlet.
- 8 respondents (including Cllrs Cubitt and McCormick) stated that the Leisure Park should be retained for leisure uses only. This is important to protect Basingstoke town centre, particularly in light of Covid. 1 further respondent suggested that the retail element should be scaled down.

- 1 respondent suggested that if retail was to be included it should have a distinctly different offer to the town centre.
- Maria Miller MP stated that the Local Plan facilities information needed updating and that residents needed to see a clear plan.
- 1 respondent suggested that the redevelopment should cater for both local people and visitors. Two respondents suggested that the leisure park should remain a local facility rather than a regional centre. It was noted that attracting visitors from a wide catchment would encourage car journeys, cause additional congestion, and be environmentally unsustainable.
- 2 respondents supported a mixed use redevelopment with some residential to improve viability. It was suggested that renovation would be better than wholesale redevelopment for environmental reasons.
- Any redevelopment should leave room for wildlife (which contributes to leisure). The nature reserve at Saunders Field should be brought forward now.
- The ice rink is an important local amenity. Suggested that the Local Plan should protect the ice rink, and set out a strategy to enhance it as part of a major multi-functional stadium.
- HCC Highways noted the importance of a well linked public transport, walking and cycle corridor between the site and the town centre, as well as demand management measures to influence car usage.

## **Section 9 – Natural and Historic Environment**

### **Question 9a: Are there any areas of land which should be designated as a new Strategic Gap? If yes, please explain where and why?**

- 8 respondents were in general support for the designation of strategic gaps to prevent coalescence and retain heritage and distinctive character and integrity of settlements.

The following more detailed points were made:

- East Woodhay Parish Council referred to the issue of coalescence and sprawl into the countryside outside SPBs due to the pressure imposed by discussions over the development of SHELAA sites and a relatively large number of application for ‘infill’ type development within the countryside, some gaining permission through appeal due to the council’s lack of land supply. This ribbon development is unacceptable.
- Considered that masterplans can be utilised to identify sensitive landscape locations and then plan accordingly (as with North Manydown).
- The A33 should not become a through-road for ‘Readingstoke’ – issue raised by Chineham Parish Council.

The following areas are suggested for designation as new strategic gap:

- **Land between North Waltham and South-West Basingstoke** – There is a distinct ridgeline between the two settlements providing a natural topographic separation, as well as the roads providing a ‘harder’ boundary. A strategic gap in this location would prevent coalescence and protect the rural identity of communities close to Basingstoke – proposed by North Waltham Parish Council.
- **Land between the M3 Motorway and Cliddesden** – it is an access gateway to the North Hampshire Downs and south of Basingstoke. The gap would prevent the coalescence of Basingstoke with Cliddesden and would preserve its designated conservation area, listed buildings and heritage. The area has a rural identity and many residents in Brighton Hill, Beggarwood and Hatch Warren use it as a recreational resource – promoted by 90 respondents, numerous individuals, a Borough Councillor, Cliddesden Community Conservation Group, STaNHd, Ellisfield Parish Council, Wield Parish Council and Upton Grey Parish Council.
- **The land area of promoted site CLID011 (Upper Swallick Garden Village)** – if this [development] were to be allowed to go ahead it would completely destroy the identity of the existing village of Cliddesden and the impact on the whole area just south of the M3 would suffer irreparable damage.
- **The land between the Candovers and Cliddesden** – a strategic gap in this location would offer protection to the ecologically sensitive and fragile Itchen Water catchment area – proposed by Candovers Parish Council.
- **Land between Oakley and Deane** – these are two separate civil parishes and Oakley has its own Settlement Policy Boundary. Justification for this proposal arises from responses to recent planning applications (20/01586/OUT and 20/03558/OUT). Such a strategic gap may well have avoided a housing site allocation in Deane CP being made within the Oakley & Deane NP – proposed by CPRE Hampshire and supported by individuals.
- **Land between Oakley and Basingstoke** – given the large scale development being proposed around Oakley Village, strategic gaps should be in place between the village and Basingstoke and planned developments such as the Health and Wellness Centre, and robustly defended against any future development.
- **The Loddon Valley** – suggested as Strategic Gap by SOLVE.
- **The land between Highclere and Woolton Hill** – this would be completely destroyed if site EW004 was allocated – supported by Highclere Neighbourhood Planning Group and individuals
- **The land between the houses on Enborne Row and Wash Water** – this would be destroyed if site EW005 was allocated – supported by Highclere Neighbourhood Planning Group and individuals.
- **South, west and east of Overton** – the AONB provides a break to the north of the railway line however there is strong opposition to development of the North Field to the north of the church. There was always a gap between Overton and Southington – previously the fields to the west of Dellands Lane were not developed for this reason – promoted by Overton Parish Council.

- **Bramley MOD Camp** – If it is ever “retired” it should be made safe and returned to agricultural and recreational open space in its entirety, not for more development –promoted by Bramley Parish Council.
- In relation to the new Strategic Gaps proposed around North Waltham and Dummer in the Council’s draft Vision for South West Basingstoke, to ensure a joined-up approach, the need for and function of any new Strategic Gaps in the area should be considered alongside the future of the Basingstoke-Oakley Strategic Gap and future development proposals in the area.
- The three villages Oakley, Dummer and North Waltham must be protected.

Those opposed to the designation of strategic gaps provided the following points:

- Suggested a Borough Masterplan developed to identify the areas most needed to either protect or change use. This cannot be done piecemeal.
- It is not appropriate to identify any additional land as Strategic Gap.
- Question the purpose of the policy, particularly as it would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing to assist in meeting the Borough’s housing needs. New development can often be located on the edge of settlements without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them, or resulting in the loss of openness or character.

The following more general comments were also made:

- If new strategic gaps are to be introduced, they must be supported by robust evidence as set out in the PPG and must allow for flexibility which assesses any harm to the visual and functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a development proposal.
- The designation of any Strategic Gap should be based upon clear stated aims to achieve its intended purpose. The current adopted Local Plan Policy EM2 explains that the designation seek to prevent coalescence and does not imply a high landscape quality. This important distinction should be carrier forward as required to inform whether or not a Strategic Gap designation is necessary.
- The designation of Strategic Gaps to ensure rural settlements can maintain their distinct identity and physical separation was welcomed, however, concerns raised that such planning tools are not misapplied simply to prevent otherwise sustainable growth of communities.
- It should be considered whether policies relating to landscaping and design would be sufficient to inform and not prohibit well-designed and appropriate development coming forward in sustainable locations.

**Question 9b: Are there any Strategic Gaps which should be deleted? If yes, where and why?**

- 6 respondents including Chineham Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, SOLVE and individuals were of the view there are no strategic gaps that should be deleted.

**Question 9c: Should any existing Strategic Gap boundary be updated? If yes, where and why?**

- **The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Sherborne St John** - the strategic gap should be retained but reviewed in line with the town's future development needs and appropriate landscape evidence. A landscape site appraisal including an assessment of landscape character and sensitivity produced to accompany the land promotion at Weybrook Park notes a level of self-containment linked to the strong tree belt and wider vegetation following Aldermaston Road. This encloses the site from wider views, where visual separation between settlements would not be diminished by development. Aldermaston road presents a key physical barrier to enclosure of Basingstoke, ensuring the future protection of Sherborne St John.
- **The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Sherborne St John** – The Strategic Gap should be updated to take into account the consent granted on land fronting Cranes Road on a housing site that came forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. The extent of the Strategic Gap should be limited to a point between the furthest southern extent of the existing built up area boundary of the village and allowed to 'round off' towards the Aldermaston Road.
- **The strategic gaps between Kempshott and Oakley** – these strategic gaps should be extended to run from the settlement borders of each area to prevent the extension of Kempshott into Oakley, thus maintaining Oakley as a village and Kempshott as a semi-rural residential area and protecting our Roman roads and green spaces.
- **The Basingstoke-Oakley Strategic Gap** – HCC Property Services (as a landowner) suggests that this strategic gap should be updated to accommodate the potential inclusion of Green Infrastructure (technically development) that may form part of Southern Manydown, should the allocation proceed to the further stages of the LPU. Should this be supported by the Council, the Strategic Gap boundary would also need to be re-drawn to support growth at Southern Manydown.
- Should the remaining Manydown Area be allocated for development in the LPU, it will be necessary to review this strategic gap. If the Gap is judged to still be necessary, while the extent of the Gap will most likely reduce, it should be noted that a reduction in Gap does not need to compromise its function. The coalescence of Basingstoke and Oakley can still be prevented, and their separate identities maintained.
- **Basingstoke/Chineham – Bramley/Sherfield on Loddon Strategic gap** – Consideration should be given to a review of historic gaps to assess the potential for some land to contribute to meeting the Borough's housing growth. Consideration should be given to reducing the size of the gap mentioned above to allow for a sustainable expansion of the village to meet local housing needs and provide improvements to local community infrastructure (The Reading Road Sherfield on Loddon promoted site). The

promoted Reading Road site does not have a sensitive landscape (as concluded in a Landscape Study of the site).

- **Chineham-Bramley Strategic Gap** – This should be extended further west to ensure that there is no connection of Bramley to Chineham. This would ensure the possibility of further development northwards connecting Bramley to Chineham would be eliminated – issue raised by Bramley Parish Council.
- **Basing Fen, Mill Field & Basing Common** – these should be protected and enhanced – issue raised by SOLVE

The following points were also raised in relation to the review of gap boundaries:

- North Waltham Parish Council stated that existing strategic gaps should only be updated if it increases or reinforces separation.
- 4 respondents including Overton Parish Council and Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council don't believe that the existing gaps need updating.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council believes that the existing Strategic Gaps designation should be fully adhered to as it delineates a minimum separation for the existing communities such as Sherfield on Loddon, Sherfield Park, Bramley, Old Basing and Chineham.
- If the strategic gap policies are to be retained, then it must be supported by robust evidence as set out in the PPG and must allow for flexibility which assesses any harm to the visual and functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a development proposal.
- Any review of strategic gaps should appropriately take account of proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan.
- It is suggested that a review of the Strategic gap boundaries is undertaken in order to identify sustainable, edge of settlement greenfield sites that may be suitable for allocation for housing, where they would not compromise the function of the strategic gap (e.g. Land at Kiln Farm).

## Section 9.4 Green Infrastructure and Local Green Spaces

A number of specific comments were made in relation to section 9.4:

- Woodland Trust set out support for policies to improve areas of poor green infrastructure connectivity and to provide an overall increase in net canopy cover.
- It was suggested there should be a target for each ward to bring existing areas up to a similar standard as the target for new development, including establishing wildlife corridors. The changes will improve quality of life, mental and physical health, and make the borough's residential areas much more attractive places to live.
- Natural England referred to a strategic approach to Green Infrastructure being required to ensure its protection and enhancement.
- Natural England set out support for the continued use of the Green Infrastructure Strategy within the LPU.
- Consideration should be given to the approach that rural settlements are linked by shared green infrastructure, facilities and services to potentially

create new and existing satellite villages which meet the demands for the future whilst retaining individual local identities and distinctiveness.

- Woodland Trust concerned that potential canopy cover targets are too vague with reference to possibly setting targets at ward level and strongly urge setting a borough-wide target for tree canopy cover and a minimum canopy cover standard for development sites in order to meet climate action plan targets. It is suggested a development site target of 30% should be pursued through the retention of important trees, appropriate tree replacement (of those lost through development, ageing / disease) and new planting to support Green Infrastructure.
- The Woodland Trust support the protection of local green spaces including accessible woodland. It is recommended that standards for access to natural green space and woodland should be included for existing and new developments –Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard recommends that all people should have accessible natural green space:
  - Of at least two hectares in size, no more than 300m (five minutes’ walk) from home.
  - At least one accessible 20-hectare site within 2km of home.
  - One accessible 100-hectare site within 5km of home.
  - One accessible 500-hectare site within 10km of home.
  - A minimum of one hectare of statutory local nature reserves per 1,000 people

The Woodland Trust has developed a Woodland Access Standard to complement the Accessible Natural Green Space Standard. This recommends that:

- That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size.
- That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people’s homes.
- Sheffield on Loddon Parish Council stated that all residents should be able to access Green Space within a 10-minute walk. The Local Plan should establish a principle that all development should provide nature filled Green spaces linked by safe walking routes.
- Natural England considered that in addition to formal Local Green Spaces, space should also be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process to allocate open green spaces for environmental enhancement which allocate housing, for the purpose of offsetting environmental impacts (further information in full representation).
- They went on to recommended that consideration is given to adjusting Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policy to allow the widening of the criteria of Local Green Spaces to allow the designation of spaces to address environmental impacts from development within Neighbourhood Plan areas.
- Furthermore they state that the plan should be provision for appropriate quantity and quality of green space to meet identified local needs as outlined in para. 96 of the NPPF (further information and standards available in full representation).

- Hart DC confirmed that they are currently preparing a strategy to promote a Green Grid across the District. The creation of green corridors between all settlements to encourage sustainable healthy transport and provide cycles for hire to enable, green spaces and other key destinations to encourage walking, cycling and other forms of sustainable healthy transport. They will also be looking to work jointly with Hampshire County Council on a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). Whilst the strategy is still evolving it would be beneficial if possible, to identify any cross-boundary links and opportunities.
- Natural England advised that the Plan should include policies to ensure protection and enhancement of public rights of way and national trails. Recognition should be given to the value of rights of way and access to the natural environment in relation to health and wellbeing and links to the wider green infrastructure network.

**Question 9d: Would you support the designation of Local Green Spaces through the Local Plan Update and neighbourhood plans? If not, why is this?**

Support for designation of Local Green Spaces:

- 104 respondents were in general agreement with the designation of LGS through the LPU.
- Maria Miller MP supported the designation of Local Green Spaces with the full involvement of the community. She suggested that Old Down should now be designated as a Nature Reserve.
- Local Green Spaces should be brought forward in conjunction with new developments to create meaningful places for recreation, biodiversity and ecology that are cohesive with the existing settlements.
- Upton Grey PC welcomed Local Green Space designations so long as their protection is greater than that of a Conservation Area.
- Bramley Parish Council supported the designation of Local Green Spaces. Open Local spaces associated with new development are always associated with play areas and suggest there should be areas which are green space with walks and resting places for the local community rather than purely children's play areas.
- CPRE commented that Local Green Spaces designations are especially welcome given the afforded level of protection consistent with that of Green Belt land.
- The designation of Local Green Spaces is essential to protect the character and natural environment from being destroyed by developers. Such designations must be upheld by the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans.
- Local Green Spaces should be determined on a local case basis.
- Local Green Spaces are essential to communities wellbeing and not just a 'nice to have'.
- Local Green Spaces are a vital health need for humans and wildlife.
- Local Green Space designation is considered a good opportunity to facilitate the setting up of community groups (similar to that in Beggarwood) where

people can be empowered to come together to look after their local space e.g. litterpicking, tree planting and watering, wildlife protection schemes etc.

- The designation of Local Green Spaces were supported where justified and supported by evidence and provided it is in accordance with the PPG and case law. The LPA should consider whether designation of the Local Green Spaces may inhibit projects that meet identified needs and requirements central to the Local Plan's vision and objectives.
- Kingsclere Parish Council stated that they secured 11 Local Green Spaces through their Neighbourhood Plan
- Sheffield on Loddon Parish Council fully supported the designation of Local Green Spaces in its Neighbourhood Plan and would continue to do so for any update of the Local Plan.

Opposed to designation of Local Green Spaces:

- Concern raised that the designation of Local Green Spaces through neighbourhood planning can often be used as an anti-development tool by Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups to prevent development on what are otherwise suitable sites. It is considered vital that there is control over its use and landowners should be required to provide consent prior to the designation of land.

### **Question 9e: Are there any specific areas that you consider meet the criteria and should be designated?**

The following specific areas are promoted for designation as Local Green Space, with the number of representations made in support in brackets:

- **Land surrounding The Gables, Whitchurch** (different boundary to SHELAA reference WHIT001) (Reps/support = 3)
- **Promoted Site: The Gables (SHELAA reference: WHIT001)** – promoted by Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 327)
- **Land at the Knowlings, Whitchurch (SHELAA reference: WHIT006)** – promoted by numerous individuals, Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 376)
- **Promoted Site: Land north of Cricket Ground (SHELAA reference: WHIT008)** – promoted by Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 459)
- **Promoted Site: Cricket ground and land north of cricket ground (SHELAA reference: WHIT009)** – promoted by Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/Support = 458)
- **Promoted Site: Whitchurch Glebe (SHELAA reference: WHIT010)** – promoted by Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 457)
- **South East Whitchurch (SHELAA reference: WHIT011)** – promoted by individuals and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 3)

- **Promoted Site: Land at Newbury Road (SHELAA reference: WHIT013)** – promoted by numerous individuals, Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 328)
- **Land East of Whitchurch (SHELAA reference: WHIT014)** – promoted by numerous individuals, Whitchurch Conservation Group and Whitchurch Town Council (Reps/support = 329)
- **Fields at the back of Church End / Wildmoor Lane / Moulshay Lane** (Reps/support = 1)
- **Newnham Lane Pyotts Hill** – Promoted by Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council, SOLVE and Individuals (Reps/Support = 2)
- **Broadhurst Grove** - Promoted by Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council and SOLVE (Reps/support = 2)
- **Saxon Way** - Promoted by Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council and SOLVE (Reps/support = 2)
- **Area Adjacent to Burney Bit and Georgina Gardens, Pamber Heath** (Reps/support = 2)
- **St Mark's Meadow** – promoted by Hatch Warren Nature Group (Reps/support = 1)
- **Mapledurwell Pond** – promoted by Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC (Reps/support = 1)
- **Up Nately Pond** - promoted by Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC (Reps/support = 1)
- **Ampport Area, Sherfield Park** – Promoted by Sherfield Park PC. (Reps/support = 1)
- **Tollhouse Meadow/Flood Plain, Chineham** – Promoted by Chineham PC (Reps/support = 1)
- **Promoted site: Land to the east of Farleigh Road(SHELAA reference: CLID001)** – (Reps/support = 1)
- **Areas north and south of Bramley SPB** – promoted by Bramley Parish Council (Reps/support =1)
- East Woodhay PC referred to the draft Neighbourhood Plan which proposes a number of green spaces which will be reviewed by the community at the time of consultation.

### **Water Quality (paras 9.5.1 – 9.5.5)**

Whilst there were no specific questions relating to water quality, respondents made the following points:

- Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates support the aspirations to protect quality and quantity of water.
- Cllr Cubitt referred to the deterioration of the River Loddon. Water Cycle Study 1 (2007) was damning of the effects of further buildings and increased population of Basingstoke Town and it is clear that the River Loddon in 2019 is failing and genuine solutions are required before further development is permitted in Basingstoke.

- Concerns expressed that local water quality is below standard in several areas, yet there is only mention of passive activities such as monitoring. Action should be taken against failing water bodies and any other sources of contamination. Suggests Action Plan to improve local water quality.
- Nitrates Offsetting, for example on the Wates development at East of Station Road (Oakley) which was refused needs to be explored more, in terms of having alternative options with public benefits / use for local people (e.g. country parks and woodlands)
- Nitrates offsetting should be achieved on land within the same ownership as the proposed development and/or within the same parish and agreed with NE
- Natural England expect the Plan to consider the strategic impacts on water quality and resources as outlined in paragraph 170 of the NPPF based on up to date evidence. The LPU should ensure such impacts on protected sites and other important habitats are properly considered, particularly where allocating sites.
- Candover PC requested more emphasis in the plan on the importance of the Itchen catchment and its ecological sensitivity and fragility.
- Chineham PC referred to Petty's Brook, which flows into the River Loddon and therefore needs to become part of the local water quality protection and improvement plans.

### **Flood Risk (paras 9.6.1 – 9.6.2)**

Whilst there were no specific questions relating to flood risk, respondents made the following points:

- HCC suggested this section should mention catchment based planning which involves all water management in line with the Lead Local Flood Authority's Local Flood and Water Management Strategy.
- Natural England expect the Plan to address flood risk management in line with the paragraphs 155-165 of the NPPF based on up to date evidence.
- The County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority were pleased to see reference to groundwater. However, suggest should be cautious when stating that only 3% of borough is in flood plain as this could be interpreted as playing down the risk of flooding. More emphasis should be placed on surface water flooding, especially with the increase in rain events from climate change and the impacts on the urban nature of Basingstoke.
- Thames Water consider the flood risk sustainability objectives should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. Thames Water advocate an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system.
- Thames Water and Southern Water have provided details of the wastewater and sewerage infrastructure requirements for the promoted sites/settlements.

- Absence of any mention of specific flood mitigation strategies such as the planting of trees and hedgerows – recommend partnering with Woodland Trust

The following specific local flooding issues were set out by respondents:

- 75 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Cliddesden, Conservation Group and Wield PC, Ellisfield PC and Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC referred to substantial surface water problems in Cliddesden, Winslade and along the A339 along with problems around the village centre, pond and in the field adjacent to Farleigh Road. Roads act as accelerators of rainfall into the village pond increasing the flash flooding.
- Tadley Town Council set out the areas suffering from poor surface water drainage: Sandford Road, Whitedown Road, Barlows Road (within Bishopswood School), Wigmore Road, Newchurch Road, Cedar Close, Silchester Road, Reynards Close, Silverdale Road, Furze Road, Bishopswood Lane (by the golf course and in-between entrances to Sheridan Crescent), junction of New Road with A340 by swimming pool and Heath End Road.
- Upton Grey PC refer to surface water problems along Weston Road.
- Candover PC concerned about potential damage that new development would place in areas already at risk of flooding and would hope that local knowledge of flooding would also be used in assessment.

### **Question 9f: Should the Local Plan Update require more than 10% biodiversity net gain?**

34 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC, Old Basing PC, Pamber PC and NP Group, Maria Miller MP, Natural England and Cllr McCormick supported a requirement of more than 10% net gain.

- East Woodhay PC suggest the requirement should be implemented prior to 2024.
- Sheffield on Loddon Parish Council believes should be set at a minimum of 25%, especially if farmland is subsumed by housing development
- Natural England suggest a strategic approach for networks of biodiversity. Plans should set out the approach to delivering net gains for biodiversity considered for all aspects of the plan and development types, including transport proposals, housing and community infrastructure.
- Maria Miller MP suggests set a more ambitious target for the protection of our area. A strategic approach to biodiversity compensation could be coordinated with opportunities to mitigate nitrates to protect water quality.
- The DEFRA metric only includes habitats, not species. The council should be looking for greater than 10% to reflect all impacts that reduce the functional use of green space for species.
- Depends on accuracy of submission, environmental assessment, accuracy of metric and quality of proposed 10%

- Woodland Trust suggested by setting a more ambitious target, the LP increases the chances that worthwhile amounts of net gain will be delivered, given the possibility that initiatives intended to deliver such net gain may fall short in practice.
- Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates state that Upper Swallick can comfortably meet this objective over a large area – in addition, Council should use this as part of their selection criteria for sites. Believe better gains are possible on much larger sites.
- Ideally 15% or 20% if possible and should require specific wildlife friendly measures as a condition of planning permission (swift bricks, hedgehog highways, street trees, allotments, wildflower verges, minimum of 25% tree canopy cover and low-level street lighting) as these measures will have a measurable impact on declining species. High quality green developments can also attract further investment from businesses and visitors
- There needs to be consideration of the long-term biodiversity of the site and surrounding land when deciding what percentage of net gain is needed. This should be aligned to the needs of the borough as outlined in the biodiversity plan for the borough
- Need to ensure that targets of the UK biodiversity action plan and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) strategic goals and 'Aichi Targets' targets, which are mandated, are met. Ensure new developments provide sufficient green spaces, including wild spaces including woodland and meadows, not just mowed parks.
- Nature recovery networks and green arteries also need consideration as they will impact on the net gain requirements
- Falcon Developments suggest only for Major Development sites and small sites should be dealt with case by case on what can be realistically achieved.
- Thakeham Homes have recently achieved 41% on a site in Surrey. They are working with Wildlife Trust and Surrey Wildlife Trust to increase their current target of 10% to 20% by 2025.

14 respondents including Sherfield Park PC and Gladman Homes object to requirement of more than 10% net gain:

- Produce 10% with success and then increase if necessary
- Fowler Architecture comment that while the LPU could encourage greater net gain, it should not be determinative, in line with national guidance which does not set any benchmark for the precise quantum of net gain that must be achieved.
- Vistry, Aster Group, Home Builders Federation, Catesby, Bloor, Sovereign Housing, Persimmon Homes and Savills all suggested any increase would need to be fully justified – in the absence of this, this is not endorsed. If a metric is not set at a national scale, the LPU should ensure flexibility within its policies to take account of site-specific circumstances. In any event, the metric lacks refinements and not all enhancement measures can be quantified therefore the LPU policies must allow for consideration of other enhancements which provide an important contribution to BNG.

- Taylor Wimpey argue the Local Plan should not exceed the threshold due to be set in the Environment Bill of 10% gain. This will enable any scheme to balance meeting biodiversity net gain requirements with other greenspace objectives, such as recreation, sports and general amenity greenspace for informal use, whilst also enabling development to remain viable and enable quicker delivery of development.
- AECOM suggest the LPU shouldn't prescribe percentages as there are other environmental net gains that need to be considered holistically site by site.
- Catesby and Bloor request that the council identify projects which can allow developments to achieve off-site offset net gain
- Bargate Homes, SN Development and HCC Property suggested likely to threaten deliverability of development particularly smaller sites. If this is pursued, robust evidence is required.
- Chineham PC requested that Will Tollhouse Meadow in Chineham be included in the LPU
- In the event that on-site net gains of 10% cannot be achieved (for example on smaller sites), the County Council in its capacity as landowner would recommend that a future policy allows for off-site biodiversity projects to be identified for developers to contribute towards in order to ensure the delivery of new development that is otherwise acceptable through the Plan period.
- Non-major development should be considered on a case by case basis.

**Question 9g: How should off-site compensation measures be coordinated and/or located?**

- Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC comment that wildlife habitats, wildlife corridors need to be integral to all planning policy.
- Cooper Estates Strategic Land, Falconer Developments and Vistry anticipate that the Council would need to take ownership of an off-site compensation scheme. Similar schemes have been utilised in other parts of the country. A well known example is that pioneered by Warwickshire County Council. Similar to approach of SANGs and could include innovative approaches such as biodiversity improvement zones – however, all measures should be coherent in a strategy and must be timely
- Sherfield on Loddon PC stated that in the past, the Borough has shown an inability to enforce its requirements. Compensation measures should be a requirement in all planning permissions with substantial penalties if they are not met; effective enforcement will be key.
- Sherfield Park PC commented that off-site compensation measures are tokenistic at the moment. For example, a large bat house was constructed on the edge of Sherfield Park, however no maintenance programme was required. The structure had to be demolished because the wood became rotten. Therefore, there should be far more robust off-site plans and follow-up to ensure these measures deliver as intended.
- Overton PC suggested administered by the environment team at BDBC whilst Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC suggest

in consultation with and according to advice of the Wildlife Trust, HBIC and employing ecologists to work alongside planners.

- HCC Property Services suggest the Council may wish to consider a flexible approach in providing off-site mitigation for nitrate neutrality, as there may already be organisation legal frameworks in place.
- Taylor Wimpey suggested the council should support sites for allocation which can demonstrate on site biodiversity net gain, or on land within the control of the developer, as this will give greater certainty of achieving the requirement as the development progresses and avoid delay to site delivery whilst off site compensation measures come forward.
- Bargate Homes argued should meet the tests in para 56 of the NPPF and be close to the development. Where funded through CIL there can be more flexibility around how off-site compensation measures are coordinated and located.
- Fowler Architecture commented that the Local Plan Review should progress in tandem with a borough-wide off-site compensatory strategy that will enable mitigation to be secured and delivered. The implementation of the off-site compensation should be a borough-wide matter and a pooled approach towards contributions could be spent as a first priority within the parish or ward where the development is to take place, much in the same way as public open space contributions are currently assessed and secured.
- AECOM and HCC Property state any compensation measures should be reported in the Infrastructure Funding Statement and monitored in the AMR
- Prioritise on site first to retain important habitats and species. Thereafter focus on connections and stepping stones that deliver priority habitats and priority species with greatest longevity and value.

Several respondents were opposed to the delivery or any compensation offsite:

- Old Basing PC and a number of other respondents suggest abandon off-site compensation measures.
- Bramley PC suggested compensation delivered onsite through the planting of trees and water courses in open green spaces within the development.
- East Woodhay PC consider off-site options are a 'get out' clause – concern over how it will be monitored and measured.
- Pamber PC and NP Group suggested should place restriction on removal of biodiverse habitat unless there are exceptional circumstances (e.g. hedges and trees)
- Thakeham Homes stance was, all net gain should be achieved on site, however, they acknowledge this might not be viable on every site. Off-site should be kept to a minimum and used to make BNG within the vicinity of the site and in consultation with the community that benefits from the improvements.

**Question 9h: Are there any other key elements of biodiversity net gain that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update?**

- The establishment of Biodiversity Improvement Zones
- Cliddesden PC, Newnham PC suggested wildlife habitat networks and corridors should be central to all aspects of spatial strategy and the design and planning process.
- Bramley PC suggested the only way to ensure a 'net gain' is to leave existing key microenvironments alone, ensure they have freedom from pollution and disturbance, expand them and interconnect them. You can't just move them.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC considered the issue of water quality in the local rivers -the Loddon, Lyde and Test should be at the heart of any Biodiversity strategy; as should the condition of the Thames Basin Heath SPA.
- Cllr McCormick promoted the use of grass in gardens and minimising concrete and impervious materials to improve drainage. Promote use of undergrowth and green corridors for biodiversity.
- Old Basing PC commented that the Rivers Loddon, Lyde and Lightwater should be judged by the same criteria as the Test and Itchen.
- The Woodland Trust referred to encouraging development of a local metric for more urban/brownfield sites such as London Urban Greening Factor – this is because these sites have such a low level of biodiversity a 10% gain may not deliver much in practice (in terms of significant enhancements)
- Basingstoke's surface water and ground water should receive more attention. Not only Nitrates but also Phosphates [from septic tanks] into surface or ground water, because much of the Borough is not serviced by Mains Drainage.
- The Woodland Trust urge all off-site be delivered as part of a comprehensive Nature Recovery Network approach (including conservation, enhancement and connection of existing habitats including ancient woodland). Happy to contribute to mapping projects to identify best habitat opportunities for natural capital investment approach.
- Bloor commented that not all measures that assist with BNG can be quantified within the metric calculator and therefore there should be an element of discretion and consideration of site specific circumstances.
- A nature-rich approach - putting the natural environment at the heart of development and planning. Easy access to high-quality, wildlife rich natural green space produces improved, health, wellbeing and quality of life for residents.
- Connectivity - wildlife corridors both within developments and linking to the wider landscape and ecological networks beyond. These can double as walking and cycling corridors for residents to enjoy and improve physical health, also reduce use of polluting transport. They are key to sustainability.
- Wildlife-friendly buildings incorporating swift boxes, nest boxes, wildlife permeable boundaries for hedge hogs and other small mammals.
- Tree canopy cover - this should be a cornerstone of the council's whole approach to mitigating climate change, reducing flooding, improving air quality, improving quality of life for residents and adding hugely to biodiversity.
- Recommend Wildlife Trust's publication on 'Homes for people and wildlife' – and suggest we partner with them.

- Wildlife protections should extend to all new built development, including commercial
- Development must connect and join up – using the nature recovery networks and there must be links between green spaces within the borough
- North Hampshire Downs represents extremely precious landscape and should be protected
- River Loddon and Lyde River Basin and flood plains should be protected
- Thames Basin Heath SPA 10km buffer zone lies immediately east of Basingstoke and should be formally designated as an areas of significant importance to the SPA with land within the 10km buffer being protected and all new development strictly prohibited
- AECOM suggest LPU SA, site assessment and settlement study should consider impacts on the extent and condition of natural capital stocks.
- Native animals such as otters and watervoles returning to the River Test
- Council should reserve the right to require another independent ecological assessment to verify that assessments conducted by developers are fit for purpose.
- Council must develop a checklist of ecological assessment criteria that takes account of site and wider impacts and habitats and species, and another checklist of what can and cannot be included within the 10% gain. (for example developers should not be able to claim that gardens provide a functional contribution).
- The DEFRA metric only includes habitats, not species. The council should be looking for greater than 10% to reflect all impacts that reduce the functional use of green space for species.
- Seek multiple habitat types especially where site acts as a corridor between areas, so perhaps reflecting canopy down through shrub and scrub to grassland and even water if appropriate.
- Biodiversity in the UK is still in decline, especially when starting from 1970 and even more so from before that.
- Nitrogen deposition and runoff have big impacts on soils and waterways. The latter being especially impacted if adjacent land is intensively farmed.

**Question 9i: Are there any particular issues relating to air quality that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update?**

- A number of respondents including parish councils provided support for general mitigation and improvement to air quality should be recognised within the Local Plan as part of a sustainable approach to development.
- Maria Miller MP welcomed the joint working with Hampshire County Council to put in relevant measures to improve air quality, as part of its Horizon 2050. Implementation of an air quality policy in the LPU should give special consideration to residential areas close to main roads, motorway and other traffic infrastructure where air quality is lowest.
- Maria Miller MP suggested encouraging the use of electric cars
- There should be increased measurement of air quality

- Natural England commented that there is the expectation that the Plan will address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment. It should address the traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and SSSIs. One of the main issues which should be considered are proposals which are likely to generate additional nitrogen emissions as a result of increased traffic, which can be damaging to the natural environment (further information available in full representation).
- Locating development close to existing centres can promote sustainable transport modes and a focus on walking and cycling that reduce reliance on private vehicle and therefore reduce impacts on air quality from growth.
- SOLVE suggested reduce rat-running and consequent air pollution by only having one turn off the A30 at the traffic light at A30 / Byfleet Avenue.
- 49 respondents including STaNHd and Ellisfield Parish Council commented that air quality would be adversely affected by the increase in traffic volumes from new development.
- The LPU should reference reports from Basingstoke Transition Network
- The consultation material does not mention air quality in Section 5.6 where transport and movement are discussed. Transport, carbon emissions and air quality are intrinsically linked, but reference is only made to targeting carbon emission reductions, there is no mention of the council targeting improved air quality.
- In order to improve air quality across the borough the council needs to prioritise improvements to sustainable transport modes as opposed to punishing car owners. Improvements to sustainable transport modes have the potential to significantly reduce private car travel, resulting in reduced carbon emissions and improved air quality across the Borough, assisting the Council to meet its sustainability aspirations.
- All busy roads, especially the A30, A33, A339, A340, B3400, the ring road and the M3 should be monitored, not just for carbon emissions and nitrous oxides, but particles of 2.5µm or smaller.
- Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council raised concerns that air quality in Sherfield on Loddon Parish is affected by the frequent queues of traffic on the A33 and C32 and would urge the updated Local Plan to adopt measures to encourage free flowing traffic.
- East Woodhay Parish Council commented that the LPU should reflect that within countryside areas, any development which encourages more vehicular activity is unacceptable, noting the affect on ait quality and the commitment of BDBC to the declared Environmental [Climate] Emergency.
- There are well-known and well documented poor air quality 'hotspots' in Basingstoke, the Hospital and Brighton Hill, plus many more. This need addressing as a priority, through travel management and tougher restrictions on private cars in these areas (i.e. residents only restrictions). Public transport needs to be improved through Mass Rapid Transit.
- HCC Highways suggested that the LPU should take into account HCC's Climate Emergency Strategy 2020-2025 which is focused around the core

principles to avoid, reduce, replace, offset. Any supplementary environmental policies that follow from the strategy should also be referred to in preparing the draft Local Plan.

- HCC Highways commented that road transport account for 37% of Hampshire's carbon outputs and the priority for transport will be to work with partners to develop a more holistic approach for communities and places that ultimately reduces the need to travel, increases the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport, alongside supporting and promoting the electrification agenda.
- HCC Highways commented that should exceedances of Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulates increase in certain areas of the Borough (most likely the ringway as identified by JAQU in 2018) this will need to be addressed by assessing whether traffic management techniques such as lower speed limits can be used as targeted measures to reduce the levels to acceptable thresholds.
- HCC Highways advised that it will be critical to ensure that the transport network is resilient and plans for the current and future impacts of climate change. The Highway Authority's working practices in terms of materials used in construction can be as environmentally friendly and as carbon neutral as possible.
- Several respondents including Chineham Parish Council Chineham commented that the Incinerator should be reflected in the LPU regarding air quality.
- The Sustainability Appraisal, Site Assessment Methodology Report and Settlement Study Report should recognise specific allocation proposals that support active modes and reduce the need to travel overall.
- The negative air quality effect associated with tree removal within any new development should be mitigated by a requirement to replace the lost trees with an additional 10% margin provided.
- Bramley Parish Council suggested that the policy needs to take into account changing patterns with a huge increase in home working and reduction in commuting.
- Bramley Parish Council commented that public transport needs to be efficient, fast, frequent and zero-carbon. Modes include small frequent busses, light rail/tram, ride-on-demand.
- Bramley Parish Council referred to the level crossing/C32 studies. If a Parish is forward thinking enough to install air quality monitoring equipment then it should be considered valid evidence.

## **Section 9.9 Heritage**

There were no specific questions on heritage, however the following points were raised by respondents:

- East Woodhay Parish Council concerned that not enough weight or consideration is afforded to heritage within the planning application process. The principles must be properly considered at all times.

- Bramley Parish Council commented that developments should not have a detrimental effect on heritage assets of the community or on conservation areas.
- Maria Miller MP suggested that in addition to the protection of heritage sites, need to avoid development leading to coalescence with surrounding communities and villages in Basingstoke, which could lead to them losing their distinctive identity.

Historic England make a number of detailed representations concerning heritage:

- Reference to Conservation Principles and Historic England published Good Practice Advice and Advice Notes, it is recommended these are reviewed as part of Local Plan preparation.
- The evidence base for the plan should be proportionate, comprehensive and robust. They list a range of available sources.
- A good strategy will offer a positive approach throughout the whole plan whereby the historic environment is considered not just as a standalone topic but as an integral part of the plan. A good strategy will also be spatially specific, unique to the area, describing the local characteristics of the area and responding accordingly with policies that address the local situation.
- Strongly encourage provision for the historic environment throughout the plan, not solely within heritage focussed policies
- Inclusion of strategic policy addressing heritage in line with paragraph 20 of the NPPF recommend.
- Development management policies welcomed specifically for Archaeology, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, Heritage at Risk, and the inclusion of renewable technologies within conservation areas and with regard to historic buildings and the wider historic landscape.
- Conservation Area new or updated evidence should be used to support the Plan.
- Expect to see appropriate references to 'setting' in policies, a focus on distance or visibility is not appropriate.
- Recommend that as a minimum, criteria for identifying non-designated heritage assets included in the Plan, with a local list of assets.
- Seek a requirement for consideration of the historic environment within the design policies and in relation to any tall buildings policies.
- Landscape character assessments should include assessment of the landscape value relating to any scheduled monuments and their settings.
- Consideration of streetscape, particularly given the issues of connectivity and traffic management is an important issue. For streetscape improvements suggest using Historic England's published advice.
- The retention of historic or significant shop fronts is often integral to the character of these buildings and that of the wider street scene. The LPU should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shop front features.
- Regarding Green Infrastructure, landscapes, parks, open spaces and routes often have heritage interest, and it would be helpful to highlight this. It is

important to consider green infrastructure not only in terms of the natural environment, health and recreation, but also the role it can play in conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

## **Section 10 – Meeting Housing Needs**

### **Question 10a: How much discount should be applied to the rent level on rented affordable homes to ensure they are able to meet local needs?**

- The most common response was that the rate of discount should be informed by a housing needs assessment and strategic viability assessment, based upon an understanding of incomes and prices. It was suggested that this evidence would need to take into account the impacts of Covid.
- 3 respondents supported rents being set at 80% of market value (affordable rent).
- Cllr McCormick suggested a discount of 50% would be appropriate.
- 1 Registered Provider (RP) commented that rents should be no more than the higher of 80% market rent or Local Housing Allowance.
- A developer raised concerns about reducing rents to less than 80% of market value as this could result in viability issues. Social rented properties could be provided with grant.
- A parish council suggested that the Plan should set a mandatory requirement for a proportion of social rented properties (at 60% of rent), as affordable rent was still unaffordable to many.
- 1 RP commented that it was important to set clear requirements at the outset so all RPs were bidding on a level playing field.
- 1 RP stated that in order to balance affordability, it may be necessary to consider social rent on one-bedroom properties and affordable rent on others (due to particular affordability issues with 1-bed affordable rent).
- 1 RP commented that the council should not cap rents in perpetuity. Government policy allows rents to increase over time and this is necessary because their management and maintenance costs increase each year. BDBC is unusual among local authorities in doing this, and while it continues to apply, that particular RP will not deliver any more rented homes in the borough.
- It was also suggested that the council could be more proactive in securing discounted rented homes, either by providing funding or delivering homes on land it owned.
- A number of respondents commented that the term 'affordable' was misleading or meaningless.

### **Question 10b: Which low cost home ownership products could be most suitable in the borough?**

- The most common response was that this should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, taking into account the full range of products set out in the NPPF's definition of affordable housing (and emerging products like First Homes).
- 3 respondents expressed general support for all types of low-cost home ownership.
- 3 RPs commented that shared ownership was a very successful product with high demand in the borough.
- A developer stated that they also supported shared ownership and suggested the requirement should be increased to 40-50% (of the affordable housing).
- However, 1 parish council respondent expressed concern about the shared ownership model, and that residents can get locked into unsellable properties.
- Cllr McCormick suggested that the council should provide interest-free loans. However, 1 respondent specifically stated that this should not be the role of the council.

**Question 10c: Are there any principles that should inform the types of products that we seek?**

- The most common response was that any policy requirements should be informed by an assessment of local needs and affordability. It should be viability tested as part of the overall Local Plan.
- A key theme in the responses was the need for flexibility. This would:
  - allow developments to respond to changing local housing needs over the plan period.
  - allow the location of development and site-specific characteristics to influence the product type, reflect the size, type and character of different sites; and
  - provide a framework to accommodate new products that could potentially arise in the future. The national definition of affordable housing was likely to be updated more frequently than the Local Plan, so it was suggested that the policy should include direct references to national policy.
- An RP noted the importance of sticking to mainstream products, as bespoke products may cause problems with lenders and delay delivery.
- Products should take into account the commercial considerations of RPs. Providing more shared ownership within the tenure split can help to make schemes viable.
- 2 respondents including an RP commented that they would like to see a mix of tenures and property types on a site. The RP stated that with flatted development, they preferred small blocks up to a maximum of 12 flats and a balanced mix of 1 and 2 bed units.
- Affordable homes should have guaranteed build quality and energy efficiency.

- Cllr McCormick suggested that the cost of mortgage repayments should be less than 30% of the median household income in the borough. An RP suggested using 40% of income as the threshold for testing affordability.
- Chineham Parish Council expressed an aspiration to deliver a greater proportion of affordable housing.
- 1 respondent suggested that residents should not be encouraged to take out unachievable mortgages, and that in some cases rented accommodation was more appropriate.

**Question 10d: Should the Local Plan do more to support the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas? If so, how?**

- Respondents generally recognised the importance of providing affordable housing in rural areas and the contribution that it made to the sustainability and vitality of rural communities. The particular requirement to meet the housing needs of skilled rural workers was identified.
- Three respondents stated that more affordable housing should be provided in rural areas to meet local needs.
- Two parish councils suggested that the council should collect specific evidence on rural housing needs (potentially combined with an economic assessment of the needs of rural businesses).
- There was support for the delivery of rural exception sites (RES).
- A developer suggested that any future RES policy should be less restrictive, than the current approach (to align with the NPPF). It should not be limited to small scale proposals and should allow a greater proportion of market housing.
- 1 RP suggested clearer guidance was required on how applicants should identify local needs for RES applications. A developer suggested that the current policy sets too much emphasis on establishing need through a Housing Needs Survey, and that it should be sufficient to show that there is need on the housing register. This causes delays.
- 1 RP said that the council should work with parish councils to encourage people in need to join the waiting list (and thus demonstrate need).
- It was suggested that where market accommodation is required to support the viability of RESs, they should focus on meeting local needs, for example, downsizer homes and self-build plots.
- A respondent stated that the council should allocate RESs where need is most acute.
- Policies should be more permissive of low-cost home ownership products on exception sites (potentially as entry level exception sites).
- 2 respondents cited that direct council involvement would assist with delivery, including through delivery on sites that the council owns.
- Cllr Cubitt suggested that every village could accommodate four new affordable homes without an issue.

- 4 respondents (including Sherfield on Loddon PC and Bramley PC) identified that rural affordable housing was most appropriate where there were good facilities and services, or in areas with accessible transport (rural settlements with railway stations were highlighted).
- 2 respondents stressed the importance of it being sympathetic to the surrounding rural environment.
- 3 developers suggested that more affordable housing could be delivered in rural areas through the allocation of market housing-led sites (including the ones they were promoting).
- An RP raised an issue about shared ownership properties in the AONB, as these had limited lending options.
- Aster Housing Association requested the LPU supports Community Land Trusts (CLTs) through a commitment to good practice in respect of allowing CLTs, choice of site, flexibility on affordability criteria and local allocations.

**Question 10e: Which option would you support for homes for older people and those with support needs? (accessibility standards)**

- 15 respondents supported Option 1 which would require all housing to be built to advanced accessibility standards. These included Maria Miller MP, Hampshire County Council Adult Services, North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, and a number of parish councils. This option was considered particularly appropriate in light of the ageing population, and respondents commented that this option would provide flexibility for the homes to meet their occupiers' future needs, and would reduce occupiers' need to move should they develop the need for additional care.
- 15 respondents supported Option 2 which proposed a 20% requirement. 10 of these respondents were house builders/developers/landowners (including the Home Builder's Federation (HBF)).
- 2 respondents suggested the standard should be between Option 1 and Option 2 (no specific target stated). 2 further respondents suggested that the council could only require the most important aspects of accessible homes to be required (such as having a level threshold) rather than the full standard.
- The responses from developers and landowners (in favour of Option 2) indicated that:
  - Option 1 could lead to viability and deliverability issues and could have an impact upon the design of homes (reducing choice). The viability impact should be tested.
  - Policy should comply with NPPF para 147 requirement to 'address an identified need'. A higher standard would be unnecessary as there was no need or demand for greater provision and properties would go unsold.
  - The increase from 15% (in the current LP policy) should be justified and evidenced through a Local Needs Assessment. It was commented that the standard appeared high relative to other Local Plans.

- The HBF noted that an ageing population does not in itself justify higher accessibility standards. Calculation should take into account number of homes already constructed to M4(1) standard. Many people will be able to adapt their current homes and do not need alternative accommodation.
- 2 respondents suggested that flexibility should be provided to account for site specific factors, including the fact that there could be different levels of need in different areas.
- There could be different requirements for adaptable housing among different tenures. For example, there would be likely to be little requirement in LCHO schemes but more within a retirement community.
- Higher provision should nonetheless not be precluded.
- If Option 1 was pursued they welcomed the reference to the wording 'where technically achievable and viable'.
- HCC suggested that the Local Plan should use the term, 'specialised needs' rather than 'support needs'. This recognises that not everyone with, for instance, a mobility impairment has a support need.
- 1 respondent stated that it was a matter that was best left to Building Regulations. A number of respondents made reference to the Government's recent consultation on standards, which could result in a new national standard.
- It was pointed out that the delivery of homes with advanced accessibility standards would not meet the needs of older people alone (the relevant points about specialist accommodation are included in the summary for Question 10g).

#### **Question 10f: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- An RP stated that more references should be given to seeking opportunities to create more shared ownership opportunities for older people – which could free up under-occupied homes.
- The Local Plan should provide a better supply of housing for downsizing and bungalows. Three respondents stated that the Local Plan should do more to retain bungalows.

#### **Question 10g: Which option (or combination of options) would you support for specialist accommodation?**

- There was a degree of support for all the options set out in the consultation document (and various combinations of them), but there was concern that securing specialist accommodation on windfall sites (alone) would not guarantee that the council would meet its needs.
- 8 respondents, including Hampshire County Council (as adult services), supported a mix of all options, due to the scale of need and the range of needs to be addressed. This would ensure the council was being proactive to

ensure a planned supply, but with flexibility for windfall sites to come forward where need exists.

- 3 respondents supported Option 1 (delivery via windfall)
- 8 respondents supported Option 2 (provision as part of housing allocations and within/adjacent to settlements). Respondents widely noted that integration would help to support mixed and sustainable communities. A number of developers welcomed the flexibility to develop outside settlements where appropriate.
- 7 respondents supported Option 3 (allocating specific sites). Comments states that:
  - Specialist accommodation in villages could provide purchasers with options about where to move, and could also enable some delivery in rural areas.
  - Could provide an 'anchor' for other community facilities (to improve the sustainability of villages).
  - If such sites are to be identified; as they are intended to meet the needs of older people (with their specific requirements), they not be assessed in the same way as other forms of accommodation.
- 5 respondents supported a combination of Options 2 and 3, 1 respondent supported a mix of Options 1 and 2.
- NHS CCG expressed support that the council was planning for older persons needs (but did not identify a specific preferred option).
- 4 respondents stated that the Plan's approach should be informed by evidence of need/demand, and the Plan should include clear targets. The PPG requires future need for specialist accommodation to be broken down by tenure and type. Two developers (including the HBF) stated the importance of delivery being monitored, with the suggestion that this would help to inform a presumption in favour of such development where needs were not being met.
- Respondents noted the importance of policies allowing flexibility and taking account of site-specific circumstances.
- Hampshire County Council noted the importance of securing affordable supported housing for older people.
- It was suggested that in Option 2, 'Where unmet need exists', should be defined at a borough level.
- A developer recommended the approach in the report, 'Too Little, Too Late? Housing for an Ageing Population' by Associated Retirement Community Operators (ARCO) and the County Councils Network.

#### **Question 10h: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- The Plan should recognise that there are many benefits of providing supported living, including reduced care costs.
- 1 respondent suggested that it could be appropriate to secure specialist accommodation instead of affordable housing in some instances.

**Question 10i: Do you have any views on the following issues: What types of sites are most suitable for specialist accommodation; and should the policy distinguish between different types of specialist accommodation and the needs of different types of occupiers?**

- Respondents indicated the following were the most important locational requirements for specialist accommodation:
  - Being accessible to amenities, such as local centres (including medical services) (6 respondents), green spaces and leisure facilities;
  - Being well integrated into communities (2 respondents);
  - Consideration of the amenities of the future residents (for example, not adjacent to main roads) (4 respondents); and
  - Having good transport links (4 respondents).
- A number of respondents stated that the policy should recognise that there is a wide spectrum of products with different levels of care (which is broader than stated in the consultation document). Policy should account for occupiers' different requirements, and this should underpin site selection.
- In particular, C2 accommodation has different considerations to C3 accommodation, as explained in guidance provided by Associated Retirement Community Operators (ARCO).
- Strategies should recognise that retirement developments are generally a certain size (40-60 units) – though retirement villages may be larger. Market demand for retirement villages is for sites of more than 10 acres. These are best located on the edge of a village centre.
- Post-pandemic, older people may be more likely to favour extra care retirement complexes over residential care homes.
- Should be underpinned by demographics and a clear understanding of local demand/need.
- Sustainability can be created through the provision of on-site ancillary facilities so not just suitable for large settlements.

**Question 10j: Which option would you support for the size and mix of market housing?**

- Respondents were generally seeking a balance of certainty and flexibility, but their responses reflected different ways in which this could be achieved.
- 19 respondents supported Option 1 (using a criteria-based policy similar to current approach)
- 14 respondent supported Option 2 (specifying a mix as a starting point for negotiations) including Cllr McCormick. 1 RP suggested that set guidance is important to prevent protracted negotiations. This option was also supported by 3 developers/landowners, subject to sufficient flexibility being included.
- 11 respondents supported Option 3 (allowing the market to decide) (including 9 house builders/developers and the Home Builder's Federation). They

considered this approach would be most responsive to local needs, however one other respondent suggested that this would result in decisions being motivated by profits not need.

- 3 respondents supported a combination of options 1 and 2. 1 respondent supported a mixture of options 1 and 3.
- Notwithstanding the options selected, 8 house builders/developers/landowners made specific comments about the importance of any policy approach including sufficient flexibility. This would allow the differences between different sites and their surrounding areas to be recognised, allow the policy to respond to changing needs over time (and to take account of changing market considerations), and take into account viability. Although the majority of the respondents from the development industry suggested this that could best be achieved from option 3, a number of respondents also cited this as a reason for supporting the other options.
- 2 respondents stated that developers should be encouraged to build good quality small market homes. Bramley PC suggested that the LPA needed to be stronger to reduce the number of large detached homes.
- 3 respondents explicitly supported the policy recognising the difference between urban and rural sites (although others more generally identified the importance of site character/location). However, it was also noted that needs may vary between parishes.
- 1 developer suggested that the market housing mix should take account of the affordable housing requirements.
- It was suggested that consideration should be given to the amount of usable floorspace rather than just the number of bedrooms.

#### **Question 10k: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- The Local Plan should support co-housing communities, and there are particular opportunities on the Manydown site.
- Local Plan should provide a framework that enables neighbourhood plans to support community-led housing.
- Local Plan should recognise importance of the growing institutional Private Rented Sector. It can help to provide mobility in the market and appeal to a broad demographic. It is best located close to employment/transport hubs.
- Should include specific provision for homeless people.
- Size and layout of new housing will need to include purpose-built space for home working.
- Policy should discourage developments of one type/size of housing only.
- Emerging data shows that Covid has increased residents' appetites for properties with gardens.

#### **Question 10l: What considerations should be taken into account in informing an appropriate mix?**

- Policy requirements should be underpinned by evidence of local need (6 respondents). This should be based upon an understanding of future need (not the current need), and should take into account information like the projected age of the population.
- Detailed evidence should be provided about needs in local areas, including reviewing market signals and past delivery.
- Bramley PC highlighted that existing imbalances in mix should not be perpetuated in future development.
- The following specific requirements were highlighted:
  - House builders and planning agent noted the importance of market demand and viability, and site-specific considerations in terms of location and the site's design and layout and integration with neighbouring built form (3 respondents).
  - There should be a presumption against the loss of bungalows to maintain the housing mix (2 respondents). Bungalows and high-quality small homes should be encouraged to allow older people to downsize.
  - More high quality 2-3 bedroom market homes are needed in rural villages for older people and first time buyers (3 respondents). It should not be assumed that this need can be met through affordable housing.
  - Sheffield on Loddon PC highlighted the importance of considering the relationship between new and old, and the potential for a large development to imbalance a community and impact upon community cohesion.
- It was suggested that it may be necessary to increase the affordable housing threshold so as not to discourage high quality smaller developments.
- A site promoter highlighted that large sites are able to deliver a mix of unit sizes and types.

**Question 10m: Should the Local Plan Update set out specific policy requirements for Houses of Multiple Occupation? If so, what should these be?**

- Hampshire County Council stated that the Plan should recognise that HMOs can make a positive contribution to the local housing market.
- A respondent commented that HMOs should be minimised as young people should be able to access a house of their own.
- Respondents suggested that HMOs should be required to have: suitable and sufficient parking; an ensuite in every bedroom; waste and recycling provision; good noise insulation; and be subject to a modern slavery risk assessment. They should be to a high standard and follow models of management set by housing associations
- Sheffield on Loddon Parish Council indicated that HMOs should be limited in the rural area unless for elderly occupation

**Question 10n: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for self-build plots?**

- 11 respondents supported Option 1 (the delivery of plots on larger housing sites).
- 11 respondents supported Option 2 (to allocate sites in the LP specifically for self build), respondents including developers/landowners.
- 5 respondents supported Option 3 (to deliver sites through neighbourhood planning), including Sherfield-on-Loddon PC and Sherfield Park PC).
- 4 respondents (including one housebuilder) supported a combination of Option 1 and Option 3, and two respondents supported a combination of Option 2 and 3 (which would allow SB in town and country locations).
- 1 respondent supported a mix of all options.
- 6 house builders/landowners made broadly similar comments on Option 1 relating to:
  - The difficulties accommodating plots on larger housing sites. They cited design integration issues, health and safety concerns from multiple contractors, and the potential for this to slow the delivery of conventional housing.
  - Delivering plots on new large developments does not meet the needs and locational preferences of those on the SB register.
  - Highlighted that any requirements relating to site size threshold and proportional requirement set for large housing sites should be robustly evidenced and viability tested. Needs should be constantly reviewed against the council's self-build register. The HBF suggested that the self-build register should be tested for its deliverability (to ensure those on the register have the means to build their own home and there is no double counting against other authorities' registers).
  - Site suitability should be taken into account. For example, self-build could not be provided on a flatted development.
  - Stated it should be recognised that they were unlikely to be able to deliver affordable housing as SB/CB.
  - If required, delivery should be phased across sites and allow it to revert to conventional market housing in the event it is not taken up within a set time period.
- However, 2 respondents (including one developer) recognised that SB plots can help to diversify the offer on large sites.
- Good precedents about how self build plots could be delivered on stand-alone sites were cited at Springhill in Stroud and Marmalade Lane in Cambridge.
- In relation to Option 3, concern was expressed about delivery timescales if delivery was left to neighbourhood planning,
- Level of need should be evidenced. It is important that the LPA looks beyond its register to identify its need for plots (e.g. Buildstore)
- Any reference to self-build should also properly reference custom build.

- There were some more general concerns expressed about design and how self-build housing would fit with local character.
- The council should consider SB opportunities on its own land.

**Question 10o: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- 5 respondents (including a mix of individuals and developers) stated that in addition to the options above, rural self-build windfall sites should be viewed favourably where there is evidence of a local demand, and where the design is of a high quality. The comments reflected a mix of views about whether such homes should be supported in the open countryside or just on the edge of settlements. On the edge of settlements, the amount could be limited in proportion to the size of the settlement.
- Council should proactively encourage more landowners to bring forward sites for SB/CB to provide additionality.
- Plan should provide a positive policy framework that reacts to needs arising through the life of the Local Plan

**Question 10p: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for gypsy and traveller pitches?**

- Responses to this question were fairly evenly spread, with similar numbers supporting options 1 (providing pitches on the larger housing allocation), 3 (specific stand-alone allocations for traveller pitches) and 4 (a mixture of the available approaches), though with a slight preference for option 3.
- Maria Miller MP expressed support for option 4 (a combination of the available options). In total 10 representations supported option 4. This also included Overton PC and Sherfield Park PC.
- 9 respondents supported option 1. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Chineham PC, Dummer PC, East Woodhay PC and Upton Grey PC.
- 14 responses stated support for option 3 (allocation of stand-alone sites). This included HCC in its advisory role on this issue. Moreover, HCC have stated that in their experience, and in light of other analysis carried out regarding these issues, the other options presented are not effective mechanisms for delivering pitches. Bramley PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE supported this option.
- DWH also supported option 3, they stated that this strategy would allow pitches to be better located close to existing services and facilities, and the sites themselves better master-planned in terms of individual serviced traveller plot provision. The alternative approach of allocating small numbers of pitches across all of the residential allocations results in piecemeal, scattered and often small-scale provision across different parts of the Borough.
- Furthermore, HCC stated that the approach adopted needs to be responsive to the preferences of the Gypsy and/or Traveller community by respecting the

requirements of different ethnicities within the community who generally prefer small, family-orientated sized sites in rural areas. Consequently, the approach taken and policy needs to be flexible.

- HCC state that as a suggested size threshold, the allocation of small family-orientated stand-alone sites (approximately 2 – 3 pitches) and avoidance of large-scale sites (e.g. 20 pitches) would be supported.
- In addition, HCC state that a prospective draft policy that seeks to enable Gypsy and/or Travellers to acquire their own land of choice and/or to expand existing sites for family and friends would also be encouraged.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that whichever option(s) proceed to the Regulation 18 stage and further SA testing, the approach should be fully justified with an up to date housing needs evidence base (as per the PPG).
- Chineham PC stated that option 3 may work in some circumstances.
- Boyer on behalf of Bloor Homes stated that they strongly support option 3. They stated that it is challenging to incorporate the gypsy and traveller pitches into conventional housing sites, and there is no evidence that this is a preference of the gypsy and traveller community. Indeed, to date, none of the pitches allocated through the current Local Plan have been delivered, and therefore there is no evidence that they will be taken up. There is however evidence that stand-alone pitches in appropriate locations are taken up, across Basingstoke previously, and other Boroughs.
- Boyer on behalf Bloor Homes stated that they would not support the continued allocation of gypsy and traveller pitches on housing sites, and indeed would support an amendment to the existing policy to remove this requirement from the current Local Plan.
- Boyer on behalf of Vistry stated that the LPU should allocate specific sites, that are properly serviced, and which offer a degree of self-containment, in terms of on-site facilities.
- Thakeham Homes expressed support for option 4. They stated that if gypsy and traveller pitches are proposed as part of housing allocations, that they would need to be carefully designed with a focus on larger site allocations.
- Similarly, Taylor Wimpey expressed support for option 4. They stated that a combination of options for standalone sites and inclusion on some allocation sites may be appropriate to ensure delivery across the plan-period.
- Bramley PC stated that option 4 could also be considered.
- Sheffield on Loddon Parish Council considers Option 2 (providing pitches on a broader range of sites than is currently the case) would be least likely to raise community issues if sited on stand-alone sites.
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates suggested that specific allocations may be needed, and that the approach taken will need to be supported by appropriate evidence.

**Question 10q: Are there any other options that should be considered?**

- Cllr Andrew McCormick recommended that a dedicated site be provided close to the M3.
- Some general comments were also provided stressing the need to ensure that the council has a robust strategy for meeting the accommodation needs of travellers, especially as this is important for preventing inappropriate development of traveller sites in unsuitable locations that do not have the right facilities to support them.
- Other general comments noted the complex nature of the issue, and the difficulty of finding an option suitable for all parties. The opinion was also expressed that travellers often prefer to live within their own communities.
- HCC, in an advisory role, supports the use of Friends and Family of Travellers' (FFT) to ensure appropriate evidence is accumulated for the emerging Local Plan.
- Hart DC stated that it published its Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment update in March 2020, which identified a need 23 traveller pitches and 5 travelling show people yards. At present this need has not been met, it may therefore be necessary to have a discussion under the duty to cooperate to determine if there are any opportunities to resolve this matter given the lack of sites identified in Hart.
- Overton PC recommended that the gypsy and traveller community are consulted regarding their preference regarding new site provision.

## **Section 11 – Infrastructure**

### **Question 11a: Which option would you support for the provision of new infrastructure?**

The consultation sought views on the delivery of new infrastructure, including the following two options:

- Option 1 - Continue to plan for the timely provision of infrastructure by working with service providers to meet needs through new and expanded facilities linked to new development
- Option 2 - Seek new ways of providing infrastructure to ensure its provision as early as possible in the delivery of new communities, through external funding and close working with key partners

Option 2 received the strongest support with respondents highlighting a range of considerations, including the following:

- Support for ensuring new ways of providing infrastructure as early as possible, through external funding and close working with key partners
- Option 2 provides the strongest likelihood of future-proofing infrastructure provision as well as minimising additional up-front costs
- Following this approach is vital to the success of new sites
- It is very important to provide as much upfront transport infrastructure as possible, particularly for public transport, walking and cycling to instil

sustainable travel behaviours to reduce car dependency. Funding mechanisms need to achieve early infrastructure delivery to address the Climate Emergency and the Transport Strategy (Local Highway Authority (HCC))

- Option 2 must be the basis for strategic planning to provide a new hospital; address the traffic problem with a Western bypass; solve M3 Junction 7; address mains drainage; resolve the railway issues at both the Station and Worting Bridge
- This option should be explored and developed as infrastructure providers have been found not to improve their infrastructure until development has demonstrated a need, thereby causing unnecessary disruption and inconvenience to existing and new residents
- There is a need to plan infrastructure provision before the allocation of new housing, especially when there are several developments in one area

Option 1 received less support than Option 2 with various comments including the following:

- Maria Miller MP suggested continue to plan for the timely provision of infrastructure by working with service providers to meet needs through new and expanded facilities linked to new development.
- The Theatres Trust consider that for cultural facilities this could involve funding improvements to existing theatres and performance venues (e.g. the Anvil, Haymarket and Central Studio)

A combination of both options was also favoured by some respondents, highlights included the following:

- A blended approach involving elements of both options is the best way to deliver new infrastructure. This includes with respect to larger development sites to successfully plan new communities and allow statutory undertakers to plan on a long-term basis
- Options 1 and 2 should be explored together to enable the timely provision of new infrastructure
- Both options have equal merit to offer a robust policy approach to infrastructure provision, depending on the type and size of development
- If Option 1 is working, then that is preferable. However, often infrastructure lags behind the occupation of new houses. Therefore, some provision for Option 2 may be needed

Respondents' general comments highlighted the following:

- Southern Water support timely infrastructure delivery and early engagement with developers
- Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities to ensure that necessary infrastructure is delivered ahead of the occupation of development
- Highways England believe that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should set out any highway mitigation required to deliver the Local Plan.

- Sport England stated that current and future sport facility needs, must be considered and appropriate strategies for their inclusion within the LPU developed.
- The need to monitor the proposed changes to infrastructure delivery in the Planning for the Future paper, including the new Infrastructure Levy.
- HCC (as Local Education Authority) are of the view that both local authorities need to continue to work together in planning for new school infrastructure.
- Development can provide new and expanded facilities, but new ways need to be found for providing strategic infrastructure.

**Question 11b: Are there other infrastructure issues that should be considered?**

Other infrastructure issues identified by respondents are wide ranging including the following:

- Maria Miller MP stated that infrastructure must go together with development, including provision of roads and community facilities. The Plan needs to take into account potential future population growth and infrastructure growth such as a new Hospital in the area, which will significantly impact Basingstoke.
- Cllr McCormick suggested need to reduce distances adults travel to work and children travel to school. Seek early provision of a secondary school at Manydown. Reduce number of secondary school pupils commuting out of town to school. Better cycle provision in the “final approach” on roads going into the Town Centre, especially the railway station. Increase pedestrian and cycle provision on main roads out of town (A30, A33, A339, A340, B3400)
- Cllr Omalee Cubitt set out the following points:
  - a) Oakley Railway Station reopened
  - b) Bramley must have a bridge built over the railway line
  - c) More parking provided at all railway stations
  - d) Trains should be double deck and longer at peak times
  - e) Western Bypass to be built connecting to A33 north of Basingstoke
  - f) A large outdoor Lido should be built
  - g) More and better leisure facilities are of paramount importance including playing fields, cricket pitches, basketball courts, an Ice Rink, an Olympic sized swimming pool, a velodrome
  - h) Water shortages also need to be addressed (e.g. by building a new reservoir)
- Highways England recognised the need for a collaborative approach to identify a strategic solution to the M3 motorway (Junctions 7 and 8) and the local road network (A30, A33)
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) recognised the need for high quality broadband together with local working hubs to help reduce the need to travel.
- Support for the early provision of pedestrian and cycle routes together with realist bus routes.
- New roads serving more than four dwellings need to be adopted by the local highway authority.

- Need to consider the impacts of larger developments on outlying settlements (e.g. the impact of additional traffic from Manydown and developments in Newbury and Greenham Park upon the A339 and Kingsclere), the need for a western bypass, improvements to the junction of the M3/A34 and access to the proposed new hospital. The A33 should not be made dual carriageway.
- Concern that local roads including the A33 are too congested and that other rural roads (e.g. Curfuade Lane) are not suitable for additional traffic
- The need to consider changing lifestyles, including increased use of e-cars, home working and possible reduced public transport use (post Covid-19)
- Southern Water encourage early engagement from developers to satisfactorily address capacity, groundwater and odour considerations, etc.
- Thames Water recommend that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the development demands and how these can be met
- NHS North Hampshire CCG highlighted a possible need for additional primary care capacity or estates, in particular from larger developments resulting in a population increase of 2,000 or more.
- Concerns that health services are not keeping pace with demand, in particular GP practices and dentists
- The need for good broadband and 4G/5G coverage
- Providing large scale natural green infrastructure to benefit people and wildlife
- Concern about water quality in the Rivers Loddon, Lyde and Test and impact on Thames Basin Heath SPA
- The need for additional local and district waste collection facilities
- West Berkshire Council raised concerns about possible impact on service provision in West Berkshire for which cross border payments may be needed.
- Ensuring that the infrastructure required is provided prior to new development

**Question 11c: What types of infrastructure are the most important in the future planning of the borough, particularly in thinking about large sites?**

Respondents' views are wide ranging including highlighting the following types of infrastructure:

- Cllr McCormick highlighted pedestrian and cycle provision, parking, charge points, local energy.
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) refer to sustainable movement corridors integrated with transport hubs integrated with community and education facilities to reduce the overall need to travel.
- Strategic transport solutions (including M3 Motorway Junction 7, etc) including addressing the associated environmental impacts
- Efficient and affordable public transport systems (including rural areas)
- Prioritising safe walking, cycling and bus/tram infrastructure
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Infrastructure that supports the NHS Healthy New Towns principles to prioritise health and wellbeing
- Community, leisure and sports facilities within walking distance
- A suitable local convenience store in Bramley
- Large scale natural green infrastructure and green spaces and corridors
- Water supply and drainage infrastructure

- District heating schemes
- Waste collection facilities

**Question 11d: Are there specific infrastructure issues in your local area to be aware of?**

When asked to identify local infrastructure issues, the outcomes included the following:

- A large number of respondents (over 130 responses) highlighted concerns relating to surface water flooding, highway capacity and air quality (due to increased traffic volumes) within Cliddesden and the surrounding area.
- Past incidences of substantial surface water flooding within Cliddesden village.
- The A339 is considered to be at capacity together with many of the surrounding local roads including through Brighton Hill, Hatch Warren, Cliddesden, along B3046 through the Candovers, to Dummer and M3 Junction 7, along A339 to Herriard, Upton Grey to North Warnborough (M3 Junction 5)
- With regards to Whitchurch Railway Station, over 505 respondents requested the deletion of Policy SS11 of the current adopted Local Plan, relating to a one-hectare site located north of the railway line that is allocated for a new station car park. Respondents considered that this facility is no longer required as this requirement has been met in relation to a separate planning application (16/03220/OUT - Land off Evingar Road) which incorporates a new station car park and is located within the town to the south.
- Respondents also raised a number of local concerns with respect to:
  - highway capacity (including within Bramley, Sherfield on Loddon, Overton, Whitchurch and along rural routes);
  - an Eastern bypass;
  - access to public transport (including Sherfield on Loddon);
  - drainage capacity (including within Bramley, Sherfield on Loddon and Tadley);
  - access to schools, health practices and all-weather sports facilities;
  - lack of railway station parking and suitable convenience shopping (including within Bramley); and
  - poor mobile phone and broadband coverage.

**Question 11e: Which option would you support for the council's approach to essential facilities and services?**

**Option 1 – *continue with current approach as set out within the current Local Plan***

- 6 respondents supported this option including Sovereign, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Baughurst PC, SOLVE, Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd and HCC property services.
- Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd. state that the current approach is sufficient, blanket protection should not be given if a facility or service is no

longer needed or desired, this would prevent unused sites from coming forward for alternative uses.

**Option 2 - *Strengthen protection against the loss of a particular facility or service***

- 21 respondents supported this option including East Woodhay PC, Highclere NP, SoL PC, Sherfield Park PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC and MP Maria Miller.
- Sport England clarified that this is unless it can be demonstrated that a nearby alternative facility is available and has capacity. To ensure there is strong protection of facilities which would only be lost when strategically identified as surplus or facilities are being replaced, this is in line with the NPPF and Sport England's Planning Policy.
- 1 respondent supported both of the above options.

**General comments on the approach in 11e:**

- Policy shouldn't be overly restrictive or onerous in the absence of a fully justified evidence base (HCC, BDBC, SMV).
- There should be exceptions contained within the policy to enable service providers to react to changing circumstances and remain effective (HCC, BDBC, SMV)
- Agree that there is a need to ensure that established facilities and services are available to develop and modernise. Southern Water would look to the local plan to support any upgrades necessary at WTWs or WSWs to accommodate growth or meet stricter environmental standards
- They would also seek to avoid encroachment on Waste Treatment Works (WTW) from 'sensitive' development such as housing through appropriate policies in the Local Plan.
- Furthermore they wish to ensure that should the need arise in the future the ability of a WTW to expand in order to cater for new growth within its catchment is not prevented or constrained by the proximity of new sensitive development.
- HCC property services concerned that the LPU may not meet the tests of soundness as it could be overly restrictive and not be effective in responding to the needs of public service providers such as HCC.
- They confirm that HCC will be implementing a series of service-driven improvements, covering frontline and support services in line with corporate policies. This could result in the 'necessary loss' of particular community buildings and land in HCC ownership in order to reinvest proceeds of sale in order to deliver its operational service improvements, these include children's services, adult services and community and cultural services.

- HCC property services concerned that any draft policy should have sufficient flexibility to respond to the county council's need for managed change to deliver improvements over the plan period.

**Question 11f: There is an opportunity for the Local Plan Update to define what would be classified as an essential facility or service. What facilities and/or services do you consider should be defined as essential within the Local Plan Update?**

- 2 respondents noted the ability for essential facilities or services to be in walking or a safe and reasonable distance.
- 3 respondents noted that as a general rule, medical, educational, groceries and/or public transport should be classified as essential.
- Critical infrastructure where the council or other bodies have a statutory obligation, could be used to help define what an essential facility or service is. (HCC, BDBC, SMV).
- Local Plan should be flexible so as not to inhibit service providers from relocating or realising best value for their land and/or property assets (HCC, BDBC, SMV).
- 1 developer noted the need to assess the level of service and infrastructure provision in a location and understand what needs to be improved to be able to decide what is essential and what is desirable.
- The same site promoter noted how services and facilities are provided will also dictate how important a service might be to an area.

Specific services and facilities that respondents recommend are defined as an essential facility or service within the local plan were (number of respondents in brackets):

- Medical services including GP surgery, (8)
- Dentist (1)
- School/ primary school (7),
- College (1)
- Local shop or convenience store (8),
- Post office (for services including banking) (4),
- Recreation facility (5),
- Community hall/building/hub/centre (8),
- Café (3)
- Pub, (4)
- Accessible open space (7)
- Sports facilities (indoor and outdoor including pitches, tennis/basketball courts), (4)
- Sports club facilities (changing rooms, refreshments, places to meet, places for parents to watch their children playing), (2)

- Play area (2)
- Meeting rooms (for community activities and healthcare meetings) (1)
- Frequent public transport/links (4)
- Library (2)
- Foul and surface water drainage (3)
- Mains water and electrical supply (2)
- High speed broadband (2).
- Employment sites (1)
- Good road network (1)
- Encouragement to switch to electric cars (1)
- Cycling and walking infrastructure (1)
- Greater policing presence (1)

**Question 11g: Are there any uses which you consider to need more specific policy requirements, either for their provision or protection/retention?**

- Community facilities are good to have but delivering a place which people wish to live and work is more important than community facilities which today are good in the town. Key partners should invest in those facilities because they rate them as economic.
- Need to retain existing sports club provision: 2 football stadiums, rugby, hockey, cricket, athletics, swimming, ice skating.
- Basingstoke could benefit from an indoor snow ski slope: the nearest one is Hemel Hempstead and the nearest dry slope is Southampton.
- The provision or retention of facilities and services in Whitchurch requires the provision of additional car parking.
- Community, sports and leisure facilities are crucial in building communities and promoting health including mental and physical health. They also provide healthcare through clinics and healthcare support groups, many people prefer to attend a community setting rather than a surgery.
- The LPU should reflect the changes in community care that are being introduced in the Primary Care Home Model that has been adopted by the CCG and Hampshire Hospital Trust where healthcare is provided by hospitals, GP surgeries and the community, therefore community facilities and the activities that take place within them are critical to the success of the new healthcare model.
- 2 respondents referred to the importance of the ice rink which is not well represented in the plan. They wish not just to retain the existing ice rink but look to build a major stadium ice rink whether it be on the same location or another plot of land. The hockey team have been at the highest levels before and this is an opportunity to build up a big fan base, an ice arena could be used for other events such as concerts.

- Essential services such as community hall, sports fields, schools, recreation grounds and medical services.
- Sherfield on Loddon PC referred to local shops, bus routes, post offices, pubs, community hubs.
- The Theatre's Trust encourage the plan to promote and protect the area's valued cultural facilities and to guard against loss, reflecting paragraph 92 of the NPPF.
- Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, in line with the Health Infrastructure Plan, referred to the proposal for a new health campus to meet the needs of the population of North and Mid Hampshire, which should be included with opportunities identified in Basingstoke, however at this stage a preferred site has not been selected (Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust on behalf of Hampshire Together – Modernising Our Hospitals and Health Services).
- An understanding of the associated impacts and requirements of different land uses to ensure delivery of one development is not compromised (HCC, BDBC, SMV.)
- For large employment land windfall applications which generate significant traffic movements, safeguards to ensure sufficient capacity in the network is needed to deliver the borough's local housing needs, this may require applicants to demonstrate that mitigation works are capable of supporting growth in plan period (HCC, BDBC, SMV).
- Overton PC referred to sustainability in all its forms, reducing carbon and being involved in using the latest innovation and technology
- Avison Young obo Newlands Property Developers LLP referred to the opportunity created by the new hospital project for north and mid Hampshire. The Local Plan has an important part to play in ensuring it can provide an exemplar project.
- Sport England suggested should contain clear specific policies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities that sets out what facilities are required to meet current and future needs, including what facilities need to be protected or enhanced and where and when new facilities are required. Specific policies would reflect the nuances of sport facilities and ensure they are protected against loss, including being lost to allow another community facility.
- Bramley PC suggested all services should be assessed for capacity and when reached and cannot be increased, development should cease.

**Question 11h: Which option would you support for the provision of new facilities and services on new developments? Is there more that the Local Plan Update could do to ensure that new development fosters strong communities and meets the needs of residents?**

***Option 1 – continue to with current approach of delivering community facilities in most new developments over 400 dwellings***

- 11 respondents supported this option including Chineham PC, and SoL PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Sherfield Park PC, Overton PC, Baughurst PC and SOLVE), they made the following points:
  - Particularly with home working with less people needing to go into busy centres.
  - Community facilities are necessary for all settlements regardless of size.
  - Sherfield on Loddon PC would like to see the Local Plan list key local facilities as fundamental requirements for all large developments.
  - Sherfield Park PC believe that community centres should be about communities, so it is important there are enough of them to local people. Need a building they feel is theirs and can use for a wide range of activities, larger centres can lose their identity.
  - Sherfield Park PC go on to say that there could be community centre hubs in very large developments which can provide more services/facilities but not to the detriment of smaller ones.
  - Community centres should remain local, both socially and for easy access. Larger facilities can become remote and be in danger of commercialisation.

***Option 1 with flexibly to deliver option 2 where appropriate***

- 2 respondents; Pro-Vision obo Mat Raymond Farming and Sovereign,
  - Sovereign were of the view that where a combination of larger development areas come forward, the council should consider opportunities to provide fewer, larger but well-connected local centres.
  - Pro-Vision obo Mat Raymond Farming suggested that facilities should be assessed on a settlement by settlement basis as important to retain flexibility and recognise there may be settlements where smaller facilities with a more limited range of services are suitable and can sufficiently meet the needs of the community.

***Option 2 – concentrate on providing fewer but large new community centres***

- 13 respondents made representations in relation to this option including Bramley PC and Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes. They made the following points:
  - Community centres are vital and have come into their own during the pandemic.
  - Benefit to provide a larger but more flexible space that can accommodate a variety of users, who can share the space rather than have responsibility for individual halls and their maintenance/upkeep,

this can represent a cost saving for future users and maintain the viability and vitality of such a facility in the long term.

- But local needs/locations do need to be fully understood.
- Basingstoke Transition Network opposed option 2 on grounds of needed longer distance travel and consequent encouragement to use cars.
- Bramley PC referred to smaller facilities competing and are liable to become unviable, Sherfield Park cited as a good example of a large facility which has been planned for.
- Current approach has led to a scattering of small community centres across the borough which may be surplus to requirement or too small for community needs. Financial contributions are sometimes better placed.

### **General comments on the approach in 11h:**

- 1 respondent believed that facilities should be reduced to be provided for 250 dwellings or more, whereas Chineham PC argued should be reduced to 300 units or more.
- Facilities should be proportionate to the development and local needs, with developers working with the community to understand need and demand and cumulative impacts.
- The number of dwellings in isolation may not be appropriate in all circumstances for requiring community facilities. High density developments with good transport connections to services will not necessarily need to provide for all community facilities on site where there is existing provision locally.
- The largest new community developments (in excess of 400 dwellings) should be comprehensively planned in close liaison with BDBC and HCC to ensure planned provision complements nearby social infrastructure and contributes to reductions in journeys by private car.
- Policy needs to be flexible to adapt to individual circumstances whilst considering the cumulative impacts of development. It is sensible to concentrate investment on social infrastructure into the larger district centres accessible by active modes and public transport (with the potential to cluster together high trip generating faculties).

In terms of how the LPU could ensure that new development fosters strong communities, the following ideas were suggested:

- More publicity made available regarding local community centres at house building/selling stage.
- If a reduced number of centres have to be offered, provide details of how people can access in an environmentally friendly way.
- Community meeting places don't have to be buildings! Providing open

'common' spaces for every new development allows communities to come together in an informal way.

- Provide a football pitch/rough area for nature and wildlife.
- Shared allotments as these are 'meeting spaces' which provide antidotes to issues of loneliness/lack of connectivity.
- Trees must be an essential part of new developments.
- Making places 'nice' to live, encourages people to stay in them at weekends.
- A local shop is very often a 'hub' for a community and can sometimes be volunteer run.
- Provide a minimum of facilities to encourage community cohesion and engagement.
- Consideration should be given to the placing of schools and medical centres if there are none available in the near vicinity.
- Reducing the need to travel and encouraging active modes.
- Southern Manydown offers the opportunity to provide a series of community facilities in a new district centre for the Borough.

# Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (including Appendix 1)

Representations made on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report are summarised below.

- Natural England made the following points
  - the Solent and Dorset Coast potential Special Protection Area (SPA) was officially designated a SPA earlier this year.
  - suggest the terms 'nutrient neutrality' and/or 'nitrogen' should be used [rather than nitrate neutrality] so that the terminology is in line with Natural England Solent Nutrients guidance document.
  - recommend the wording for objective 6 is changed from 'Conserve, and where possible, improve biodiversity, including connectivity' to 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, including connectivity' to reflect national planning policy and the intention to achieve biodiversity net gain through forthcoming Local Plan.
  - advise with regards to Objective 7 that Local Plan Policy requires relevant development to carry out site-level Habitats Regulations Assessments in order to ensure impacts on European sites are suitably addressed.
  
- The detail of the SA Framework, and the site assessment framework that flows from it, needs to be amended slightly in the following ways:
  - Objective 2: needs an additional decision-making criterion to cover the potential to deliver a new regional healthcare facility.
  - Objective 3: needs an additional decision-making criterion referring to the ability to deliver new train stations or to re-open stations, and for the ability of sites to deliver on-site facilities. Reducing the need to travel is impractical in semi-rural and rural areas and discriminates against those that would like to bring forward modest organic development.
  - Objective 7: the proposed approach would score nitrate neutral development negatively however by definition a development that is "neutral" would not lead to a negative effect.
  - Objective 7: it is inconsistent that for the River Loddon it is stated it must not change band status but for the Solent/Test/Itchen catchment any development must be "nitrate neutral to avoid harm". The River Loddon must also be subject to the same rules and the principle of "no deterioration" should be adopted for all rivers. The banding of the WFD is an arbitrary construct and the Borough should be seizing the opportunity to improve water quality.
  - Objective 9: clarity sought on whether this criterion will be scored against existing or emerging evidence and whether the assessment will be focussed on landscape sensitivity and/or landscape capacity.
  - Thames Basin Heath Management Plan must be included as well as AONB Management Plan.

- The assessment methodology should give due consideration to large strategic sites. Linked to this the SA scoping report fails to mention the Government's 'Garden Communities' Prospectus and the associated 'Garden communities toolkit'. The TCPA have produced guidance that would assist the LPA in identifying criteria that cover the strengths and weaknesses of any such Garden Community proposals that are subject to later SA assessment.
- The impact of Covid-19 is not confined to the retail sector but also impacts on the way in which residential and other development will need to be planned and delivered; with more personal open space, access to formal and informal well managed green spaces, and the delivery of spaces and places for safe working and start-up enterprises.
- The proportion of dwelling completions on previously developed land has halved in recent years and the relative shortage of available previously developed land for redevelopment is identified as a concerning baseline issue. Allocated greenfield sites are needed to meet additional housing need. There are a number of social and economic concerns associated with urban intensification, increased urban density, loss of urban open spaces, car parks and lower value employment space.
- Concern raised that the proposed grading in the Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Site Appraisal at Table 22, applies the greatest negative impact to development of any greenfield site – a greenfield site located in accordance with the spatial strategy should be given a favourable weighting. 'Brownfield first' is not necessarily the most sustainable solution.
- Burghclere PC was supportive of efforts in respect of water resource management, biodiversity, waste/recycling and renewable energy. Rural communities will continue to rely on private transport. The local grid and road network will need enhancement for all electric vehicles.

## Settlement Study (Part 1)

The representations received concerning the Settlement Study (Part 1) are summarised below.

### Settlement's included

- Several respondents agreed with the settlements which are included/excluded including Burghclere PC who agree that Burghclere should be in category 5 and two respondents stated that Mapledurwell doesn't have the facilities or transport links to support further growth.
- Oakley and Deane PC stated that the vast majority of development in the Borough is taking place in the West and South West of Basingstoke. The 3 villages in this area - Oakley, Dummer and North Waltham - must be protected in terms of their heritage and distinctive characteristics (as expressed in the recently published Draft Vision for the SW area). This can be achieved by ensuring strategic gaps between any new development and these villages are adequate (unlike at North Manydown, for example) and removing any requirement for further housing in these areas, unless requested by the villages themselves. Oakley is at saturation point already.

### The matrix – sustainability indicators

- JPP Land stated that population size should not be a determining factor of the hierarchy and it should only focus on issues listed in para 78 of the NPPF.
- They go on to state that it is essential that the study assesses the level of and access to services.
- Thakeham Homes were of the view that the level of services should not define whether or not development should be located in a particular settlement – what happens if a development moves a settlement up the hierarchy and development opportunities support the change? This could also increase demand for other services and facilities.
- JPP Land suggested the approach is insufficiently flexible in terms of how provision of services and facilities vary (para 103 NPPF) between rural and urban areas. Therefore the characteristics are not consistent within the NPPF particularly in relation to Highclere.
- JPP Land suggested bus services to other towns/villages should be listed in the matrix.
- Wades Estate suggested indicators should reflect proximity to Newbury (for example Kingsclere) in terms of buses and services.
- JPP Land unclear how distances have been measured for those settlements without an SPB
- JPP Land queried why Woolton Hill surgery is not listed as closest GP for Highclere.
- Vistry argued that the matrix should consider the availability of modern sustainability – high speed broadband, accessibility for delivery vehicles/drop off and greater emphasis placed on the sustainability benefits that rural/semi-

rural locations can provide in terms of access to green and open space and safe environments.

- Linked to this Vistry suggested matrix provides little if any consideration of social, economic and environmental changes which the pandemic has created or accelerated.
- Bramley PC suggested infrastructure needs to be considered more thoroughly – further information and evidence has been submitted to BDBC since October 2019.
- Bramley PC also requested that consideration is given to the quality of the existing facilities and services and their position to ensure the methodology is in line with the NPPF. A summary of the services and facilities in Bramley is provided in the response.
- Bramley PC queried why the study uses minimum requirements and not a scoring system.
- Burghclere PC agreed with last two paragraphs on employment facilities in methodology chapter and this will rise in prominence and have other impacts on space and connectivity which should be considered in the study.
- Six respondents including Sovereign were of the view that part 2 should consider local affordable need in smaller settlements.
- Taylor Wimpey expected part 2 to recognise sites on the edge of Basingstoke, but within other Parish areas due to their physical relationship with the town itself e.g. Cufaude Farm relates to Basingstoke/Chineham but is in Bramley Parish.
- Fowler Architecture were of the view that the methodology needs to provide a robust and credible basis to understand issues facing the area including the needs and function of rural communities. It should consider the following additional elements:
  - Assessing evidence of local housing need
  - An understanding of the level of development required to support a thriving rural community by ensuring local services and facilities remain, or become viable;
  - Assessing the availability of land (within the SHLAA);
  - Assessing the implications of delivery in locations where the Framework indicates development should be restricted;
  - Assessing the dual role many settlements provide in delivering services to other nearby settlements, and the benefits of development in one village supporting services in a village nearby; and
  - Recognising the value of the plan delivering a greater percentage of the overall LHN within the rural communities.

### **Assessing options for new settlements**

- Bewley Homes suggested that new settlements should be included and sustainability principles should be a guiding factor. Areas for new settlements should be able to demonstrate not only how delivery will take place, but how a development builds on what is there already whilst meeting the aims of self-containment as a stand alone settlement. They can also contribute to key

strategic infrastructure deficits. Recommended that the Council should follow the below principles when considering opportunities for new settlements:

- Location of development –consider growth along key modal points, including the strategic road infrastructure or rail line.
- Proximity to larger centres
- Scale of development –can it provide all necessary services.
- Ability to deliver with appropriate lead in times for delivery. Single or very limited ownerships can assist with this.
- Ability to assist with strategic infrastructure, contributing to a wider strategy for key upgrades to known issues within the District.

### **Matrix inaccuracies**

The relevant parish councils identified the following inaccuracies:

- Ecchinswell convenience shop is closed and there is only one Place of Worship
- Bishops Green has one community hall and does not have a Place of Worship
- Overton has a dentist

### **Categories**

- Approach was supported by Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates.
- Fowler Architecture referred to 9 of the small villages which have greater access to the key facilities than North Waltham which only has access to 4 of the 5 key facilities. In addition, they refer to 2 small villages which contain all 5 key facilities within the village (St Mary Bourne and Preston Candover).

The following points were made about Bramley specifically:

- Bramley PC requested that the quality and position of existing services and facilities and their capacity for coping with further development, residents and traffic I considered. Also need to consider how these can be improved and expanded to ensure quality of life for existing and future residents. Detailed consideration of what services/infrastructure are needed to accommodate expansion essential.
- Bramley PC requested that conservation areas are protected as they important elements of rural/village characteristics.
- Wates believed Bramley should be category 2.

### **Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs)**

- It might be possible to draw an SPB around each of the existing 5 settlements separately, but this could result in pressure for infilling which would destroy character of villages therefore they should remain countryside.

### **Overall/conclusions**

- Two respondents were in general agreement with conclusions.
- A number of responses referred to the assessment of particular settlements as follows:
  - Burghclere PC requested appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/20/3256370 Land at Oxleas House, Ox Drove) is

reviewed and policy SS1 and SS6 reconsidered to be in line with NPPF.

- Burghclere PC and East Woodhay PC wish for all development to be considered against the housing requirement – noted a total of 8 dwellings at Whitway are not included against SS5 currently and should feature prominently in category 5 considerations.
- Dandara provided own assessment of Overton and agree with identification in Category 2.
- Two respondents were concerned about the promoted sites in Whitchurch and how infrastructure (particularly the roads and additional traffic), services and facilities will cope. They also reference impact on biodiversity.
- Study accurately reflected that Highclere partially relies on Woolton Hill but mostly Newbury for essential needs.

### **General points:**

- Burghclere PC requested detail on how SPBs might be identified.
- Those settlements which fall outside category 1-5 should be listed as not subject to further housing growth within the plan period.

### **Part 2:**

- With regards to Part 2 of the study the following points were made:
  - Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates and BDBC/HCC re. Southern Manydown were concerned that there is no consideration of how the option of a new settlement would be assessed and how this is to be addressed in subsequent Part 2 assessments. This does not reflect national policy para 72 as Part 2 needs to capture opportunities for new settlements where suitable sites are being promoted.
  - They went on to state that Part 2 of the study must take into account the “bottom up” availability of sites to consider constraints and opportunities in addition to the baseline indicators collated in Part 1, and factor this into assessments of reasonable alternatives through the Sustainability Appraisal process and wider evidence base studies. Stage 1B of Part 1 needs to be revised so new settlements and urban extension opportunities are considered in addition to opportunities in top 3 tiers.

## Site Assessment Methodology

The representations received relating to the Site Assessment Methodology are summarised below.

### **General:**

- One letter of support was received. This stated that the process set out accords with the NPPF. The support was mainly on the basis that the process correctly establishes that Mapledurwell is not suitable for additional development.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) welcome the fact that the draft document also raises the importance and need for large-scale sites (NPPF para 72).
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates considered that the process set out was a clear methodology.
- Burghclere PC stated that the detailed criteria column is confusing and options could be numbered or bulleted for clarity and simplicity.
- Kingclere PC stated that there are two paragraphs 'paying lip service to Neighbourhood Planning' (paras. 2.10 – 2.11), but there is no mention of the role of NP's in the following paragraphs when outlining the call for sites, filtering of sites, prioritising, assessment, selection etc. The document does not make clear how site selection takes account of the role of NP's and in the summary flow chart there is no mention of NP's. They feel the paper should give greater prominence to the role of Neighbourhood Planning in the site selection process.
- Sheffield Park PC stated that they did not consider that there was land available for development in and around the locality. They also expressed concerns about the suitability of the Dixon Road site for development as they consider that it does not accord with a number of the requirements set out in the site assessment methodology.

### **Filtering:**

- CPRE stated that even while focusing on the top 3 settlement tiers, there were still sites within that bracket which would have potentially urbanising impacts upon the countryside. They drew particular attention to WHIT013 (North of the Railways Line, Whitchurch) and OAK016 (Oakley Hall). Their representation mainly focused on particular sites rather than site assessment methodology.
- Douglas Bond on behalf of JPP does not consider that the authority should artificially reject the suitability of sites in villages (i.e. those below tiers 1 – 3), especially where such growth would be consistent with the approach of paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Therefore, the council's justification for its draft approach in Stage 1B of prioritising the most sustainable locations is inconsistent with national advice.
- The categorisation of settlements caused some confusion in relation to filtering, as it was assumed by some that sites with a prefix pertaining to a

settlement outside tiers 1-3, but functionally related to Basingstoke e.g. SOL008 or SSJ004, would be excluded from the assessment.

- Similarly, Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates were concerned that the Bishops Green site they are promoting would be excluded from the site assessment process on the basis that it falls outside of the top 3 tiers.
- Support was expressed by various parties for using the SHELAA as stage one in the filtering process.
- Various respondents expressed concern about their sites being excluded from the detailed assessment process on the basis that they would be situated within tier 4 – 5 settlements.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) stated that there appears to be no recognition of the potential for new settlements in the filtering process, or the potential for lower tier settlements to move up the hierarchy through strategic scale development.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates agreed with the approach of focusing on the most sustainable settlements. They considered that it is a sound town planning principle to place growth at the locations where the need is generated, and hence to focus development on Basingstoke.
- SOLVE recommend that distribution of allocations should be across the borough including modest small development in villages and hamlets.

**Methodology:**

- Historic England made reference to their guidance on site allocations and set out the key considerations from a historic environment perspective. However, they did not specifically comment on the proposed methodology itself. They also stated that they would expect to see historic environment considerations incorporated into site allocation policies.
- In terms of the deliverability elements, Douglas Bond on behalf of JPP stated that the sites selected in the current Local Plan have not been able to show that they are able to achieve the overall housing requirements of the document. Consequently, it is not considered that the approach to the assessment of the deliverability of potential sites was robust. They would advocate that the determination and implementation of applications, together with their build programme as demonstrated in the Lichfield's report, are used to inform the authority's assessment. This should consequently be a key output of the appraisal for a robust site assessment.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) requested that the potential benefits of large sites, such as Southern Manydown, is recognised. By breaking up the assessment of housing and employment sites the assessment may lose some of the cumulative and synergistic benefits offered by larger sites such as Southern Manydown.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) had concerns about the design criteria for new settlements/garden villages, on the basis that it is the only reference to new settlements and garden villages within the methodology, and only relates to design issues. They stated that the council

will need to be careful to ensure that new settlement opportunities are not inadvertently penalised compared to other sites, and that these non-design benefits of new settlement opportunities are adequately captured in the other criteria under the various SA objectives.

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) request that the assessment methodology and criteria account for larger than local benefits to North Hampshire and the wider Local Enterprise Partnership area.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates considered that the weight should be favoured towards location first, not brownfield first. Furthermore, they felt that the methodology must add weight to the value that an existing brownfield site adds to the social and economic rich tapestry of an existing community. They added that including a community peer review into the process will help establish local value of existing land uses.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates also felt that there should be more emphasis on new settlements in the methodology. In this regard they considered that factors such as proximity and accessibility to Basingstoke town centre should also be included as a measure.

***Stages 3 and 4 (Refinement and Selection):***

- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby supported the Council's proposed approach to engage with site promoters and key stakeholders in relation to sites identified for potential allocation.

## Comments on Previously Promoted Sites

The table below summarises the representations received on the Promoted Sites Document. Maps showing the sites listed are contained within the SHELAA (primarily in appendix 6), it can be found on the council's website here: [Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment \(SHELAA\) \(basingstoke.gov.uk\)](http://basingstoke.gov.uk)

*\*Both Southern Water and Thames Water have provided detailed comments on sites/settlements in respect of water supply, wastewater and sewerage network reinforcement requirements, groundwater Source Protection Zones, areas of high infiltration flow and those sites close to a wastewater treatment works that would require odour assessments.*

Site Ref.	Summary of key issues raised	No of respondents
ASH002	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for up to 27 dwellings, which will support existing local services and offer environmental benefits. The site is available and deliverable.</li> </ul>	1
ASH002	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection by CPRE as set out in response to planning application for the site (19/02726/OUT)</li> </ul>	1
ASH003	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection by CPRE as set out in response to planning application for the site (20/01796/OUT)</li> </ul>	1
BAS024	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is available for development and could come forward sooner than the 5-10 year timeframe suggested in the SHELAA. An allocation in the Local Plan is requested</li> </ul>	1
BAS024	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This should be protected as a football ground</li> </ul>	1
BAS025	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of existing local park – greenspaces should be protected. Proposed building too dense, lack of community involvement.</li> </ul>	1
BAS050	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a brownfield site, in an accessible location in an area of high housing demand, and is advocated for allocation in the emerging Local Plan. Supporting documents previously submitted.</li> </ul>	1
BAS051	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a brownfield site, in an accessible location in an area of high housing demand,</li> </ul>	1

	and is advocated for allocation in the emerging Local Plan. Supporting documents previously submitted.	
<b>BAS053</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for industrial use; storage and distribution use; or trade park use. There is a lack of demand for the existing retail use. There are no policy, physical or infrastructure constraints to developing the site.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BAS056</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a brownfield site suitable and available for residential development and is in a sustainable location. The site can no longer operate viably as a commercial use. It can provide market and affordable housing.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BGH001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains, and is adjacent to, Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BGH002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BHG003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14 dwellings in a rural location outside of the Settlement Policy Boundary is inappropriate</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM001</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site adjoins the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary and is in a sustainable location within walking distance of the village centre and local services, as well as bus services to Reading and Basingstoke. Bramley is identified as a sustainable location in the Settlement Study. The site will provide a mix of housing whilst respecting heritage assets.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>Access issues – will affect streetscene, and neighbouring residents' amenities</li> <li>The land is good quality agricultural, in open countryside, loss of greenspace</li> <li>Valuable views are listed in the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>Impact on wildlife habitat</li> <li>Harm to public footpaths</li> </ul>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact on listed buildings and Conservation Area</li> <li>• Flooding, sewage and drainage issues</li> <li>• The site has been assessed through the Neighbourhood Plan process</li> </ul>	
<b>BRAM003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Last remaining view across open countryside from eastern side of Bramley</li> <li>• Road capacity issues (C32) and increased air pollution</li> <li>• Adverse impact on listed buildings and Conservation Area</li> <li>• Flooding, sewage and drainage issues</li> <li>• The site has been assessed through the Neighbourhood Plan process</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM006</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>• Threat of a potential access for BRAM001</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM007</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Adjacent to Bramley Conservation Area</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• Harm to rural setting of Bramley, one of the only remaining green areas south of the C32</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM008</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is south of Bramley MOD Training area – its development shouldn't lead to the need for mitigation of training activities (e.g. access, noise). Need for buffers around MOD sites.</li> <li>• Cufaude Lane is unsuitable for new development that would increase the volume of traffic</li> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> </ul>	3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access issues, traffic congestion and increased air pollution, limited capacity of lane, reliance on cars due to remoteness of site</li> <li>• Loss of good agricultural land</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Adverse impact on listed building</li> <li>• Adjacent to military site - noise issue</li> <li>• No sewage infrastructure</li> <li>• Potential impact on SSSI</li> <li>• No useable broadband service</li> </ul>	
<b>BRAM010</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is promoted for up to 1000 dwellings, to include new infrastructure, education facilities, open space and community facilities. Bramley has a number of local services and facilities, as well as being served by the Reading-Basingstoke train services. A significant development is needed to support the growth of the village. A landscape site appraisal has been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM010</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Object</b></li> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Scale of development dwarfs existing settlement, further urbanising Bramley, facilities inadequate</li> <li>• Coalescence with Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>• The site has been assessed, and rejected, through the Neighbourhood Plan process</li> <li>• Access issues – narrow lanes</li> <li>• Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>• The site is remote from the station, and there are parking issues at the station</li> <li>• Impact on Bramley Green Conservation Area, and identified views in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Flooding</li> <li>• Restrict expansion of school</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Adverse impact on listed buildings and views from the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Inadequate sewage infrastructure</li> <li>• The site has been assessed through the Neighbourhood Plan process</li> </ul>	1
<b>BRAM011</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is promoted for approximately 500 dwellings with biodiversity enhancements, open space and allotments. The site is available,</li> </ul>	1

	<p>considered to be in a sustainable location adjacent to the existing Settlement Policy Boundary and close to local facilities at Sherfield Park and Chineham. A Vision document, Landscape appraisal, heritage appraisal, preliminary drainage strategy and biodiversity net gain assessment have been submitted.</p>	
<b>BRAM011</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cufaude Lane is unsuitable for new development that would increase the volume of traffic</li> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>• Urbanisation</li> <li>• Access issues – capacity and congestion</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Proximity to heritage asset – The Vyne</li> <li>• Sewage infrastructure inadequate, along with capacity of school, social and sports facilities</li> <li>• Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	3
<b>BRAM012</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramley is not in a position to take further development without considerable planning and investment in required infrastructure</li> <li>• Increased traffic and air pollution</li> <li>• Awaiting appeal decision</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NWD AONB object as the site is within the North Wessex Downs AONB and would have a landscape impact. This is major development, contrary to the NPPF.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NWD AONB object as the site is within the North Wessex Downs AONB and would have a landscape impact. This is major development, contrary to the NPPF.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR003</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should be considered as a future allocation – it is in a sustainable location in the centre of a village, will provide affordable housing and natural open green space. It is subject to a current planning application,</li> </ul>	1

	including a vision and supporting technical documents.	
<b>BUR003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as the site is within the North Wessex Downs AONB and would have a landscape impact. This is major development, contrary to the NPPF.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR006</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB comment that either this site, or BUR008 could be bought forward for development within the NP</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR007</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as this is a major site, inappropriate for employment in the AONB. Loss of woodland would adversely impact local landscape character.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR008</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB comment that either this site, or BUR006 could be bought forward for development within the NP. Part of the site could provide biodiversity net gain.</li> </ul>	1
<b>BUR009</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as the site is within the North Wessex Downs AONB and would have a landscape impact. This is major development, contrary to the NPPF.</li> </ul>	1
<b>CLID001</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site promoter submitted supporting information explaining that the site could accommodate approximately 25 dwellings. The site could be designed to fit in with the conservation area and would include landscape-led high quality design.</li> </ul>	1
<b>CLID001</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policies SS1 or SS6.</li> <li>Development would be large scale and disproportionate to Cliddesden village. The site is in a prominent location and development would be out of character with the village setting, and harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</li> <li>Development on this site has previously been refused planning permission and dismissed at appeal. The Inspector cited the impact upon Cliddesden's rural landscape setting and the consequent impact upon the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	60

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the promoted site is smaller, its density is only slightly lower than the scheme previously dismissed.</li> <li>• The site is identified as a 'green finger' in the adopted VDS, and within the Cliddesden Design Code that has been prepared to accompany the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• The meadow supports valuable biodiversity.</li> <li>• It is in a flood risk area and provides an overflow for the village pond. Development would increase the risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Part of the site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• Development would compromise the existing foul drainage infrastructure which is already at full capacity.</li> <li>• Cliddesden is identified as a Category 5 settlement in the Part 1 Settlement Study so is not an appropriate location for such a significant level of growth. New development would be car dependent.</li> <li>• The site is valuable arable farmland producing food and providing carbon capture.</li> <li>• Adverse impact upon character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape.</li> <li>• CPRE state their opposition to the site.</li> <li>• Light pollution in the village.</li> <li>• Additional vehicles resulting in highway safety impact upon B3046 through village, and upon A339 (route into Basingstoke).</li> <li>• Could ultimately result in a larger development, as a developer has an option on the remainder of the meadow (beyond the land promoted).</li> </ul>	
<b>CLID002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>• Would result in direct and indirect harm to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• The site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• The promoted yield of 10 dwellings would be high density and out of character with the village setting.</li> <li>• Would increase traffic.</li> <li>• Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> </ul>	55

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	
<b>CLID003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>Development would be large scale and a disproportionate level of growth. It would be out of character with the village setting and harmful to the character and appearance, and the significance, of the conservation area.</li> <li>Site is identified as a 'green finger' in the adopted VDS, and within the Cliddesden Design Code that has been prepared to accompany the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>The site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone</li> <li>Development would compromise the existing foul drainage infrastructure which is already at full capacity.</li> <li>Development would increase existing problems with flooding in the village.</li> <li>Cliddesden is identified as a Category 5 settlement in the Part 1 Settlement Study so is not an appropriate location for such a significant level of growth. New development would be car dependent.</li> <li>Adverse impact upon character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape.</li> <li>Result in light pollution in the village.</li> <li>Highway safety impact upon B3046 through village, and upon A339 (into Basingstoke).</li> <li>Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	56
<b>CLID004</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>Proposed development would be disproportionate in scale. It would be out of character with the village setting and harmful to</li> </ul>	56

	<p>the character and appearance, and the significance, of the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact upon character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape.</li> <li>• Site is identified as a 'green finger' in the adopted VDS, and within the Cliddesden Design Code that has been prepared to accompany the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Cliddesden is identified as a Category 5 settlement in the Part 1 Settlement Study so is not an appropriate location for such a significant level of growth. New development would be car dependent.</li> <li>• The yield promoted would result in a density that would be disproportionately high for the village context.</li> <li>• The site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone</li> <li>• Development would compromise the existing foul drainage infrastructure which is already at full capacity.</li> <li>• Development would increase existing problems with flooding in the village.</li> <li>• Result in light pollution in the village.</li> <li>• Highway safety impact from upon B3046 through village, and upon A339 (into Basingstoke).</li> <li>• Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>• Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	
<b>CLID006</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>• Impact upon character and appearance, and significance of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• Site accessed via a narrow lane that gets congested and blocked.</li> <li>• Highway safety impact in Cliddesden village.</li> <li>• Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>• Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites</li> </ul>	55

	around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.	
<b>CLID007</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>• Site is within an area to be identified as a Local Gap in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Work on the NP has identified coalescence as a priority concern for local residents and the proposed designation was supported by the vast majority of respondents in the Neighbourhood Plan Group's September 2020 Issues and Options consultation.</li> <li>• Within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• Highway safety impact in Cliddesden village.</li> <li>• Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>• Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	55
<b>CLID008</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> <li>• Site is within an area to be identified as a Local Gap in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Work on the NP has identified coalescence as a priority concern for local residents and the proposed designation was supported by the vast majority of respondents in the Neighbourhood Plan Group's September 2020 Issues and Options consultation.</li> <li>• Within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• Highway safety impact in Cliddesden village.</li> <li>• Loss of arable land/carbon capture potential.</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>• Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	55
<b>CLID009</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is outside the settlement boundary and development would not meet the requirements of LP Policy SS6.</li> </ul>	56

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is identified as a 'green finger' in the adopted VDS, and within the Cliddesden Design Code that has been prepared to accompany the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Cliddesden is identified as a Category 5 settlement in the Part 1 Settlement Study so is not an appropriate location for such a significant level of growth. New development would be car dependent.</li> <li>• Development would result in a disproportionate level of growth, in relation to the size of the current village. It would be out of character with the village setting and harmful to the character and appearance, and the significance, of the conservation area.</li> <li>• Adverse impact upon character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape.</li> <li>• Majority of the site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone.</li> <li>• Result in light pollution in the village.</li> <li>• Highway safety impact from upon B3046 through village, and upon A339 (route into Basingstoke).</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impacts with other sites promoted around village.</li> <li>• Cliddesden Parish Council expressed concern that it would be premature to allocate sites around the village before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</li> </ul>	
<b>CLID011</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A response was submitted on behalf of the landowner. This explained (inter alia) that the development would help to diversify and increase housing supply, and that it would deliver a well-planned, well-designed, accessible and sustainable new Garden Community. It also acknowledged the council's aspirations to improve design and tackle climate change.</li> </ul>	1
<b>CLID011</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p>384 objections including representations from Cliddesden Parish Council, Ellisfield Parish Council, Herriard Parish Council, Dummer Parish Council, and Preston Candover and Nutley PC. Objections were also submitted by Cllr Andrew McCormick, and County Cllr Mark Kemp-Gee (representing an adjacent ward)</p> <p><u>Principle</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General objection to building in the countryside on a greenfield site, which does not comply with</li> </ul>	381

	<p>current Local Plan Policy SS6 (262). Site is therefore considered unsuitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about size and scale of development. Houses are not required to meet the requirements of the Local Plan or other local housing needs (249). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lots of homes are already being built in and around Basingstoke, and these will be sufficient to meet needs.</li> <li>○ There are also other large development sites that have not yet been built out (such as Manydown, Hounsome Fields and the Golf Course).</li> <li>○ Pressure needs to be put on developers to prevent 'land banking'.</li> <li>○ There are signs that there is now likely to be a post-Covid economic crash, which will reduce demand for housing. As people are more able to work from home, they may relocate to cheaper areas, and so reduce pressure on the local housing market.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There are better sites that can meet housing needs (40). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strategy should prioritise brownfield sites including sites in the town centre and repurposing/reusing empty retail parks/business parks.</li> <li>○ Amount of suitable brownfield land is likely to increase as a result of changed working patterns arising from covid. Those locations are already served by infrastructure, and development could provide a tangible regeneration benefit.</li> <li>○ As Manydown is owned by the public sector, that site should be preferred as the revenue would be invested in public services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submitted documents illustrate that all the homes could not be delivered within the next Plan period (197). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stated delivery rates are overly-optimistic taking account of Lichfields' Feb 2020 research on site delivery and market conditions. Reliance on this site risks under-delivery and future housing land supply problems.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Impact upon landscape and rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanent loss of countryside and impact upon rural character (314). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Area is particularly high quality chalk downland in the North Hampshire Downs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>with beautiful views and vistas that have not changed for many years. Cliddesden Parish Council state that CPRE have assessed this area and consider it to be a 'valued landscape' and that they (the PC) consider it should be protected in line with NPPF para 170(a). CPRE's comments strongly object to the proposal and state that it would have 'a detrimental impact on the local landscape character'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development of such scale would be contrary to the local settlement pattern. BDBC's Landscape Capacity Study (2008) concluded much of the area had no capacity for development in landscape terms.</li> <li>○ The landscape makes a significant contribution to the setting of Basingstoke and the villages south of the motorway. Cliddesden's Conservation Area appraisal notes that its heritage is agricultural and its landscape setting is integral to its sense of place.</li> <li>○ Area has retained a very rural character despite its proximity to Basingstoke.</li> <li>○ There would be long distance views of site as the land undulates and rise steadily from Cliddesden (including views from central Basingstoke).</li> <li>○ Development would impact upon the AONB.</li> <li>○ Concerns about the cumulative loss of countryside around Basingstoke since 1960s.</li> <li>● Loss of large area of valuable and productive farmland (279). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concern about food security and carbon sequestration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● M3 provides a physical barrier and prevents Basingstoke 'sprawling' (21). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Breaching the M3 could result in unconstrained development on surrounding land.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Land provides a valuable space for recreation and enjoyment for residents of the villages and residents of Basingstoke. Development would remove access to this countryside (275). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The land provides 'green lungs' for the town. Covid has highlighted the importance of accessing countryside for peoples' physical and mental wellbeing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would affect (and urbanise) a number of PRowWs including the historic Three Castles Path.</li> <li>○ Value of countryside shown by number of runners, cyclists, horse riders and bird watchers – which has increased during pandemic.</li> <li>○ Cliddesden PC suggest that the land should be managed for recreation and biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ecology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact upon biodiversity and the natural environment including fauna, flora and woodland (270). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would result in loss of hedgerows, biodiversity-rich field margins and wildlife corridors.</li> <li>○ Range of species present indicates importance of area.</li> <li>○ Habitats should be protected or enhanced.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Hampshire Ornithological Society comment that the marginal farming land appears to have been overexploited to the detriment of local ecology, however the chalk downland has great ecological potential. This type of habitat could not be replicated in a Garden village style development.</li> <li>● Impact upon ecology of Ancient Woodland (264) and SINC.s. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The response from the Woodland Trust notes the site contains Ancient Woodland, is adjacent to Ancient Woodland, and contains veteran trees. They stated that development that results in the loss of ancient woodland should not be permitted and recommended a 50m buffer as a precautionary principle.</li> <li>○ Ancient woodland is irreplaceable and could not be replaced by new tree planting.</li> <li>○ Cumulative impact with past loss of Ancient Woodland.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Potential impact upon mature broad leaf native trees across site.</li> <li>● Impact upon Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.</li> <li>● Busier roads will result in greater wildlife mortality.</li> <li>● Cumulative impact upon habitats with other development sites around Basingstoke.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact upon listed buildings (221)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Many Grade II Listed buildings and Grade II* Church of St Andrew and Farleigh Wallop House</li> <li>● Impact upon Cliddesden conservation area (243) and Ellisfield conservation area.</li> <li>● Impact upon house and Registered Park and Garden at Hackwood Park.</li> <li>● Site includes ancient burial grounds (229) that could be disturbed by development. Archaeological interest has not yet been fully investigated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other environmental considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Would exacerbate existing surface water flooding in the area (Cliddesden - including area around the pond, Winslade, on the A339, Ellisfield, Preston Candover) (242). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Problems has worsened in recent years due to climate change.</li> <li>○ The response from Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions, and the importance of agreeing an appropriate sustainable surface water strategy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Site covers areas of Ground Water Protection Zones (209)</li> <li>● Light pollution (inc importance of local dark skies) and noise.</li> <li>● Pollution during construction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Climate change</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proposal would not support council's climate declaration (and reaching zero carbon by 2030), or comply with statements in Local Plan Issues and Options consultation about placing climate change at the heart of decisions (8).</li> <li>● Would result in loss of arable land and woodland (and replacement with hard surfaces), and a consequent reduction in carbon sequestration (8).</li> <li>● Carbon emissions from the manufacture of the building materials.</li> <li>● Green credentials are stated (without detail) – but unclear in principle about how the loss of so much countryside can be 'green'.</li> <li>● Car dependency of location would increase carbon footprint/air pollution.</li> </ul> <p><u>Impact upon villages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development would be of an inappropriate scale and would swamp Cliddesden, Winslade</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>and Ellisfield to detriment of their rural and historic character and their individual identities (247). Also, impact upon the rural characters of Farleigh, Dummer and Herriard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Villages would coalesce with Basingstoke.</li> <li>• Section 7 of the Issues and Options consultation document sets out the importance of protecting the setting of the borough's villages.</li> <li>• Impact upon wellbeing/ amenity of local residents (in Cliddesden and nearby villages). There would be disturbance from construction for many years.</li> <li>• Loss of sense of community in rural villages. The communities are tightly-knit and residents look after each other, including the elderly.</li> <li>• Inappropriate scale of development illustrated by settlement typologies in BDBC's Settlement Study. Would move Cliddesden from a Category 5 'village' to a Category 2 'service centre' alongside Tadley, Overton and Whitchurch. Would not be sustainable for Cliddesden to accommodate more development than these larger towns and villages.</li> </ul> <p><u>Highways and transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about increased traffic (334) resulting in congestion, air quality/air pollution, noise pollution and increased risk to vulnerable road users. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased traffic through Cliddesden on B3046 and on Woods Lane. Particularly dangerous as Cliddesden village has narrow roads and few footpaths.</li> <li>○ Would increase traffic on the A339 and cause congestion on roundabouts into Basingstoke (which already suffer delays at peak hours). There is a history of accidents on the A339 – the proposed new junction would be at a 'black spot'.</li> <li>○ Proposal would channel traffic onto already congested roads through Brighton Hill, Hatch Warren and Beggarwood and impact upon those communities. There would be insufficient road capacity to access Basingstoke town as the M3 has limited crossing points.</li> <li>○ Would result in additional traffic on the rural roads south of the M3 (through the Candovers, Ellisfield, Herriard, Upton Grey,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>North Warnborough and the surrounding villages, and through to M3 J5, J6 and J7). Roads would be used as rat runs and are unsuitable for high volumes of traffic because they are predominantly narrow and winding, and many are in a poor state of repair (concerns raised by nearby parish councils). Consequent concerns about highway safety, and the impact upon the rural character of villages and the amenity of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed bypass off Woods Lane would not be sufficient to cope with extra traffic.</li> <li>• There are various highway pinchpoints in and around Cliddesden that could not be alleviated without compulsory purchase. Such changes would affect village character.</li> <li>• Additional pressure on M3 junctions 6 and 7. Would necessitate a ring road around Basingstoke (and further environmental damage).</li> <li>• Standard 'distributor road' model of development would exacerbate traffic and is urbanising.</li> <li>• The proposed 'Main Street' is currently a winding countryside lane (as are others in the locality). Any changes to these roads (such as widening) would have a harmful impact upon the character of the area and consequences for biodiversity (4).</li> <li>• Impact upon National Cycle Network route 23.</li> <li>• Impact of construction traffic on narrow lanes.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other infrastructure issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate infrastructure to deal with needs of additional residents (40)</li> <li>• Site is physically isolated from facilities and infrastructure and sustainable transportation links. Even if some new infrastructure was provided on-site, residents would still need to access facilities and services in Basingstoke (and likely do this by car). By comparison, sites to the north of the M3 would benefit from MRT. Report, 'Transport for New Homes 2020: Garden Villages and Garden Towns Visions and Reality' suggests that such developments remain car dependent. Neighbourhood Plan research showed that 95% of Cliddesden residents use their car as their primary method of travel.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon Cliddesden Primary School. School uses surrounding countryside for learning.</li> <li>• Development not large enough to justify a new secondary school. Given topography and distances, walking and cycling would not be a realistic option for home to school transport.</li> <li>• Inadequate medical provision.</li> <li>• Basingstoke railway station is already at capacity at peak times.</li> <li>• Utility issues in local area. Frequent power and internet cuts and occasional water pressure problems.</li> <li>• Thames Water commented that such development would be likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network, and noted the importance of phasing infrastructure upgrades so they are available prior to the occupation of development.</li> <li>• Would increase demand for water. Concerns about recent water shortages.</li> <li>• Problems with treatment of waste water and the water quality of the River Loddon.</li> <li>• Difficult to physically provide sewerage capacity in this location for so many homes.</li> <li>• If additional infrastructure was required, it would further affect rural character and fragment the landscape.</li> <li>• Infrastructure improvements would need to be extensive and would be very expensive.</li> <li>• The provision of new facilities would not outweigh the other harm.</li> <li>• Will create socially deprived areas. Could result in increased crime and antisocial behaviour.</li> </ul> <p><u>Character, size and location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this become a 'place' or just an unattractive suburban commuter stop-over?</li> <li>• 2,500 houses isn't large enough to support a self-sufficient garden village. 2,500 homes is unlikely to be viable due to the scale of the infrastructure requirements.</li> <li>• Concern about size. Development would not be a 'village'. It would be larger than Hook.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would not comply with any of the draft sustainability objectives used for the site assessments (5).</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would not meet any of the other objectives set out in the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation, particularly those related to climate change, environment and heritage, and the natural environment (4).</li> <li>• On-site employment unlikely to provide jobs for new residents. Likely to encourage in-commuting, whilst residents would still need to out-commute.</li> <li>• Proposed entrepreneurial hub would conflict with the role of Basing View (2).</li> <li>• Type of homes would not meet needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would be executive homes rather than small starter homes.</li> <li>○ Housing unlikely to be affordable for most local people.</li> <li>○ Not clear whether development would provide affordable housing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cumulative impact with motorway service area at Farleigh needs to be considered.</li> <li>• If the site was developed it would be necessary to reinstate Basingstoke and Alton Light Railway as a rapid transit route (to mitigate the highways impact).</li> <li>• Could lead to further development south of the M3 in the future (6). Would ultimately lead to the coalescence of Basingstoke and Alton.</li> <li>• Steep ground may make building difficult.</li> <li>• Landowner has restricted public access to areas of their land.</li> <li>• The area used to have a special landscape designation from the council.</li> <li>• Properties in Cliddesden and the surrounding villages will be devalued (3).</li> <li>• Does not agree with developer's assertion it is for the benefit of the community. Proposals are motivated by financial gain (24).</li> </ul>	
<b>DUM003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent to SINC and comprises Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted</li> <li>• No sewage infrastructure</li> <li>• Dangerous access and increased traffic</li> </ul>	1
<b>DUM004</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is promoted for approx. 271,000sq m use class B8 floorspace, providing employment and economic opportunities. This is subject to two current planning applications; evidence of need and technical documents have been submitted with the application. The site should</li> </ul>	1

	be considered as a key strategic development location in the new local plan.	
<b>DUM004</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much larger than initially proposed (Steventon Parish Council)</li> <li>• Needs significant consultation with the local communities (Steventon Parish Council)</li> <li>• Objection by CPRE as set out in their comments for planning applications for the site (20/02162/OUT and 20/02586/FUL)</li> <li>• DUM004 is not included in the LPU for storage and distribution so to allow this site to be considered for the new hospital</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• Local and strategic road network is substandard</li> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> </ul>	3
<b>DUM005</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection by CPRE as set out in their response to planning applications for the site (16/03526/FUL)</li> <li>• Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>• Implications for infrastructure and services</li> <li>• Development on the site already dismissed on appeal</li> </ul>	2
<b>DUM006</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenfield site</li> </ul>	1
<b>DUM006</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 houses could be situated on the southern part of the site as part of the current Local Plan requirement for 10 houses in the parish</li> </ul>	1
<b>DUM007</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenfield site</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on existing residents' amenities</li> <li>• No requirement for another village hall</li> </ul>	1
<b>DUM008</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any new commercial development should be small in scale and sympathetic to the location, with limited commercial traffic and no adverse impact on residents' amenities or the listed building</li> </ul>	1
<b>DUM009</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site</li> <li>• Huge impact on the character of the village and nearby listed buildings</li> <li>• Alterations to junction 7 would be required</li> <li>• No power or drainage for the site</li> </ul>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area should be a strategic gap</li> </ul>	
<b>DUM010</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield site</li> <li>Access issues</li> <li>Waste collection issues</li> </ul>	1
<b>EC002</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW001</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as the site is an important green wedge in this hamlet and retains the open character of the edge of the settlement</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside settlement boundary, set out on a limb</li> <li>NWD AONB object due to potential biodiversity impact on Hargreaves pond</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW004</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for a sustainable neighbourhood of 40-50 homes on the edge of Woolton Hill which has a range of facilities. The development will include zero carbon homes, affordable housing, open space, biodiversity net gain, landscape buffering. The representation includes a vision document. The site is available and achievable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW004</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB comment that there is potential for development but land could also enable potential expansion of the school, and should be landscape led. Woolton Hill has taken a significant amount of development in the last plan period.</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW005</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as the site is an important green wedge in this hamlet and retains the open character of the edge of the settlement</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW007</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as the site is an important green wedge in this hamlet and retains the open character of the edge of the settlement</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW008</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development to allow the expansion of Newbury and meet local needs. A landscape site appraisal has been submitted incorporating blue/green infrastructure.</li> </ul>	1
<b>EW008</b>	<b>Object</b>	32

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of greenfield site, loss of countryside, important green wedge</li> <li>• Site and existing properties already liable to flooding - increased flood risk on proposed site and elsewhere, with increased potential for flooding due to climate change. Environment Agency maps conservative regarding extent of flooding currently. Common Farm currently provides flood plain.</li> <li>• Urbanisation</li> <li>• Adverse impact on wildlife and biodiversity – part of a wildlife corridor link to The Chase woodland</li> <li>• Adverse impact on human health due to proximity to busy road</li> <li>• Impact on already stretched local services e.g. sewage infrastructure, doctors/schools, including within West Berkshire. Concerns by GP surgery about physical/resourcing capacity.</li> <li>• Increased traffic flow/congestion/impact on road junctions/road safety (already dangerous junction)</li> <li>• Increased water, traffic and noise pollution and carbon emissions due to unsustainable location</li> <li>• Increased light pollution</li> <li>• Potential loss of trees and hedgerows</li> <li>• Adverse impact on AONB</li> <li>• Lack of connection to Woolton Hill</li> <li>• Will result in coalescence between Woolton Hill and Newbury</li> <li>• Risk of erosion to land &amp; lack of responsibility for riparian rights</li> <li>• Sand and gravel on the site protected for mineral safeguarding</li> <li>• Public footpath running through the site provides good access to green infrastructure</li> <li>• The land may be needed for expansion of the A34</li> <li>• The river Enborne should be retained as a natural boundary to the settlement</li> <li>• The land adjacent to the A34 should be designated as green belt to prevent infill development</li> </ul>	
<b>HI001</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NWD AONB object as inappropriate site for employment, detrimental to the AONB. Loss of wooded area would have an adverse impact on local landscape character</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI002</b>	<b>Object</b>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as major, inappropriate development in the AONB</li> </ul>	
<b>HI003</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be allocated for development, including affordable housing to meet housing need. Housing is required outside of Basingstoke Town. The site is deliverable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as major, inappropriate development in the AONB</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI004</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be allocated for development, including affordable housing to meet housing need as housing is required outside of Basingstoke Town. The site is deliverable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI004</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as major, inappropriate development in the AONB</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI006</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a brownfield site that should be allocated for development. Supporting documents have previously been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI007</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be allocated for development alongside HI006. Supporting documents have previously been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>HI008</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as major, inappropriate development in the AONB</li> </ul>	1
<b>HP004</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate existing roads/infrastructure</li> <li>Increased traffic congestion</li> <li>Loss of biodiversity and local greenspace</li> <li>Impact on local footpaths</li> <li>NWD AONB object as site set out on a limb from the settlement, elevated site which would impact the setting of the AONB</li> </ul>	3
<b>KING004</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for a sustainable neighbourhood on the edge of Kingsclere which has a range of facilities. The development will include zero carbon homes, affordable housing, open space, biodiversity net gain, landscape buffering. The representation includes a vision document.</li> </ul>	1
<b>KING004</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council should support, and give priority to sites allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>	1
<b>KING004</b>	<b>Comment</b>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB comment that part of the site could provide a small development, avoiding creep into AONB</li> </ul>	
<b>KING005</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council should support, and give priority to sites allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>NWD AONB object as land inappropriate for development – detached from the settlement, within setting of AONB</li> </ul>	2
<b>KING007</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for approximately 180 homes. It is in a sustainable location with a range of local services and well connected by public transport, with a role to play in meeting wider housing needs. The site adjoins the current settlement policy boundary and is not significantly constrained. A vision document has also been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>KING007</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council should support, and give priority to sites allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>NWD AONB object as land inappropriate for development – detached from the settlement, within setting of AONB</li> </ul>	2
<b>MAP001</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>MAP001</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>Located within an area designated as countryside.</li> <li>This site falls into the category of an important and valued high quality landscape which is greatly valued by residents and visitors.</li> <li>Unsustainable location.</li> <li>Impact on the Conservation Area. Developing the site would have detrimental visual impact and destroy key locally valued views and vistas identified in the Mapledurwell Conservation Area Appraisal.</li> <li>Detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>There is no mains drainage to the south side of the M3 motorway. Determining a route across the motorway with associated pumping stations</li> </ul>	23

	<p>and drain infrastructure would be required making viability unlikely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding and creating suitable vehicular access may be very difficult to achieve and make the site unviable.</li> <li>• Concern regarding challenging ground conditions which make viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Concern that the development of the site would create noise and pollution.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Developing the site would harm the character of the settlement and would be incongruous in terms of scale and intensity of development.</li> <li>• Suburbanising impact on the village.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding coalescence with Old Basing/Hatch.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the rural character and amenity value of local footpaths.</li> <li>• Would be affected by noise and pollution from the M3.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the settlement.</li> <li>• Concern that new housing which has been provided is not the right typology, which is creating social problems.</li> <li>• Affordable housing in the area has not proven popular with prospective occupants.</li> <li>• Inconsistent with the Climate Emergency.</li> <li>• Highway safety and traffic generation – local road network not suitable for the additional level of development promoted.</li> <li>• Could set a precedent for developments south of the M3.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife.</li> <li>• Developing in Mapledurwell is not a sensible strategic solution to the borough's housing need.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity of local infrastructure and facilities, including local schools.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAP002</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>MAP002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>• Located within an area designated as countryside.</li> </ul>	23

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site falls into the category of an important and valued high quality landscape which is greatly valued by residents and visitors.</li> <li>• Unsustainable location.</li> <li>• Impact on the Conservation Area. Developing the site would have detrimental visual impact and destroy key locally valued views and vistas identified in the Mapledurwell Conservation Area Appraisal.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>• There is no mains drainage to the south side of the M3 motorway. Determining a route across the motorway with associated pumping stations and drain infrastructure would be required making viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Finding and creating suitable vehicular access may be very difficult to achieve and make the site unviable.</li> <li>• Concern regarding challenging ground conditions which make viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Concern that the development of the site would create noise and pollution.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Developing the site would harm the character of the settlement and would be incongruous in terms of scale and intensity of development.</li> <li>• Suburbanising impact on the village.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding coalescence with Old Basing/Hatch.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the rural character and amenity value of local footpaths.</li> <li>• Would be affected by noise and pollution from the M3.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the settlement.</li> <li>• Concern that new housing which has been provided is not the right typology, which is creating social problems.</li> <li>• Affordable housing in the area has not proven popular with prospective occupants.</li> <li>• Inconsistent with the Climate Emergency.</li> <li>• Highway safety and traffic generation – local road network not suitable for the additional level of development promoted.</li> <li>• Could set a precedent for developments south of the M3.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing in Mapledurwell is not a sensible strategic solution to the borough's housing need.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity of local infrastructure and facilities, including local schools.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAP003</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>MAP003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>• Located within an area designated as countryside.</li> <li>• This site falls into the category of an important and valued high quality landscape which is greatly valued by residents and visitors.</li> <li>• Unsustainable location.</li> <li>• Impact on the Conservation Area. Developing the site would have detrimental visual impact and destroy key locally valued views and vistas identified in the Mapledurwell Conservation Area Appraisal.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>• There is no mains drainage to the south side of the M3 motorway. Determining a route across the motorway with associated pumping stations and drain infrastructure would be required making viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Finding and creating suitable vehicular access may be very difficult to achieve and make the site unviable.</li> <li>• Concern regarding challenging ground conditions which make viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Concern that the development of the site would create noise and pollution.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Developing the site would harm the character of the settlement and would be incongruous in terms of scale and intensity of development.</li> <li>• Suburbanising impact on the village.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding coalescence with Old Basing/Hatch.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the rural character and amenity value of local footpaths.</li> <li>• Noise and pollution from the M3.</li> </ul>	23

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdevelopment of the settlement.</li> <li>• Concern that new housing which has been provided is not the right typology, which is creating social problems.</li> <li>• Affordable housing in the area has not proven popular with prospective occupants.</li> <li>• Inconsistent with the Climate Emergency.</li> <li>• Highway safety and traffic generation – local road network not suitable for the additional level of development promoted.</li> <li>• Could set a precedent for developments south of the M3.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife.</li> <li>• Developing in Mapledurwell is not a sensible strategic solution to the borough's housing need.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity of local infrastructure and facilities, including local schools.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAP004</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>MAP004</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>• Located within an area designated as countryside.</li> <li>• Falls into the category of an important and valued high quality landscape which is greatly valued by residents and visitors.</li> <li>• Unsustainable location.</li> <li>• Impact on the Conservation Area as would have detrimental visual impact and destroy key locally valued views and vistas identified in the Mapledurwell Conservation Area Appraisal.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>• There is no mains drainage to the south side of the M3 motorway. Determining a route across the motorway with associated pumping stations and drain infrastructure would be required making viability unlikely.</li> <li>• Finding and creating suitable vehicular access may be very difficult to achieve and make the site unviable.</li> <li>• Concern regarding challenging ground conditions which make viability unlikely.</li> </ul>	24

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the development of the site would create noise and pollution.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Harm the character of the settlement and would be incongruous in terms of scale and intensity of development.</li> <li>• Suburbanising impact on the village.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding coalescence with Old Basing/Hatch.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the rural character and amenity value of local footpaths.</li> <li>• Noise and pollution from the M3.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the settlement.</li> <li>• Concern that new housing which has been provided is not the right typology, which is creating social problems.</li> <li>• Affordable housing in the area has not proven popular with prospective occupants.</li> <li>• Inconsistent with the Climate Emergency.</li> <li>• Highway safety and traffic generation – local road network not suitable for the additional level of development promoted.</li> <li>• Could set a precedent for developments south of the M3.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife.</li> <li>• Developing in Mapledurwell is not a sensible strategic solution to the borough’s housing need.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity of local infrastructure and facilities, including local schools.</li> <li>• Would be inconsistent with previous council decisions which sought to protect the site and the views which would be affected.</li> </ul>	
<b>NEW002</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>NEW002</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that more housing is needed. Too many new houses have recently been built or are planned along the A30</li> <li>• Development would detract from the rural sense of place</li> <li>• Would radically alter the nature of the village and erode the open nature of countryside, development out of character</li> </ul>	20

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local roads unsuitable. Blackstock's Lane inadequate as too narrow for vehicles to pass as is road from Greywell to Mapledurwell.</li> <li>• Pollution and noise from M3 issue</li> <li>• Valued and tranquil rights of way would be lost</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors including chalk streams, Hang Wood and Mill Wood SINC and ancient woodland.</li> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Unsustainable as no local facilities nearby so all new residents would need to use car.</li> <li>• Negative impact on historical buildings i.e. Grade II listed Manor Farm, Manor Farm Barn, and ancient Grade I listed St. Swithuns Church.</li> <li>• A clearly marked watercourse flows to the north of NEW003 and then through the A30 culvert. The River Lyde flows to the west and is also culverted under the A30. This area of Blackstocks Lane has a history of regular flooding after heavy rain, exacerbated by any blockage at the culvert.</li> <li>• A more efficient use for this land would be a buffer for adjacent SINCS and ancient woodland in sustaining irreplaceable habitat and wildlife corridors, and in flood mitigation.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion, carbon emissions, light, noise and air pollution with detrimental impact on health</li> <li>• Access, parking and road safety issues</li> <li>• Negative impact on amenities of neighbouring residents</li> </ul>	
<b>NEW003</b>	<b>Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>NEW003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that more housing is needed. Too many new houses have recently been built or are planned along the A30</li> </ul>	19

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would radically alter the nature of the village and erode the open nature of countryside, development out of character</li> <li>• Local roads unsuitable. Blackstock's Lane inadequate as too narrow for vehicles to pass</li> <li>• Constrained by pollution and noise from M3</li> <li>• Valued and tranquil rights of way would be lost</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridors including chalk streams, Hang Wood and Mill Wood SINC and ancient woodland.</li> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Unsustainable as no local facilities nearby so all new residents would need to use car.</li> <li>• Negative impact on historical buildings i.e. Grade II listed Manor Farm, Manor Farm Barn, and ancient Grade I listed St. Swithuns Church.</li> <li>• A clearly marked watercourse flows to the north and then through the A30 culvert. The River Lyde flows to the west and is also culverted under the A30. This area of Blackstocks Lane has a history of regular flooding after heavy rain, exacerbated by any blockage at the culvert.</li> <li>• A more efficient use for this land would be a buffer for the adjacent SINC's and ancient woodland in sustaining irreplaceable habitat and wildlife corridors, and in flood mitigation.</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion, carbon emissions, light, noise and air pollution with detrimental impact on health</li> <li>• Negative impact on amenities of neighbouring residents</li> <li>• Access, parking and road safety issues</li> <li>• Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	
<b>NT003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>NWAL001</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is being promoted for development as part of a strategic opportunity with 'Southern Manydown'. This provides the opportunity to provide a sustainable and comprehensively</li> </ul>	3

	<p>planned mixed use development. The scale of the development allows innovative transport and infrastructure to be considered from the outset, and for a self-contained new community in accordance with Garden Community Principles. The site also has the potential to provide a healthcare campus. A concept plan, and a Vision and Development Principles Document for Southern Manydown have been submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is on the shortlist for a new hospital under the Government's Health Infrastructure Plan Phase 2. A preferred site will be selected following formal consultation in 2021.</li> </ul>	
<b>NWAL001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains, and is adjacent to, Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK001</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is being promoted for development as part of a strategic opportunity with 'Southern Manydown'. This provides the opportunity to provide a sustainable and comprehensively planned mixed use development. The scale of the development allows innovative transport and infrastructure to be considered from the outset, and for a self-contained new community in accordance with Garden Community Principles. The site also has the potential to provide a healthcare campus. A concept plan, and a Vision and Development Principles Document for Southern Manydown have been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as would result in coalescence between Oakley and Basingstoke, to detriment of the village and setting of the AONB. Part of the site is part of the lapwing mitigation strategy.</li> <li>Contains Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	2
<b>OAK009</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB comment that this site would be logical next step for allocating land, without compromise to AONB.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK011</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is being promoted for a small development of 5 dwellings. The site is within the built-up area of Oakley and close to the</li> </ul>	1

	settlement policy boundary of East Oakley, well related to existing services and facilities. This development would enable the release of land to enable expansion of the school to the east.	
<b>OAK012</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development, located in a sustainable location on the edge of Oakley and within walking distance of local facilities and bus services to Basingstoke and Overton. Oakley is identified as a sustainable location in the Settlement Study. The site is available and achievable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK016</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site was wrongly allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. The allocation was for retirement dwellings.</li> <li>Contrary to numerous planning policies in terms of landscape and heritage impact (Deane Conservation Area), design, coalescence of settlements, traffic congestion and noise pollution, SS6, CN4, CN9.</li> <li>The size of development is out of proportion to the size of the local settlement, and some distance from local services.</li> <li>Objection by CPRE as set out in their response to planning application for the site (20/01586/OUT)</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK017</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development including open space, as natural growth to the west of Oakley a natural extension to the village. Oakley is a strongly performing settlement to deliver sustainable development. The site is deliverable within the next 5 years. A landscape site appraisal and landscape development plan have been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK017</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NWD AONB object as inappropriate development within the AONB, would unbalance the character of the village.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK018</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development (along with OAK019), providing onsite facilities, enhancing connectivity and offering easy access to existing facilities within Oakley. It is served by bus services to Basingstoke and provides the potential to facilitate a new railway station. The site represents a logical extension to Oakley as well as being well related to</li> </ul>	1

	Manydown and the council's Vision for south-west Basingstoke. The site could be delivered within 5 years.	
<b>OAK018</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as inappropriate development within the AONB, would unbalance the character of the village.</li> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	2
<b>OAK019</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development (along with OAK019), providing onsite facilities, enhancing connectivity and offering easy access to existing facilities within Oakley. It is served by bus services to Basingstoke and provides the potential to facilitate a new railway station. The site represents a logical extension to Oakley as well as being well related to Manydown and the council's Vision for south-west Basingstoke. The site could be delivered within 5 years.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK019</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as inappropriate development within the AONB, would unbalance the character of the village.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK020</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development of approximately 25 dwellings, including a recreational area, strategic landscaping and enhanced access. It is adjacent to existing residential development with good infrastructure and connectivity. Oakley village has a good range of facilities and services and is well served by buses to Basingstoke, Whitchurch and Andover. Development could be delivered within 5 years.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OAK020</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as would result in inappropriate development within the AONB, would unbalance the character of the village</li> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	2
<b>OLD001</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hampshire County Council as landowner supports sites development. Currently progressing proposals for the full extent of the site for 900 homes with supporting</li> </ul>	1

	<p>infrastructure delivering a comprehensive and deliverable scheme for whole site.</p> <p>Representations include site context analysis, vision, concept masterplan and current project programme (planning application to be submitted spring 2022).</p>	
<b>OLD001</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD002</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey promote land for development stating site sustainable location adjacent to existing settlement boundary with potential to deliver 600 dwellings brought forward alongside and comprehensively with neighbouring allocation. Technical work submitted alongside representations include, vision, highways technical note, ecology technical note, landscape report, heritage appraisal and drainage/utilities report.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD002</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD002</b>	<p><b>Object</b> <u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure including water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance which are already struggling to cope with demand.</li> <li>Road congestion and safety cause for concern. Unacceptable and unmanageable increase in traffic on Newnham Lane. There are limited crossing points over the railway which will also cause problems.</li> <li>In combination with other proposed sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old</li> </ul>	19

	<p>Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Basing already has a major issue with ‘Rat Running’ through the village.</li> <li>• If any development was to take place all traffic should be stopped heading east up Newnham Lane from Hale Farm.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village character</li> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species.</li> <li>• The adopted Local Plan Inspector’s Report (Para 64) – referred to ‘unacceptable environmental impacts, on the quality of the landscape and Chalk Rivers’.</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Along with neighbouring promoted sites this area plays an important role as a River Basin/Catchment Area also lying within the 10 km Buffer Zone for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA</li> <li>• Loddon valley important for wildlife including; skylark, meadow pipits, lapwings, woodcock, snipe, grey partridge, voles, barn owls, protected amphibians and reptiles.</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations.</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity. Tranquillity an essential feature both for people and wildlife.</li> <li>• There is no landscape capacity for development as highly sensitive to development given the site location in River Loddon valley corridor</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• Site fails the Sequential Test as the Borough has numerous sites to the west of Basingstoke with lower risk of flooding</li> <li>• The adopted local plan inspectors report states ‘the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.’ Para 191</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD003</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey promote the land for development. Site has potential to deliver 3,000 dwellings alongside community facilities as a future strategic growth area linking Lodge Farm to north and Hodds Farm to south to meet long term housing needs. Representation supported by Highways Technical Note.</li> </ul>	2
<b>OLD003</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure including water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance which are already struggling to cope with demand.</li> <li>• Road congestion and safety cause for concern. Unacceptable and unmanageable increase in</li> </ul>	18

	<p>traffic on Newnham Lane. There are limited crossing points over the railway which will also cause problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In combination with other promoted sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33.</li> <li>• Old Basing already has a major issue with 'Rat Running' through the village.</li> <li>• If any development was to take place all traffic should be stopped heading east up Newnham Lane from Hale Farm.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village character permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species.</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Along with neighbouring promoted sites this area plays an important role as a River Basin/Catchment Area also lying within the 10 km Buffer Zone for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA</li> <li>• Loddon valley important for wildlife including skylark, meadow pipits, lapwings, woodcock, snipe, grey partridge, voles, barn owls, protected amphibians and reptiles.</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity. Tranquillity an essential feature both for people and wildlife.</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations.</li> <li>• There is no landscape capacity for development as highly sensitive to</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>development given the site location in the River Loddon valley corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains, and is adjacent to, Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• Site fails the Sequential Test as the Borough has numerous sites to the west of Basingstoke with lower risk of flooding</li> <li>• The adopted local plan inspectors report states ‘the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.’ Para 191</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD005</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD005</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure including water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance which are already struggling to cope with demand.</li> <li>• Road congestion and safety cause for concern. Unacceptable and unmanageable increase in traffic on Newnham Lane. There are limited crossing points over the railway which will also cause problems.</li> <li>• In combination with other promoted sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old</li> </ul>	19

	<p>Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Basing already has a major issue with ‘Rat Running’ through the village.</li> <li>• If any development was to take place all traffic should be stopped heading east up Newnham Lane from Hale Farm.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village character permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species.</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Loddon valley important for wildlife including; skylark, meadow pipits, lapwings, woodcock, snipe, grey partridge, voles, barn owls, protected amphibians and reptiles.</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity.</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations.</li> <li>• Contains, and is adjacent to, Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• Site fails the Sequential Test as the Borough has numerous sites to the west of Basingstoke with lower risk of flooding</li> <li>• Para 191 of the adopted Local Plan inspectors report states for this site ‘the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.(para 191)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production.</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD006</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD006</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure. Water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance are already struggling to cope with demand.</li> <li>• Road congestion and safety cause for concern. Unacceptable and unmanageable increase in traffic on Newnham Lane. There are limited crossing points over the railway which will also cause problems.</li> <li>• In combination with other promoted sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33.</li> <li>• Old Basing already has a major issue with 'Rat Running' through the village.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village character</li> <li>• Permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species.</li> </ul>	19

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Inspector’s Report (Para 64) – referred to ‘unacceptable environmental impacts, on the quality of the landscape and Chalk Rivers’.</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Loddon valley important for wildlife including; skylark, meadow pipits, lapwings, woodcock, snipe, grey partridge, voles, barn owls, protected amphibians and reptiles</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations</li> <li>• There is no landscape capacity for development as highly sensitive to development given location in the River Loddon valley corridor</li> <li>• Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• Site fails the Sequential Test as the Borough has numerous sites to the west of Basingstoke with lower risk of flooding</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD007</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey promote the land for development. Site has potential to deliver 800 dwellings in a sustainable location adjacent to existing settlement boundary. Technical work submitted alongside representations include, vision, highways technical note, ecology technical note, landscape report, heritage appraisal and drainage/utilities report.</li> </ul>	1

OLD007	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
OLD007	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure including water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance which are already struggling to cope with demand</li> <li>Road congestion and safety cause for concern. Unacceptable and unmanageable increase in traffic on Newnham Lane. There are limited crossing points over the railway which will also cause problems.</li> <li>In combination with other promoted sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33</li> <li>Old Basing already has a major issue with 'Rat Running' through the village</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>Newnham should retain its village character</li> <li>Permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species</li> <li>Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity</li> <li>Along with neighbouring promoted sites this area plays an important role as a River Basin/Catchment Area also lying within the 10</li> </ul>	19

	<p>km Buffer Zone for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loddon valley important for wildlife including; skylark, meadow pipits, lapwings, woodcock, snipe, grey partridge, voles, barn owls, protected amphibians and reptiles</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity</li> <li>• The adopted local plan inspectors report states that 'The site at Hodds Farm also has sensitive landscape and biodiversity issues.'para192</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations</li> <li>• There is no landscape capacity for development as highly sensitive to development given location in the River Loddon valley corridor</li> <li>• Contains Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• Site fails the Sequential Test as the Borough has numerous sites to the west of Basingstoke with lower risk of flooding</li> <li>• The adopted local plan inspectors report states 'the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.' Para 191</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD008</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD008</b>	<b>Object</b>	9

	<p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities including water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance which are already struggling to cope with demand</li> <li>• Road congestion and safety cause for concern</li> <li>• In combination with other promoted sites a further 7,000 houses east of Basingstoke will put massive pressure on the roads through Old Basing both from the south, the A30, and from the north, the A33</li> <li>• Old Basing already has a major issue with 'Rat Running' through the village</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village character</li> <li>• Permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape and biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</li> <li>• With regards to this site the adopted local plan inspectors report states 'the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.' Para 191</li> <li>• Loddon Valley has the potential to meet the Nature Recovery Network or Environmental Land Management aspirations</li> <li>• Footpath network easily accessible to residents of Old Basing and Basingstoke providing links to countryside for mental health and to experience tranquillity. Tranquillity an essential feature both for people and wildlife</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adopted local plan inspectors report states ‘the EA has objected on the grounds of flood risk and impact on the River Loddon and associated wetlands on biodiversity grounds.’ Para 191</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> </ul> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from SOLVE (Save Our Loddon Valley Environment)</li> <li>• Objection from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> </ul>	
<b>OLD011</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD011</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council</li> <li>• Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities</li> <li>• Water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance are already struggling to cope with demand</li> <li>• This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>• Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>• Newnham should retain its village rural character</li> <li>• Permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> <li>• Road congestion and safety cause for concern</li> <li>• Farmland should be protected for food production</li> <li>• Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>• The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species</li> <li>• Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance</li> </ul>	9

	this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity	
<b>OL012</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OLD012</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objections from Old Basing and Lychpit, Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council and Newnham Parish Council</li> <li>Number of dwellings proposed would put strain on community facilities and infrastructure</li> <li>Water supplies, sewage disposal, doctors, hospitals, other health services, energy supplies, education, road capacity and maintenance are already struggling to cope with demand</li> <li>This rural area would expand to size comparable to Hook</li> <li>Would result in coalescence of Newnham with Hook and/or Old Basing with Newnham</li> <li>Newnham should retain its rural village character</li> <li>Permanent loss of countryside, changing the landscape from rural to suburban</li> <li>Road congestion and safety cause for concern</li> <li>If any development was to take place all traffic should be stopped heading east up Newnham Lane from Hale Farm.</li> <li>Farmland should be protected for food production.</li> <li>Concerns about flood risk from developing river valley</li> <li>The rivers Loddon and Lyde are chalk streams – internationally rare, valuable and fragile habitats, home to a diversity of wildlife and priority species</li> <li>Loddon valley at the heart of wildlife corridors providing opportunities to protect and enhance this environment to help halt the generally rapid decline in wildlife habitat and biodiversity</li> </ul>	11
<b>OV001</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for up to 100 dwellings. The site is in a sustainable location relative to local services and public transport links, immediately adjoining the Settlement Policy</li> </ul>	1

	Boundary. The site could provide the opportunity for a school car parking area. The site is available and achievable.	
OV001	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> <li>• NWD AONB object as site inappropriate for development – impact on AONB and St Marys Church.</li> </ul>	2
OV002	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has been promoted for allocation as an age-restricted independent older persons living development. An opportunities and constraints plan has also been submitted. The site is within a large local service centre and will provide a range of housing to meet Neighbourhood Plan objectives.</li> </ul>	1
OV002	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> <li>• NWD AONB object as site inappropriate for development – impact on St Marys Church, important green gap.</li> </ul>	2
OV004	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan, and should be retained as an allocation in the LPU. It is suitable and deliverable.</li> </ul>	1
OV005	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site could be brought forward in tandem with site OV001, which would enable benefits in respect of biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood alleviation scheme, open space and parking for school and church.</li> </ul>	1
OV005	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> <li>• NWD AONB object as site inappropriate for development – will significantly alter character of the lane and settlement.</li> </ul>	2
OV006	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields.</li> </ul>	1

	There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.	
OV007	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> </ul>	1
OV009	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development and can provide safe vehicular and pedestrian access, will not significantly affect traffic or landscape character and can achieve nitrate neutrality.</li> </ul>	1
OV009	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> </ul>	1
OV011	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development and can provide safe vehicular and pedestrian access, will not significantly affect traffic or landscape character and can achieve nitrate neutrality.</li> </ul>	1
OV011	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> <li>NWD AONB object as site readily visible from PROW which would be detrimental to the AONB. The site has a strong visual link with the open countryside.</li> </ul>	3
OV012	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site, together with OV014, is being promoted for a development of approximately 240 dwellings (including affordable housing), public open space and allotments. The site is sustainably located within Overton with good access to public transport and rights of way.</li> <li>Overton has a wide range of facilities and services. The site has good access to local and strategic road network. A vision document has also been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
OV012	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> <li>NWD AONB object as site readily visible from PROW which would be detrimental to the</li> </ul>	2

	AONB. The site has a strong visual link with the open countryside.	
<b>OV014</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site, together with OV012, is being promoted for a development of approximately 240 dwellings (including affordable housing), public open space, allotments and nitrate mitigation land. The site is sustainably located within Overton with good access to public transport and rights of way.</li> <li>Overton has a wide range of facilities and services. The site has good access to local and strategic road network. A vision document has also been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OV014</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OV015</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> </ul>	1
<b>OV016</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development, being in a sustainable location within walking distance of the local services. The site abuts the settlement edge and is in an enclosed landscape</li> </ul>	1
<b>OV017</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the government encouraging building over rural fields, should stop building on fields. There are empty offices on the market which could be converted into flats instead.</li> </ul>	1
<b>PAM009</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development of approximately 60 dwellings, there are no technical constraints to its development. Some sustainable development should be allowed at Tadley.</li> </ul>	1
<b>RO001</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is outside of the settlement policy boundary and cut-off from Rooksdown by 'The Spinney'</li> <li>It is in the strategic gap between Rooksdown and Sherborne St John</li> <li>Access issues</li> </ul>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is likely to be an opportunity for local brownfield development in the next few years, so greenfield development should not be allowed in the meantime</li> </ul>	
<b>SIL002</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodland on site and adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SSJ004</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for development of approximately 300 homes (including affordable housing), public open space and infrastructure contributions. Immediately adjacent to the edge of Basingstoke and therefore forms a logical extension to Popley. The site is close to existing services and facilities within Popley, with good public transport to the rest of Basingstoke Town. The site has good access to the strategic road network. A concept masterplan and vision document have also been submitted.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SSJ005</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for the development of approximately 100 mixed dwellings, potentially with employment development and open space including sports facilities. It is adjacent to the settlement boundary of Basingstoke. The site is available and achievable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SSJ005</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SSJ010</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted for the development of approximately 300 dwellings and public open space, a logical extension to the settlement of Sherborne St John which it adjoins. It is within walking distance of local facilities and bus services. A Landscape Study, Highways and Transport Appraisal, and Flood risk and drainage appraisal have been submitted with representation.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SMB002</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NWD AONB object as contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, encroachment into open countryside.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SOL001</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 units agreed/allocated in adopted Local Plan</li> </ul>	1
<b>SOL001</b>	<b>Object</b>	2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity on A33 for more traffic</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> </ul>	
<b>SOL002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Numerous planning applications refused for the site</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be prioritised before rural greenfield sites</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity on A33 for more traffic</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>• Objection by CPRE as set out in comments relating to the planning application for the site (18/03486/OUT)</li> </ul>	4
<b>SOL003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Within the Conservation Area – historic agricultural area</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion</li> <li>• Ribbon development would create coalescence and loss of community identity</li> <li>• Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> </ul>	3
<b>SOL004</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Within the Conservation Area – historic agricultural area</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion</li> </ul>	3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ribbon development would create coalescence and loss of community identity</li> <li>• Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> </ul>	
<b>SOL005</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Within the Conservation Area – historic agricultural area</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion</li> <li>• Ribbon development would create coalescence and loss of community identity</li> <li>• Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> </ul>	3
<b>SOL006</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site promoted for development of approx. 220 homes as a sustainable extension to the village. Includes affordable housing, public open space. Close to existing local amenities and bus stops served by buses to Bramley and Basingstoke. Representation includes concept masterplan, highways technical note and landscape study.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SOL006</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Conservation Area</li> <li>• Harmful to strategic gap, and strategic view identified in Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Site is often waterlogged – may impact other properties</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity on A33 for more traffic</li> </ul>	2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> </ul>	
<b>SOL007</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• There is a restrictive covenant on the site</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and habitat</li> <li>• Loss of historic community of Churchend</li> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Loss of strategic gap</li> <li>• Coalescence</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> </ul>	4
<b>SOL008</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site promoted for development of 200 homes (phase 1) followed by a further 200 homes (phase 2). Both options illustrate the potential for high-quality development across the site, informed by consideration of environmental and heritage constraints, incorporating amenity space, landscape buffers and sustainable transport links. A concept masterplan has been submitted with the representation.</li> <li>• Basingstoke and other large settlements such as Sherfield-on-Loddon are the most sustainable locations for new development. This site is located adjacent to existing allocations and therefore provides the opportunity for joined up development on the edge of Basingstoke.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SOL008</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• There is a restrictive covenant on the site</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and habitat</li> </ul>	4

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of historic community of Church End</li> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Loss of strategic gap</li> <li>• Coalescence</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> </ul>	
<b>SOL010</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• There is a restrictive covenant on the site</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and habitat</li> <li>• Loss of historic community of Church End</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Coalescence</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> </ul>	4
<b>SOL011</b>	<b>No objection</b> provided access is not directly onto the A33	1
<b>SOL011</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity on A33 for more traffic</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>• Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> </ul>	3
<b>SOL012</b>	<b>No objection</b> provided access and car parking issues resolved	1
<b>SOL012</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel – overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity on A33 for more traffic</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> </ul>	3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> </ul>	
<b>SOL013</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is promoted as an allocation for residential development in the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	1
<b>SOL013</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ruin village feel – overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>Loss of wildlife</li> <li>The council should not be rewarding illegal behaviour (trees previously cut down and illegal access onto the land) – adverse impact on the area. The replanting that was required has not been implemented.</li> <li>Greenfield site, part of strategic gap</li> <li>There has been a lot of recent development in this area with inadequate infrastructure (roads, schools, doctors) to support recent housing. Overpopulated area.</li> <li>Poor and dangerous access to the site – with no safe walking routes to local amenities</li> <li>Adverse impact on woodland and biodiversity</li> <li>There is an alternative site for travellers near Junction 7 of M3.</li> <li>Impact on road congestion and road safety</li> <li>There is already a lot of affordable housing being provided in the area</li> <li>Risk to future residents of military ordnance as previously used by military</li> <li>Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> <li>Loss of historic agricultural land, footpaths, biodiversity and greenspace used for recreation</li> </ul>	14
<b>SOL014</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ruin village feel – overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>Loss of wildlife</li> <li>Brownfield site so in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan but retail unit offers valuable facility</li> <li>Impact on road safety/congestion</li> <li>Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> </ul>	2
<b>SOL015</b>	<b>Object</b>	2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruin village feel – overdevelopment of Sherfield on Loddon</li> <li>• Loss of local walking opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• There is a restrictive covenant on the site</li> <li>• Brownfield site so in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan but access/road safety and congestion issues, overdevelopment and harmful to historic community of Church End</li> <li>• Adverse impact on the water quality of the River Loddon and the Lyde, and would exacerbate existing sewage issue</li> </ul>	
<b>SSJ001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside the settlement policy boundary</li> <li>• In the strategic gap between Rooksdown and Sherborne St John</li> <li>• Would be contrary to the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Access issues</li> <li>• There is likely to be an opportunity for local brownfield development in the next few years, so greenfield development should not be allowed in the meantime</li> </ul>	1
<b>STE001</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land at Popham airfield and Coxford Down is promoted for development by the landowner for a new garden village of some 3,000 dwellings (enlarged site) with a diverse mix of uses and sustainable infrastructure. The site is close to Micheldever station and the strategic road network. Part of the site is previously developed land.</li> <li>• Inclusion of this site will alleviate growth in smaller settlements where sustainable development is difficult to achieve due to the lack of critical mass to support infrastructure investment and delivery.</li> </ul>	1
<b>STE001</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about scale of development (Steventon Parish Council)</li> <li>• Devastating impact on the local landscape character and environmental and heritage assets (Jane Austen)</li> <li>• Erosion of open landscape between Basingstoke and Winchester</li> <li>• Vulnerable to future expansion</li> <li>• Contains, and is adjacent to, Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	3

TAD002	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>• Greenfield development</li> <li>• Abuts Conservation Area</li> <li>• Adverse impact on ecology – the trees should be protected to protect wildlife, minimise traffic pollution and maximise carbon neutrality</li> <li>• The area is prone to flooding</li> </ul>	1
TAD004	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extends urbanisation into the countryside</li> <li>• Adverse impact on listed building and Church Road Conservation Area</li> </ul>	1
TAD014	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough local facilities to support more people, and site is some distance from local amenities</li> <li>• Entry via small cul-de-sac - impact of increased traffic on congestion, road safety – next to school and church. Would worsen existing access and parking issues</li> <li>• Need to protect green spaces, negative impact on landscape</li> <li>• Adjacent to Ron’s meadow and Tadley pastures – an SSSI, also wildlife on site. Runoff from site contributes to biodiversity of the SSSI. Negative impact of air, noise, light pollution on SSSI. Negative impact on adjoining rookery.</li> <li>• Identified as a viewpoint in the Tadley Design Statement 2004 – adverse impact on the outlook of this part of Tadley</li> <li>• This part of Tadley is currently rural in character – landscape capacity rated as low in the Landscape Capacity Study 2008</li> <li>• Outside settlement policy boundary, size of development contrary to policy</li> <li>• Negative impact on amenities of existing residents/school including outlook and privacy, location in a cul-de-sac</li> <li>• Impact on AWE DEPZ</li> <li>• Mineral safeguarding area</li> <li>• Increased noise and air pollution</li> <li>• Increased pressure on drainage systems/sewage infrastructure</li> <li>• Already poor water pressure and frequent power cuts</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of development on all promoted sites, especially on SSSI</li> </ul>	18

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should prioritize development on previously developed land in Tadley</li> <li>• Part of the site gets waterlogged</li> <li>• Loss of green infrastructure</li> <li>• Adverse impact on listed buildings and Conservation Area</li> </ul>	
<b>TAD015</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside SPB</li> <li>• Impact on AWE DEPZ</li> <li>• Loss of green infrastructure</li> <li>• Close to SSSI – possible impact on birds</li> <li>• Greenfield development</li> <li>• The surrounding roads and infrastructure could not cope without vast improvements</li> <li>• The lanes around the proposed development provide green space for walking, cycling and horse riding</li> <li>• Adverse impact on existing residents’ amenities</li> <li>• Adverse impact on local landscape character, listed buildings and Conservation Area</li> </ul>	4
<b>UG002</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.</li> </ul>	1
<b>UG002</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Unsustainable location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village has already seen a disproportionate number of homes built in the past three years, despite being classified as a small village in hierarchy.</li> <li>• Upton Grey is not a sustainable location with reliance on private car, no public transport</li> <li>• The village of Upton Grey does not have the infrastructure to support further development no public transport, no street lighting, no gas supply, limited mains drainage, no school or GP.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural and landscape character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erosion of rural character, represents further sense of urbanisation.</li> <li>• Open countryside outside the village settlement boundary, visible from many other parts of the village conservation area, would have substantial harm to setting of conservation area.</li> <li>• Village already extending out in this direction - encouraging ribbon development – these</li> </ul>	94

	<p>strung-out developments do not add to the community feel of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of properties proposed is far too dense for the size of the plot.</li> <li>• Footpath crossing the site is popular with villagers with rural views and provides means of accessing village facilities without walking on dangerous roads without footpaths.</li> </ul> <p><u>Local housing need</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No local housing need identified.</li> <li>• No linkage to agricultural or rural workers.</li> <li>• At the time of writing understood that the recent development at Holme Hill is only one third sold indicating there is no need.</li> <li>• Two recently permitted developments consist of multiple large houses. Market forces seem unlikely to change this in the near future, so any further development is unlikely to add to the diversity of the village.</li> <li>• Village not suitable for affordable housing as no public transport or facilities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Natural environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>• Impact on natural environment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrow roads not suitable for additional traffic, already suffer from rat-running and unsafe for pedestrians as no footpaths.</li> <li>• Village already suffers from drainage problems, there is no guarantee that the pumping station at Woodmanfield/Little Hoddington will be able to cope with the additional waste.</li> <li>• The pumping station is old, it flooded badly in 2014, and despite assurances it has not been upgraded, it still causes problems and Thames Water need to make constant visits.</li> <li>• Water pressure and flooding also a problem.</li> <li>• The river Whitewater, which rises near the village, is already threatened by excessive water abstraction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other constraints</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>• Minerals Safeguarding Area which shouldn't be sterilised.</li> </ul>	
<b>UG003</b>	<p><b>Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart DC comment that any development proposals which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 5-7km zone, would need to be</li> </ul>	1

	assessed for impacts on the SPA and include any necessary mitigation measures through discussion with Hart DC.	
<b>UG003</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of site in the SHELAA is misleading. This is meadow and paddock, it has never been garden. Only very recently that part of the area seems to have been adapted to resemble a sort of garden. It is not brownfield land.</li> <li>• Contains a public right of way that makes for safer access to the Church and village centre from Cleves Lane and access to countryside.</li> </ul> <p><u>Unsustainable location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upton Grey is not a sustainable location and the village has already seen a disproportionate number of homes built in the past three years, despite being classified as a small village in hierarchy.</li> <li>• Reliance on private car (no public transport).</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village does not have the infrastructure to support further development, no public transport, no street lighting, no gas supply, limited mains drainage, no school or GP.</li> <li>• There are road safety issues - main access is already wholly inappropriate to accommodate the current level of traffic as single track roads with limited visibility.</li> <li>• Village already suffers from drainage problems and flooding. Development can't connect to the already overloaded sewage treatment plant in Woodmanfield.</li> <li>• The pumping station is old, it flooded badly in 2014, and despite assurances it has not been upgraded, it still causes problems and Thames Water make constant visits.</li> <li>• Water pressure also a problem.</li> <li>• The river Whitewater, which rises near the village, is already threatened by excessive water abstraction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Local housing need</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No local need for housing.</li> <li>• No linkage to agricultural or rural workers.</li> <li>• Two recently permitted developments consist of multiple large houses, market forces seem unlikely to change this in the near future, so any further development is unlikely to add to the diversity of the village.</li> </ul>	97

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village not suitable for affordable housing due to reliance on private car.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural/landscape character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detrimental to rural character, a part of the village that currently has a distinctly rural and appealing aspect.</li> <li>• Open countryside outside the village settlement boundary and within the village conservation area.</li> <li>• The proposed site, with its elevated location, would be highly visible from many angles throughout the valley. It would seriously impact upon the rural aspect of the village and the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is an important contributor to the vista referenced in conservation area appraisal.</li> <li>• Directly adjoining the Grade II listed Cleves Farmhouse and would have a significant visual impact on this building.</li> <li>• Roman road runs through site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Natural environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone.</li> <li>• Part meadow, part paddock, with some well established tall trees. There is a belt of ancient woodland on the north-east boundary of the site and a mature copse on the south west border which should be preserved for their support of wildlife, including endangered species, and contribution to carbon reduction.</li> <li>• Development would have significant ecological and arboricultural impact. Bats also inhabit this area.</li> </ul>	
WHIT001	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is owned by Genko Ltd represented by Turnberry and is available for development. Argues that site is enclosed on three sides by development, a natural infill for Whitchurch and an important small-medium site that can be delivered very quickly. Submission accompanied by site context and vision document.</li> <li>• Also own WHIT013 and WHIT014 and could be developed as part of comprehensive masterplan.</li> <li>• Another respondent suggests whilst development reasonable that 69 dwellings would be too many as lower meadow is flood plain.</li> </ul>	2

<p><b>WHIT001</b></p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Unsustainable location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to LPU aims which seek to reduce need to travel as employment is limited in Whitchurch and footpath/cycle links to the village centre are not suitable leading to air quality impacts as people continue to use their cars.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated SINC.</li> <li>• Concerns raised about impact on biodiversity and reference to part of the site designated a SSSI.</li> <li>• The lower part of the site borders with the River Test, and the rest of the site is uphill from it. Concerns raised about water quality, including groundwater contamination and nitrates entering the river Test.</li> <li>• Wildlife seen on site include roe deer, muntjacs, hedgehogs and various birds of prey.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flooding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is at high to medium risk of flooding and some of the land adjacent to the river Test already floods every winter even without accounting for climate change. Concerns also raised about flooding downstream.</li> </ul> <p><u>Landscape/Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on landscape character and natural beauty of the area, because it would unnecessarily extend the village boundary into downland which links to the North Wessex Downs AONB.</li> <li>• Site part of the Laverstoke and Freefolk Conservation area attracting both visitors and locals. Argues the site is prominent on raised ground above the river valley and therefore development here would be highly visible and damaging to the views across the valley from many areas of the CA.</li> <li>• Section of the Whitchurch Mill Trail that runs from the end of The Green to Bere Mill would be lost.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whitchurch does not have the infrastructure in place to support existing residents, new development will overwhelm the infrastructure and further overcrowding (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, parking, busy trains).</li> </ul> <p><u>Local Green Space promotion</u></p>	<p>14</p>
-----------------------	--	-----------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote site as a Local Green Space, particularly as this wildlife habitat is within the Laverstoke and Freefolk Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT003</b>	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On respondent comments that proposals sound reasonable.</li> </ul>	1
<b>WHIT003</b>	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whitchurch does not have the infrastructure in place to support existing residents, new development will overwhelm the infrastructure (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, parking, busy trains).</li> <li>Development would destroy the beautiful, peaceful, historic rural village with conservation area attracting both visitors and locals.</li> <li>Impact on biodiversity.</li> </ul>	5
<b>WHIT006</b>	<b>Object</b> <u>Open space</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site offers an essential amenity for the people of Whitchurch, is constantly in use by families, walkers, runners and easily accessible for wheelchair/mobility scooter/pushchair users.</li> <li>Concerned that now evaluation of the open space availability in Whitchurch has been undertaken.</li> <li>Provides safe route to primary school for children.</li> </ul> <u>Unsustainable location</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is too far from the town centre and train station to be sustainable and will lead to additional car journeys.</li> </ul> <u>Biodiversity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since 2002 the field has been steadily increasing in biodiversity as it rewilds, with new species returning each year It is within a recognised Biodiversity Priority Area (BPA).</li> <li>There is a strong economic argument for improving the connectivity of The Mill Trail here to the adjacent landscape as part of a continuous buffer zone for the Test and its SSSI.</li> </ul> <u>Infrastructure and access</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whitchurch does not have the infrastructure in place to support existing residents, new development will overwhelm the infrastructure and lead to further overcrowding (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, parking, busy trains). Primary school and doctors surgery are oversubscribed and traffic congestion causes</li> </ul>	12

	<p>slow traffic which exacerbates air pollution levels. This section of Winchester Street is the most congested stretch of road in Whitchurch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is completely land locked and there is no suitable access as Micheldever Road is already very congested, it would be impractical to upgrade this single track country lane.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would destroy the beautiful, peaceful, historic rural village with conservation area attracting both visitors and locals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Local Green Space promotion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of site for Local Green Space.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT008</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners of this site, The Hospital of St Cross and Almshouse of Noble Poverty make representations via Pro Vision promoting its development for 15 dwellings. They argue site located close to the centre of Whitchurch in an accessible location in line with the councils growth strategy. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement policy boundary, flat unconstrained by topographical features, existing vehicular access, small site able to help meet five year supply.</li> </ul>	1
<b>WHIT008</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Meeting local housing needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other more suitable sites in Whitchurch should be used to meet local housing needs</li> <li>• The community is now at a critical point of excess development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cricket Club</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whitchurch Cricket Club, which has historical value as one of the oldest cricket clubs in the country have been based at Parsonage Meadow for 170yrs, the development of this site would result in the loss of this active community cricket club.</li> <li>• Development of this site would impact on the viability of the cricket club through increased run-off and loss of rural and historic setting.</li> <li>• Winchester Cricket Club raise objection – club has existed for 235 years, provides both good standard of facilities and village surroundings and atmosphere, grass roots cricket, active youth teams, as a community club allow informal public access for benefit of residents at no cost to town or borough council, forest</li> </ul>	531

	<p>school nursery also use ground, self-funding club run by volunteers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whitchurch Cricket Club is a valued amenity and should be listed as an Asset of Community Value.</li> <li>• Too many football pitches serving the village, only one cricket pitch.</li> </ul> <p><u>Open space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green space providing community amenity in a beautiful tranquil location for informal recreation. Used by dog walkers, families, for exercise and children's play. Particular reference made to being able to access without stiles and importance for physical and mental wellbeing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Heritage and landscape character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would have an unacceptable impact on the heritage of the town as these fields form an important part of the conservation area.</li> <li>• Development would harm the intrinsic character and overall appearance of the landscape.</li> <li>• The footpath (Mill Trail Footpath #18) between Fulling Mill and the Church is one of the only locations that the river can be seen with open rural views of the conservation area. These views are considered 'important' in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and is a rare rural footpath loved by the community and tourists alike.</li> <li>• Concerns raised about the listed building located within the site 'Granary of the vicarage' rescued by Lord Denning.</li> <li>• Concerns about impact on archaeology associated with church.</li> <li>• Ancient and beautiful trees would be lost.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on biodiversity – home to red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, house martins, swifts, geese, ducks, voles, foxes, rabbits, hares, moles, owls, woodpeckers, badgers, deer, kingfisher, grey wagtails and little grebe.</li> <li>• Riverbank restoration to the SSSI riverbanks have seen the recent return of water voles and otters, both protected species.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proximity to SSSI</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the setting of the river Test, water quality and neighbouring SSSI as the site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and within the</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>River Test catchment providing a buffer to the river. There is a potential for ecological damage. Concerned that current nitrate-neutral policy would likely not be met by development of this 'sensitive' site.</p> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not be permitted so close to the river Test in the floor plain. Photos of flooding of the road outside church provided. Also reference to incident recently when water level in the River Test rose significantly and members of the Armed Forces were deployed to the town to assist in flood alleviation work and there was standing water for a number of days on the cricket pitch.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure including highways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unacceptable impact on local infrastructure; utilities, primary school and doctors surgery are oversubscribed and traffic congestion causes slow traffic which exacerbates air pollution levels.</li> <li>• Mains sewer showing signs of lack of capacity and requires upgrade, culminating in three floods of raw sewage in the 6-month period ending in January 2020.</li> <li>• Concerned about dangerous car parking on the road as the cricket fields are currently used by the church congregation, for village events and the nursery who use the church hall.</li> <li>• Concerned about highway safety at access onto Andover Road where there is a sharp blind bend and visibility to the west is partially obstructed by the brick bridge and high embankment of the dismantled Didcot to Southampton railway line.</li> </ul> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site suffers from considerable noise due to close proximity to the A34 that crosses the B3400 just to the west of the site at an elevated height.</li> <li>• Concerns about noise disturbance at the church and peaceful enjoyment of the countryside as a result of development in this location.</li> <li>• Concerns also raised about impact of noise from development on wildlife.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT009</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>2</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One respondent suggests number of homes reduced developing only part of the site so that cricket ground can also remain.</li> <li>• If homes are to be built in Whitchurch they should be affordable.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT009</b>	<p><b>Object</b>  <u>Meeting local housing needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other more suitable sites in Whitchurch should be used to meet local housing needs</li> <li>• The community is now at a critical point of excess development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cricket club</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whitchurch Cricket Club, has historical value as one of the oldest cricket clubs in the country and have been based at Parsonage Meadow for 170yrs, the development of this site would result in the loss of this active community cricket club. Proposals would result in loss of sporting facilities used by whole community supporting physical and emotional wellbeing of residents.</li> <li>• Winchester Cricket Club raise objection – club has existed for 235 years, provides both good standard of facilities and village surroundings and atmosphere, grass roots cricket, active youth teams, as a community club allow informal public access for benefit of residents at no cost to town or borough council, forest school nursery also use ground, self-funding club run by volunteers.</li> <li>• This view is reiterated by the Hampshire Cricket League chairman who refers to the clubs long history and states the loss of the ground would mean loss of the Club and the players would be forced to go elsewhere or leave the game altogether.</li> <li>• Whitchurch Cricket Club is a valued amenity and should be listed as an Asset of Community Value.</li> <li>• Too many football pitches serving the village, only one cricket pitch.</li> </ul> <p><u>Open space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open space in a beautiful tranquil location used for informal recreation by the community for dog walking, exercise, children’s play and community events. Particular reference to being able to access without stiles and dogs off leads.</li> </ul>	550

- The local preschool, Rising 5's, have access to this land for their Forest School learning.

Heritage and landscape character

- Parsonage Meadow and its surrounding fields lie within the conservation area, development of this site would remove the last green area within its boundaries having a landscape impact.
- The footpath (Mill Trail Footpath #18) between Fulling Mill and the Church is one of the only locations that the river can be seen with open rural views of the conservation area. These views are considered 'important' in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, also forming part of the setting of the river Test and is a rare rural footpath loved by the community and tourists alike.
- Vicar of All Hallows Church objects to development on basis that development would have an impact on the historic church and conservation area.
- Concerns about impact on archaeology associated with church.

Infrastructure including highways

- Unacceptable impact on local infrastructure, primary school and doctors surgery are oversubscribed and traffic congestion causes slow traffic which exacerbates air pollution levels.
- Mains sewer showing signs of lack of capacity and needs upgrading culminating in three floods of raw sewage in the 6-month period ending in January 2020.
- Concern about car parking on the road as the cricket fields are currently used by the congregation, church hall and for community events.
- Concerned about highway safety as access is onto Andover Road where there is restricted visibility as a sharp blind bend and visibility to the west is partially obstructed by the brick bridge and high embankment of the dismantled Didcot to Southampton railway line.

Flood risk

- Site is located in the flood plain, development should not be permitted so close to the river Test. Photos of flooding of the road outside church provided and reference made to time when members of the Armed Forces were

	<p>deployed to the town to assist in flood alleviation work. At that time there was standing water for a number of days on the cricket pitch.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on biodiversity – home to red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, house martins, swifts, geese, ducks, voles, foxes, rabbits, hares, moles, owls, woodpeckers, little grebe, kingfisher and grey wagtail, and rare bird of prey the hobby.</li> <li>• Riverbank restoration to the SSSI riverbanks have seen the recent return of water voles and otters, both protected species.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proximity to SSSI</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is of environmental importance; development would have an impact on biodiversity, water quality and neighbouring SSSI within the River Test catchment. There is a potential for ecological damage and the current nitrate-neutral policy would likely not be met by development of this ‘sensitive’ site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site suffers from considerable noise due to close proximity to the A34 that crosses the B3400 just to the west of the site at an elevated height and is less than 30m away from some parts of site. Concerns this constraint hasn’t been considered sufficiently.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise impact of development on wildlife.</li> <li>• Concerns are also raised about the noise and disturbance at the church and quiet enjoyment of the countryside as a result of development.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>WHIT010</b></p>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p><u>Meeting local housing needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other more suitable sites in Whitchurch should be used to meet local housing needs</li> <li>• The community is now at a critical point of excess development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cricket ground</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whitchurch Cricket Club, has historical value as one of the oldest cricket clubs in the country which has been based at Parsonage Meadow for 170yrs. The development of this site would result in the loss of this active community cricket club.</li> <li>• There would also be an impact on the viability of the cricket club through increased run-off and loss of rural and historic setting.</li> </ul>	<p>522</p>

- Winchester Cricket Club raise objection – club has existed for 235 years, provides both good standard of facilities and village surroundings and atmosphere, grass roots cricket, active youth teams, as a community club allow informal public access for benefit of residents at no cost to town or borough council, forest school nursery also use ground, self-funding club run by volunteers.
- Whitchurch Cricket Club is a valued amenity and should be listed as an Asset of Community Value.
- Too many football pitches serving the village, only one cricket pitch.

Open space

- Loss of open space in a beautiful tranquil location for informal recreation, dog walking, exercise and childrens play. Particular reference to being able to access without stiles and importance for physical and mental wellbeing.

Heritage and landscape

- Would have an unacceptable impact on the heritage of the town and conservation area including the setting of the church.
- Vicar of All Hallows Church believes that development would have an impact on the historic church and conservation area.
- The Public Footpath (footpath #18) adjacent is enjoyed by many providing views of the river, forming part of the Mill Trail. These views are considered 'important' in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and is a rare rural footpath loved by the community and tourists alike.

Infrastructure including highways/parking

- Unacceptable impact on local infrastructure. Schools and doctors already oversubscribed and traffic congestion leads to slow moving traffic causing air pollution.
- Mains sewer showing signs of lack of capacity and in need of upgrade, culminating in three floods of raw sewage in the 6-month period ending in January 2020.
- All Hallows church does not have its own carpark, WHIT010 is made available for parking so that cars are not parked dangerously along Church street. Vicar makes the point that it provides parking for congregation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHIT010 could be developed into a community car park with electric charging points and a community bus to benefit the local community instead.</li> <li>• Concerned about highway safety at access onto Andover Road where there is a sharp blind bend and visibility to the west is partially obstructed by the brick bridge and high embankment of the dismantled Didcot to Southampton railway line.</li> </ul> <p><u>Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHIT10 is effectively land locked, as the landowner does not own the unmade track from the B3400 giving access to WHIT08 &amp; WHIT09.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on biodiversity - home to red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, kestrels, house martins, swifts, geese, ducks, voles, foxes, rabbits, hares, moles, owls, woodpeckers, little grebe, kingfisher and grey wagtail.</li> <li>• Riverbank restoration to the SSSI riverbanks have seen the recent return of water voles and otters, both protected species.</li> </ul> <p><u>Proximity to SSSI</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the setting of the River Test. Site is of environmental importance; development would have an impact on biodiversity, water quality and neighbouring SSSI within the River Test catchment. There is a potential for ecological damage and the current nitrate-neutral policy would likely not be met by development of this 'sensitive' site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Flood risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not be permitted close to the river Test on the flood plain. Photos of flooding of the road outside church provided. Reference also made to Armed Forces deployed to the town to assist in flood alleviation work. At that time there was standing water for a number of days on the cricket pitch and standing pools of water are present after heavy rain.</li> </ul> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site suffers from considerable noise due to close proximity to the A34 that crosses the B3400 just to the west of the site at an elevated height.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise impact of development on wildlife.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about impact on quiet enjoyment of the countryside.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT011</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barratt David Wilson Homes promote land for development as a logical next phase of their recently completed development on Micheldever Road arguing it is the best and most deliverable opportunity to deliver housing in Whitchurch close to existing facilities. Representations include illustrative masterplan showing the potential for 270 dwellings. They state that detailed and costed design shows site is deliverable, layout is sensitive and landscape led, able to deliver nitrate neutral and biodiversity net gain and link road between Winchester Street and Micheldever Road. Representation supplemented by preliminary landscape and visual impact appraisal, nutrient balancing sheet and highways review technical note.</li> <li>Possible for further expansion of the village although not the number of dwellings suggested.</li> </ul>	2
<b>WHIT011</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development will overwhelm existing infrastructure (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, parking, busy trains).</li> <li>This area is topographically sensitive, development would have an impact on landscape character.</li> <li>Development would destroy peaceful rural village, have an impact on conservation area and historic buildings.</li> <li>River valley habitats should be protected, concerned about impact on river Test SSSI, ecology of the river and water quality including the impact of nitrates.</li> <li>Concerned about flooding downstream as a result of increased runoff.</li> <li>Site valued local green space for walking/exercising.</li> <li>North Wessex Downs AONB objects to development due to impact on setting on AONB, unbalancing the village and detrimental impact on rural character of lane.</li> <li>Adjacent to Ancient Woodland – any loss should not be permitted, and a buffer maintained.</li> </ul>	8
<b>WHIT013</b>	<b>Comment</b>	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly expanded secure cycle parking and cycle charging (for electric bikes) would allow Whitchurch residents to utilise the train station well and would promote more sustainable travel choices eliminating the need for additional car parking.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT013</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is owned by Genko Ltd represented by Turnberry and is available for development. They argue that site is enclosed on three sides by development, a natural infill for Whitchurch and an important small-medium site that can be delivered very quickly. Submission accompanied by site context and vision document. Further detail provided in representations.</li> </ul>	1
<b>WHIT013</b>	<p><b>Object AONB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents a major intrusion into the North Wessex Downs AONB.</li> <li>Assessment in the SHELAA is superficial and does not refer to the test of exceptional necessity (Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework and judgment of the Supreme Court) which any major proposal in the AONB must pass. This proposal fails this test given the many alternative locations for such development in the Borough and the rest of Whitchurch lying outside the AONB. There are other suitable Whitchurch sites, already identified and available to meet future housing needs (outside of the AONB) as set out in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. WHIT013 should have been excluded/sifted out of the assessment at the beginning. Whilst it is appreciated that there is a duty to publish all promoted sites annually through the SHELAA it should be made clear that the WHIT013 submission opposes central government policy.</li> <li>Furthermore there is 'no exceptional necessity' as all these elements have recently been provided just south of the railway line and outside the AONB via permission 16/03220/OUT, which provides for a mixed use development of a 70 space station car park, 60 homes and 3,300 sq.m of B1 and B2 employment space. The need for additional station car parking has therefore already been met.</li> </ul>	509

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existence of the A34 and the Litchfield junction makes the AONB north of Whitchurch potentially vulnerable to development. The A34 shouldn't be seen as any kind of enticement to compromise the boundary between the town and the AONB.</li> </ul> <p><u>Need</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SHELAA assessment states "there are likely to be existing businesses looking to expand or relocate in the local area". Argues there is no evidence presented in relation to this assertion which is undermined by the presence of a modern flexible business unit next to Whitchurch Station which has been vacant for over 3 years in spite of consistent marketing. Furthermore there is a pending application for a further 5 light industrial units at Southfield Farm Whitchurch, offering a further 10,342 ft<sup>2</sup> - 20/01835/FUL, PP-08867704. In addition, the recently permitted 3,300 sq m of B1 and B2 employment floorspace under 16/03220/OUT can provide bespoke opportunities for other local businesses if required.</li> <li>• There is no requirement for the car park. The change to how businesses operate in the future has been evidenced as a result of Covid. There will be fewer commuters using the trains in future. Current commuters suggest that overflow need is no more than 20 vehicles a day.</li> </ul> <p><u>Unsustainable location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear how car parkers using the new proposed car park would reach the station. Newbury Road is an extremely fast road, and dangerous in the dark. At present those that park north of the station have to risk walking across the narrow road bridge where there is no room for pavement; extremely dangerous. Presumably night time lighting would be required and this would impinge on an area of very low light pollution, and which due to its elevated nature relative to Whitchurch, would be visible at night for quite some distance.</li> <li>• Location of site is such that future residents would be unlikely to walk into the town centre resulting in an increase cars and congestion.</li> </ul> <p><u>Infrastructure</u></p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development will overwhelm existing infrastructure (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, road safety, parking, busy trains).</li> <li>• Any development to the North of the Whitchurch railway line would necessitate traffic having to be directed through the Litchfield /Dunley exit from the A34. This would mean upgrading this junction due to limited visibility, and a negative impact as a result of increased traffic on the villages of Litchfield, Dunley and Woodcott. Furthermore, lighting the road from Dunley to Whitchurch will change the nature of the area.</li> <li>• North West Hampshire Downs Farmers Clusters state that this road verge supports an important population of Duke of Burgundy <i>Hamearis lucina</i> butterfly, a Section 41 species of principal importance under the NERC Act in England and UK Biodiversity Action plan Species. The removal of this site would not only result in loss of the butterfly from this particular site but, due to its population dynamics and ecology, would threaten its survival within the wider landscape. It would undo the Defra funded work undertaken in the area for the benefit of this species.</li> </ul> <p><u>Visual/landscape impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in an elevated location where development would have an adverse visual impact on the AONB and its dark skies policy, both during the day and at night, on characteristics of the landscape, recreational enjoyment of this protected countryside and local tourism economy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is of environmental importance; development would have an impact on biodiversity, water quality and neighbouring SSSI which is within the River Test catchment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Agricultural land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about loss of grade 3 agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p><u>Local Green Space promotion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of site for Local Green Space. Argue that the site makes a valuable contribution visually, ecologically &amp; environmentally to the character of the area. Whitchurch places great value on the adjacent AONB and the important contribution it makes to the local economy,</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>health &amp; well-being. (Whitchurch Walkers are Welcome initiative.)</p> <p><u>Specific representations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPRE Hampshire raise an objection to this site due to its location in the AONB.</li> <li>• Objection made by Litchfield and Woodcott Parish Council.</li> <li>• North West Hampshire Farmer Cluster object to assessment of WHIT013 through the SHELAA due to impact on AONB and loss of wildlife habitat at A34 Litchfield exit (see above).</li> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB states development is of significant concern as would result in significant and demonstrable encroachment into AONB and open countryside. Development would have a significant adverse impact upon the natural landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</li> </ul>	
<b>WHIT014</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is owned by Genko Ltd represented by Turnberry and is available for development. Argue that site is enclosed on three sides by development, a natural infill for Whitchurch and an important small-medium site that can be delivered very quickly. Submission accompanied by site context and vision document. Further details provided in representations.</li> <li>• Only suitable for limited development, should not stretch behind Lynch Hill houses.</li> </ul>	2
<b>WHIT014</b>	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted for Local Green Space. Argues the site has special landscape qualities, natural beauty, environmental diversity, provides a visual and natural connection between the North Wessex Downs AONB.</li> <li>• Area is topographically sensitive and provides a green corridor from the NW Downs to the Test Valley. The public right of way at the north-western end of the site is well used by local people for health and well-being and walking tourists.</li> <li>• Development here will create a ribbon settlement destroying the sense of separate, distinctive rural communities which is part of the character of this area.</li> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB objects to development due to impact on setting on</li> </ul>	14

	<p>AONB, unbalancing the village and detrimental impact on rural character of lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional residents will overwhelm the infrastructure (schools, healthcare, traffic congestion, parking, busy trains, sewerage infrastructure).</li> <li>• Site served by unsuitable road network already overwhelmed by traffic.</li> <li>• Site regularly floods – winterbourne running on the eastern edge of the site floods part of the proposed development area when the water table is high. Photo of flooding in February 2020 provided.</li> <li>• The winterbourne flows into the River Test which is of environmental importance; development would have an impact on biodiversity, destroying a wildlife corridor, water quality in the neighbouring SSSI within the River Test catchment.</li> <li>• Sustains a huge diversity of wildlife, as well as being productive grazing land. The copse which runs through the valley is home to many species including numerous badger setts, snakes, slow worms, and deer. There are also bats and red kites that feed on this area.</li> </ul>	
<b>WSL001</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is promoted for residential development. The site has few constraints and it is adjacent to existing settlement. A small development of 4 dwellings could be delivered within the next 5 years.</li> </ul>	1

## Newly Promoted Sites

Nine new sites were promoted for development through the consultation and can be found listed below. Further detail, including maps and proformas covering each site can be found on the council's website here: [Issues and Options Consultation \(basingstoke.gov.uk\)](http://basingstoke.gov.uk)

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Settlement</b>
TAD16	Skates Lane	Tadley
EC003	Land to the East of Ecchinswell Road	Ecchinswell, Sydmonton, and Bishops Green
DUM011	North West of Dummer Down Farm	Dummer
UG004	Land at Weston Road	Upton Grey
TAD017	Land at West Street	Tadley
TAD018	Land rear of Rowan Road	Tadley
CLID012	Land to the South of Myhaven	Cliddesden
BAS058	Land at Roman Way / Worting Road	Basingstoke Town Centre
NWE003	Land at Turk's Lane	Mortimer West End