

Summary of representations received by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council made in relation to the Regulation 16 version of the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to Paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Introduction

1. This document provides a summary of the issues and representations submitted in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan (AHWH NP).
2. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a seven week period of public consultation from Monday 14 March 2022 to Tuesday 3rd May 2022 on the submission version of the AHWH NP. The consultation documents included the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Plan, a Consultation Statement and a Basic Conditions Statement and other evidence base documents.
3. The representations submitted during the consultation period have been published on the borough council's website, and can be found by clicking on the following link: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/3498.pdf>. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, RG21 4AH.
4. A total of 15 representations were received from 13 individuals, organisations and statutory consultees (excluding BDBC's comments). These can be summarised as:
 - Support: 3 representations made
 - Oppose: 2 representations made
 - Other (general comment/ no specific comment): 10 representations made
5. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised by consultees during the consultation. Appendix 1 of this document provides a summary of the representations made by specific consultees. The borough council's comments (which includes a summary within the covering letter) provided during the consultation can be viewed in full in Appendix 2.

Summary of issues raised by consultees

General:

- MoD should be consulted on proposals in specific areas of the parish where development could affect their communications network.

Basic Conditions

- Concern was raised that the plan does not meet the basic conditions without amendments to Policy HD1. The Plan should include greater flexibility to allow new development outside/adjacent to Settlement Policy Boundaries, given the council's lack of a five year housing land supply.

Policy NE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

- The connectivity of green and blue infrastructure is vital. Suggested that corridors could be identified and included in the plan. Alternatively, they could be identified over time, but they must still be protected and enhanced.

Policy NE2: Trees and Hedgerows

- This policy was supported.

Policy HD1: Location and Scale of New Development

- Suggested that the Plan should allocate housing sites adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary. The housing requirement in Policy SS5 should not be considered to be a maximum. As the council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, the plan should be looking at allocating sites in less environmentally sensitive areas of the borough, such as this parish.
- The policy is therefore considered to be inconsistent with national policy and fails to contribute towards sustainable development and it is not in accordance with the strategic policies of the existing development plan.

Policy HD4: Infrastructure Considerations

- Alternative wording was suggested for how the Plan should address the provision of wastewater, water supply infrastructure, and SuDS.

Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan (NP) (excluding comments from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council)

Please note that the representations below are a summary of the representations made. The full representations made by respondents can be viewed here <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/3498.pdf>

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comment	Respondents suggested modifications
Mrs Anne Ayres	NE1	9.2	-	Support	This policy is supported, it is noted that the connectivity of the landscape is vital.	Green and blue corridors could be identified and incorporated into the plan. They must be protected and enhanced.
Mrs Anne Ayres	NE2	-	-	Support	Unequivocal support	-
The Coal Authority (Deb Roberts)	-	General	-	-	There is no requirement for the coal authority to be consulted.	-
Guy Hirson	-	General	-	Support	In broad agreement with limited, sustainable development that is appropriate for the rural setting and affordable. There is a need for more infrastructure not large houses.	-
Historic England (Katie Rowden)	-	General	-	-	No comments	-
National Grid (Avison Young, Matt Verlander)	-	General	-	-	National Grid has identified that there are no assets currently affected by proposed allocations within the neighbourhood plan area.	-
National Highways (Beata Ginn)	-	General	-	-	No comments	-
Natural England (Sharon Jenkins)	-	General	-	-	Not able to provide detailed advice. This does not imply there are no impacts on the natural environment, but it is for the decision-maker	-

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comment	Respondents suggested modifications
					to determine whether the plan is consistent with local and national policies.	
ONR (Vicki Enston)	-	General	-	-	ONR land use planning processes may apply to some development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Further information is required for ONR to have no objections.	-
Solve Planning (Rosalind Gall) on behalf of Kelmscot Building Company.	HD1	-	-	Oppose	<p>The plan does not allocate any housing. The NP suggests that no further housing is required to meet the ALP's housing requirement, but this should not be interpreted as a moratorium on new development.</p> <p>The council does not have a 5 year housing land supply, so the plan should be looking to identify sites.</p> <p>Suggest that the site at Thornford Road in Headley would be suitable for allocation.</p>	Include the site allocation: Thornford Road, Headley.
Planning South, Sport England	-	General	-	-	It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99, and the PPG. Sport England also has Active Design Guidance.	-
Thames Water	HD4	-	-	-	<p>New development should be coordinated with sufficient provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>The NP should seek to ensure that there is adequate waste water and supply infrastructure to serve all new developments. Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities at the earliest opportunity to ensure any necessary infrastructure reinforcement is delivered ahead of occupation.</p>	It is recommended that text about new water /wastewater infrastructure, and surface water drainage is included (suggested wording provided)

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comment	Respondents suggested modifications
Thames Water	HD4	-	-	-	Support SuDS and ensure surface water is not allowed to drain to the foul sewer.	Thames Water request that a paragraph in relation to surface water drainage is included (suggested wording provided).
Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of Rosemary Pelham, Timothy Pyper and JPP Land Ltd.	HD1	-	-	Oppose	<p>The policy is inconsistent with national policy and fails to contribute towards sustainable development. It is not in accordance with the strategic policies in the existing development plan.</p> <p>The Council does not have a 5yr Housing Land Supply and that is unlikely to be resolved before the LPU is adopted. Policy HD1 should therefore be amended to provide greater flexibility and contribute to resolving this deficit.</p>	Revise policy to provide more flexibility to developing outside the settlement (suggested wording provided).
Ministry of Defence/Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Chris Walrdon)	-	-	General	-	A WAM Network corridor crosses the Neighbourhood Plan area. The MoD should therefore be consulted on planning applications within specific identified areas.	-

Appendix 2: Full representation from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (as Local Planning Authority) on the Submission version (Regulation 16) of the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan

The table below sets out the comments provided by the LPA in response to the pre-submission Regulation 14 consultation in 2021, and how these have been addressed by the submission version of the Plan.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
Page 7, paragraph 2	<p>The text should make reference to the additional Basic Condition that the making of the neighbourhood plan ‘does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements’. This is still a requirement, despite Brexit.</p> <p>It may be helpful to set out the Basic Conditions in full to provide a clear context for the Plan.</p>		Include reference to additional Basic Condition	Met.
Section 9	<p>Suggest introductory text highlights that the policies in the Plan should be read together, and that the Plan should be read in conjunction with the policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>There are some places where the Neighbourhood Plan covers the same topics as the Local Plan but does not include the same level of detail. The NPPF states that where there is a conflict between policies the most recent planning policy takes precedence. Although some of the policies highlight specific cross overs, it would be prudent to include a ‘catch all’ statement to clarify that where there are minor differences between the AHHNP and ALP policies, these do not imply there is a conflict between the two and they should be read together.</p>	NPPF para 30	Include additional supporting text.	Met (but paragraph would be better before Section 9.1).
Section 9.1 (Landscape)	Introductory text to Section 9.1 and supporting text to Policy L1 should include reference to the recently-published Landscape Character Assessment (May 2021) .		Update references to the Landscape Character Assessment.	Met.
Section 9.1 Landscape and Policy L1	<p>The identification of strategic views is supported – however these are not specifically referred to in Policy L1 (though it is noted they are referred to in Policy H3 in another part of the document). It is suggested that these are referred to this policy.</p> <p>This section also identifies the importance of public footpaths and bridleways. The Plan could go further by:</p>		<p>Consider including a reference to strategic views and PRoWs in the policy.</p> <p>Consider including a map showing all Public</p>	<p>Met.</p> <p>Policy L1 has been amended to include a bullet point relating to strategic views and public rights of way; and also a bullet point identifying the importance of retaining hedgerows when they</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping the PRoWs, and; Referring to the importance of protecting views from the PRoWs in Policy L1. <p>The policy could also helpfully identify the importance of retaining hedgerows / existing boundaries that complement and are part of the landscape character.</p>		Rights of Way within the Parish boundary.	are part of the landscape character.
Policy L2	It would be helpful to explain why maintaining dark skies is an important issue for the Parish, to provide a fuller justification for this policy.		Include additional supporting text	Met. Additional information added to Policy L2's supporting text.
Section 9.2	Introductory text identifies designated sites but does not include Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).		Include additional supporting text	Met (page 15).
Policies NE1 and NE2	<p>These policies include a headline requirement for development to 'reflect the principles and requirements of BDBC's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD'.</p> <p>It is considered that this would be better expressed in the supporting text (and could be made more specific). Local Plan Policy EM4 (Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation) is also relevant.</p>		Revise policy wording.	Met.
Policy NE1	<p>Suggest BP1 is amended to state:</p> <p><u>'... provide net gains in biodiversity habitats and/or connectivity including connecting to the green infrastructure network'</u></p> <p>BP3: <u>'habitats together into broader networks a more robust green infrastructure network'</u></p>	NPPF para 170 d) and PPG (Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 8-027-20190721)	Revise policy wording.	BP3 in Policy NE1 has been changed. This suitably elevates the status of the GI network in this policy.
Policy NE2	<p>BP2: Requirement to 'seek to retain veteran (trees)' is less strong than NPPF para 175(c). Should also explicitly support retention of hedgerows (as well as trees) (to provide continuity with BP3 which states 'where loss of trees or hedgerows is unavoidable...').</p> <p>BP4: <u>'...that contribute to the green infrastructure network, character and biodiversity of the Parish...'</u> This is suggested to ensure that wider network enhancement opportunities are not missed. Also, <u>'native trees and hedgerows'</u>.</p>	NPPF para 175	Revise policy wording	Addressed by minor changes to BP1, BP2 and BP3 in Policy NE2.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
Policy HA1	<p>BP3: ‘...that affect non-designated heritage assets (including non-designated archaeology) <u>or their setting</u> will be considered...</p> <p>The policy could also require a Statement of Significance to be submitted to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of any affected heritage assets or their setting.</p>		Revise policy wording	<p>(policy renamed: Policy HA)</p> <p>Met. However, a further minor amendment is suggested as Figure 12 shows listed buildings not locally listed buildings (the title is incorrect).</p> <p>It is suggested that the requirement for a Statement of Significance is slightly changed to provide greater clarity and to require a ‘heritage statement including a statement of significance for any affected heritage assets’.</p>
Local Valued Facilities	<p>Are there any built facilities at LVF No 6 (Rugby/football pitches)? If not, it is suggested this should only be protected as a Local Green Space (it is currently proposed to be both).</p>		Consider whether Site No 6 should be retained as a LVF.	Met. The pitches are no longer identified as an LVF.
Local Valued Facilities	<p>Text prior to LVF1: ‘Applications for improvements to such facilities will constitute the very special circumstance’ required by Policies LVF1 and LVF2’.</p> <p>This text should be deleted as the test is more relevant to LGS policies.</p> <p>It would be more precise if LVF1 referred to the LVFs ‘identified in Table XX’ rather than the more general reference to ‘in the Plan’</p>		Revise supporting text	Met.
Policy LGS1	<p>The descriptions of the proposed LGSs in the text are helpful, however, it is suggested that an appendix is provided explicitly setting out how each space meets each of the 3 tests in NPPF in para 100. It is necessary for a LGS to meet all 3 requirements.</p> <p>From the information provided, there is a concern that the following may not meet the requirements:</p>	NPPF para 101 and 144	Further justification of LGSs	<p>(policy renamed: Policy LGS)</p> <p>The submission plan now helpfully includes an appendix justifying how the proposed LGSs meet the NPPF’s requirements.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sports pitches near Compagna – is the inclusion of the adjacent heathland justified? - Is Headley Ford in ‘reasonably close proximity’ to the community it serves’? <p>It is also suggested that the boundary of Mill Green Common Ground LGS is checked and confirmed.</p> <p>For clarity, it is recommended that policies LGS1 and LGS2 are combined and the names of the LGS are listed in the policy. In LGS2 it is not necessary to say ‘when the Plan is ‘made’ by BDBC’.</p>			<p>It is understood that the heathland by Compagna is a valued local space for walking and ecologically distinctive.</p> <p>Although Headley Ford is physically separate from the village it could still be deemed to be in ‘reasonably close proximity’ because it is one of Headley’s ‘distinguishing features’.</p>
Policy PCF	<p>Suggest this policy directly follows the LVF policies as these are closely related (and the supporting text to the LVF policies about the policy being read alongside Policy CN7 is also relevant). Could they be grouped as Community Facility policies?</p> <p>The supporting text describes why the policy supports a new/replacement church and village hall, but it is not explained why a new day nursery is specifically supported.</p>		<p>Possible reordering of policies.</p> <p>Additional supporting text</p>	<p>This has not been addressed but does not affect the basic conditions.</p>
Policy H1	<p>Concern about having a list of the circumstances where development would be supported in the SPB (under bullet point 1). As the list is limited, it implies that other types of development (such as the conversion of (non-agricultural) buildings or subdivisions) would not be supported. This would not be in general conformity with Local Plan Policy SS1.</p> <p>It is noted, however, that the subsequent paragraph (starting ‘Development proposals within...’) is broader, and so does not conflict with the Local Plan, but is inconsistent with the NP’s initial bullet points.</p> <p>Should the policy be retained in a similar form it is necessary to provide greater clarity about what ‘suitably located’ means in the context of previously developed sites (in sub-BP2).</p> <p>Are there any agricultural buildings within the SPB?</p>	NPPF paras 77-79	<p>Revise policy wording. Review whether policy is required.</p>	<p>(policy renamed: Policy HD1)</p> <p>Met. The policy has now been simplified to address the points previously made.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
Policy H1	<p>The council's Issues and Options consultation included a review of the relative sustainability of the borough's settlements and included Headley alongside Ashford Hill in Category 5 (Small Villages). The consultation document's supporting text states that, 'in line with the above categorisation, the Local Plan Update will need to consider if SPBs should be included around these settlements to bring them in line with other settlements included in the sustainability categories'.</p> <p>Although a decision has not been taken on whether Headley should have an SPB, it is suggested that Policy H1 could be future proofed by removing explicit reference to Ashford Hill (when reference is made to the 'defined settlement policy boundary'). This would provide greater flexibility in the future, should it be required.</p>		Review policy wording.	<p>(policy renamed: Policy HD1)</p> <p>Met. The policy refers to 'any settlement policy boundary' which future proofs it in the event that further SPBs are identified within the parish through the Local Plan Update.</p>
Policy H2	<p>The first paragraph of Policy H2 should be removed as it does not set out planning policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 should be made more precise, with greater clarity about what 'predominantly' means (is it more than 50% of dwellings)?</p> <p>Although it seems to have been intended, it could be made clearer that the housing mix should apply to market homes and affordable homes <i>separately</i> and not a blended mix of the two. This would be worth clarifying, as an overall mix of predominantly smaller dwellings could be contrived to include large market homes and small affordable homes.</p> <p>The final sentence 'The 2019 survey confirmed a local need for such housing' is not required in the policy (and is noted in the supporting text).</p>	NPPF para 77 and PPG (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 70-017-20210524 and Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 67-013-20210524)	Review policy wording	<p>(policy renamed: Policy HD2)</p> <p>Partially met.</p> <p>It is considered that the points raised in the Reg 14 response have been met.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 requires 70% 1-3 bedroom units. This aligns with the priorities identified through the parish council's survey and the proportions identified in Principle 3.1 of the council's adopted SPD. However, it is suggested that the policy should include a reasonable degree of flexibility to allow local circumstances to be taken into account, where they are suitably justified.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
				However, it is unclear why (in the final sentence) the percentage should be determined in relation to area rather than number of units. A policy which relied upon identifying the proportion of 'small' units would be easier to implement and consistent with the LPA's approach elsewhere in the borough.
Policy H3	<p>NPPF para 125 states that 'Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development'.</p> <p>Suggest that this policy relates to the design of all types of development (not just housing). Although the policy wording is not specific to housing, the policy title ('Housing Policy H3) indicates that it is, and this could cause confusion.</p> <p>BP1: It is considered that BP1 could be broadened beyond just density and pick up some of the features of high quality development highlighted in bullet point 3 (which are referred to only in the context of heritage assets but would be relevant for all).</p> <p>BP2: Suggest that it is made clear that, 'development should be locally distinctive <u>to the character of the area</u>'.</p> <p>Section 10 does not include the signposted information about local vernacular, but this appears to be set out in Section 9.3 (page 22). This has a strong emphasis on detailed heritage features, but there would be an opportunity for this section to instead identify (perhaps slightly more broadly) what design features make the Parish distinctive. It could also identify other features, such as building set back, trees and hedges etc that contribute to local character.</p>	NPPF paras 124/125	Clarify scope of policy and review policy wording.	(policy renamed: Policy HD3) Met. This policy has been significantly revised and improved since the Reg 14 consultation.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
	<p>BP3: Suggest these should be a requirement for all development (not just heritage assets). Consider extent to which sub-criteria repeat other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>BP5: Overlaps with requirements set out in Policy L1.</p> <p>BP6: Overlaps with Policy TTP2. 'Adequate parking' should be informed by the BDBC Parking Standards SPD. It is also not clear what would make allocated parking 'appropriate' or why garages 'should not be isolated within the plot' (or precisely what this means).</p> <p>BPs 7 and 8 are not structured around, 'development will be permitted where...' and the requirements (and the reasons for including them) are not fully explained/justified in the supporting text. In relation to criterion 7, not all proposals will have an outline planning stage (they may be 'full' applications), and it is not entirely clear what standard it is requiring development to meet (and whether that is different to the requirements of Local Plan Policy EM7 (Managing Flood Risk)).</p>			
Policy LE1	<p>Although high-speed broadband/mobile is desirable, it would not be essential for all employment uses (and does not relate to the supporting text). It is considered that planning permission could not be refused because a site didn't include this. It could therefore only be encouraged but not made mandatory.</p> <p>Policy EP4 (which is cross-referenced to) only relates to economic uses in the countryside (so would not be relevant to development in the SPB, which also falls within the scope of this policy).</p> <p>The second sentence of the supporting text identifies some specific impacts (neighbour amenities, highways) which could be included in the policy text (but these are picked up by other policies in any case). If not, it is unclear whether a policy is required.</p>		Review policy wording.	Met.
Policy LE2	It is not clear if the bullet points are relevant to both elements of the policy (diversification and conversion). For example, there may be diversification schemes that do not include building conversions.		Review policy wording	Although amendments have been made, the structure of the policy does not make it clear

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
	<p>This type of development may also have heritage impacts.</p> <p>Would be helpful to explain the relationship with ALP Policy EM4.</p>			<p>that the requirements in the bullet points also apply to the first paragraph. Without this change, the policy would support increases in commercial or recreational activity without any constraints.</p>
Policy TTP1	<p>This policy appears to duplicate the requirement of Policy H3 (BP 6), and is also similar to Local Plan Policy CN9 (criterion h)</p> <p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term 'off street' is used rather than 'off-road'. • The policy should refer to BDBC's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document to define 'adequate'. • Should add 'unless an essential justification can be demonstrated' to provide a reasonable degree of flexibility. <p>There is no supporting text to this policy. It would be helpful to explain why this policy is necessary.</p>		Review policy wording	<p>Elements of this policy repeat Policy CN9, criterion h, however it is recognised to be an important local issue.</p> <p>The second paragraph should be changed to reflect the fact that the adopted Parking Standards SPD sets standards not recommendations.</p>
Policy TTP2	<p>The first paragraph would be better as a supporting statement as it provides the national policy context.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 should be rephrased to be positively worded. It is recommended that the policy requirements and the reasons for it are explained in more detail. It is noted that a similar policy in another NP in the borough was recently removed by the examiner. Greater detail could be included to explain what type of changes would be 'unsympathetic' and how they would have an urbanising effect.</p> <p>Should it say footways in paragraph 2 (rather than footpaths)?</p> <p>Paragraph 3: Is the 'following map', Figure 31?</p>	NPPF para 98, PPG (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 37-004-20140306)	Review policy wording and scope of policy.	<p>It is recognised that this policy has been significantly changed. Although it is desirable that all development should provide safe pedestrian and cycling access, this may not be possible in all parts of the rural parish, so this should be suitably caveated.</p> <p>It is unclear how the second paragraph differs from the safety requirement of TTP1, or why access is required 'adjacent' to the site.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Submission Plan
	<p>The policy title refers to Public Rights of Way but these don't seem to be covered by the policy. The policy could give emphasis to protecting these rights of way, protecting their setting, and ensuring they remain accessible in the interests of enjoying the countryside.</p>			

