

1. MISCELLANEOUS

Objections

0011/69, 390 Highways Agency
0033/223 Scott Brownrigg (unconditionally withdrawn)

Issues

- a. The Highways Agency should be involved in the scoping of transport assessments for allocated sites and the Council should formally update policies that relate to transport more fully to reflect PPG13

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

The Alterations are specific to 3 elements of the current Local Plan and the principle of each is already established. However, the Council will need to review all of its policies having regard to PPG13 and all other issues as part of the production of its new Local Development Framework which is already underway (anticipated date of adoption 2007- CD5).

RECOMMENDATIONS

No change.

2. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

2.1 POLICY ALT GEN 13 & PARAGRAPHS 2.2 - 2.39

Objections

1004/398	Helical (Fleet) Ltd
1006/402	Luckmore Ltd
1008/405	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society
1010/407-408	George Wimpey UK Ltd
1013/418	HBF Southern Region
1014/420-422, 424	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council
1015/425	A. & WM White
1016/428	Premier Properties Plc
1017/429-430	Eversley Parish Council
1018/431-442	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
1024/459-461	Fairview New Homes Ltd
1025/462-468	C. Leversha
1026/469-471	The Odiham Society
1027/472-477	Wates Landmark Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre
1028/480	V. Street
0004/5-7	E. Lawrence
0005/8-12, 16-18	Lean & Co.
0006/13-15, 19-23	Wates Homes Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre
0007/28- 37	Berkeley Community Villages
0008/46-5	The Odiham Society
0010/55-61	GOSE
0012/70-73	Longstreet Homes Ltd (72 conditionally withdrawn)
0013/74-75	Dr. R Pinchin
0014/76-82	HBF – Southern Region
0016/93-95	Horizon Developments Ltd
0017/96-98	Bell Cornwell Partnership
0018/104-106	MH Character Homes
0019/107-121, 123, 125 - 136	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
0020/147-154	Luckmore Ltd (151 & 153 conditionally withdrawn)
0022/180-182	Linden Homes Developments Ltd
0023/183-190	Flavia Estates Ltd
0024/192-199	Premier Properties Plc
0025/200-207	Friday Street
0026/208-214	The Conville Family
0031/220	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society
0032/221-222	The Crondall Society
0033/224-228	Scott Brownrigg (all unconditionally withdrawn)
0034/229-232	Carson & Company
0036/241-242	Bellway Homes

0044/258-263	Hook Parish Council
0045/268-271	BT Plc
0046/272-275	Fairview New Homes Ltd
0047/276-277	George Wimpey strategic Land
0048/280-281	Y. Fuller
0050/286-293, 295	Estates Practice (Hampshire County Council)
0051/296-302	P. Goddard
0053/305-313	MaCarthy Stone Developments Ltd
0054/314-317	Helical (Fleet) Ltd
0056/321-324	Ashridge Homes Ltd
0059/329-332	Carlton Construction
0061/337-338	Cliveden Homes
0066/346	Fordham Research Ltd (unconditionally withdrawn)
0071/356-357	Hampshire County Council (357 conditionally withdrawn)
0073/366-372	NHS Estates
0076/377	V. Street
0078/379-380	Portsmere Ltd
0080/383	P. Todd
0081/384-388	Eversley Parish Council
0082/389	Mattingley Parish Council

Issues

- a. References should not be made to the Local Development Framework or to revisions to PPG3; the revision of the existing Local Plan policies is premature and there has been no consultation with the development industry, landowners or village communities;
- b. The wording is in some instances unclear and contains too much detail;
- c. The proposed alterations are contrary to planning policy and do not comply with government guidance;
- d. The 40% requirement for affordable housing is not justified and should not be applied across the whole District;
- e. Planning policy should not attempt to prescribe the maximum size of affordable housing clusters;
- f. Planning policy should not attempt to determine tenure mix;
- g. Negotiations for affordable housing should be on a site-specific basis;
- h. Planning legislation has no powers to determine the price of land;
- i. Affordable housing cannot be made available in perpetuity;
- j. The Housing Needs Survey has not been made available and the evidence from it does not justify exceptional housing need in Hart;
- k. The requirement for affordable housing on all sites will make the viability of small sites unviable;
- l. The definition of affordable housing used in the policy will allow developers to sell at a small discount;
- m. The Council should not remove thresholds for all residential sites;
- n. Both policies (ALT GEN 13 and ALT URB 14) should not refer to Registered Social Landlords as providers of affordable housing;
- o. The policies are either too detailed or do not contain enough detailed information;
- p. The policy leaves a loophole in securing support for affordable housing;
- q. The Policies are premature and should wait until PPS 3 is published;
- r. Concerns about the levels of affordable housing in rural areas/ villages and the relationship with rural exception sites;
- s. A distinction should be made between subsidised and low cost market housing as identified in Circular 6/98;
- t. There should be recognition in the policy of the needs of key workers;
- u. The policy should only apply to suitable sites for affordable housing;
- v. The policy should not make reference to draft national policies;
- w. The policy does not state what densities may be sought;
- x. The policy should allocate sites for affordable housing;
- y. Miscellaneous.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

PPS3

Whether the Policies are premature and whether the Council should wait until PPS3 is published

Just before the Inquiry opened the government published a Consultation Paper which seeks comments on a draft Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing*. This PPS and accompanying guidance (currently being drafted) will, in due course, replace Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: *Housing*, published in March 2000 and Planning Circular 6/98: *Planning and Affordable Housing* (C6/98).

PPS3 aims to make significant changes to the planning and delivery system for housing with the aim of ensuring that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. In the context of proposed changes to the strategic planning process, the government is keen to deliver a better balance between housing demand and supply in every housing market, and to improve affordability where necessary, as well as creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

However, I note first, the current Alterations have been prepared against the background of national guidance in PPG3 and C6/98. Secondly, the purpose of the transitional arrangements is to speed up the process to adoption in order to meet the July 2006 deadline. Since PPS3 is still subject to consultation with the full range of interested parties and is unlikely to be published in final form until Summer 2006 (i.e. after the intended adoption of these Alterations) it cannot be determinative of the approach I have taken in the consideration of the presently proposed plan policies.

But, the imminence of published new national guidance, and the ongoing review of RSS (RPG9) for the South East, are such that it is likely that the Council will need to review its policies for overall housing provision and delivery in general, and for affordable housing in particular, at an early stage as part of the new LDF system which is already underway (anticipated date of adoption 2007-CD5 and CD28).

Furthermore, whilst the adopted Development Plan will be the starting point for future development decisions, as and when PPS3 is published it will be a material consideration. If decision makers decide not to follow relevant statements of Government planning policy, they must give clear and convincing reasons.

The need for affordable housing

Whether the Housing Needs Survey has been made available and whether the evidence from it justifies exceptional housing need in Hart

The HNS was updated in 2005 and approved at Officer level but it remained as a Draft Final Report at the time the Inquiry was closed as it had not been approved by the Planning Committee. Although the update revised the 2003 HNS (which had been adopted by the Council) the conclusions generally remained the same. In this report I shall put the 2005 revised figures in brackets after any figures quoted from the 2003 report.

Supporting paragraphs 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 2.10, 2.18, 2.28, 2.32 to Policy ALT GEN 13 (May 2005) (paragraphs 2.2, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, 2.17, 2.27 of Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) refer to the 2003 Housing Needs Survey (HNS) by David Couttie Associates. The survey was extremely comprehensive and was conducted in accordance with

the advice in DETR (now ODPM) Good Practice Guidance on Local Housing Needs Assessment issued in August 2000.

The only criticism of the methodology itself raised by the objectors was the inclusion of households requiring "some form of assistance" which it was claimed included mainly young people wishing to leave home. I note first, that this calculation is in accordance with the Government's model for determining housing need. Secondly, that in any event, around 70/71% of new forming households are aged between 20-29.

The HNSs were undertaken by consultants who are very experienced in this field and undertake work across the country. Both HNSs identify a very substantial level of unmet need for affordable housing which considerably exceeds any realistic expectation of being fully met. Indeed, the annual scale of affordable need is over 7 times the annual new unit delivery planned (see details below) over the next 2 years. Accordingly, it is the Council's view that an Alteration is required in order to help to address the urgent need for affordable housing in the District in advance of the LDF.

However, I note that first, although the Council anticipates adopting the LDF in 2007 (CD5), there could be some slippage and these proposed Alterations once adopted will be saved to 2009. Secondly, although the Adopted plan covers the period 1996-2006, the Council considers these Alterations to be intentionally limited and so it considers that it would be inappropriate and impractical to apply the advice in PPG12 and PPG3 regarding length of the plan and the undertaking of a full review of sites at this stage and that it would negate the purpose of these limited Alterations.

I shall therefore consider these Alterations in the light of the housing requirement set out by Policy H2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 (4750 dwellings); the provision to be made under Adopted LP Policy DEV1 for the construction of 4166 dwellings in the period from 1996-2009; and the projected completions for the period to March 2009 taken from Appendix 3 of Hart District Council Draft Annual Monitoring Report (DAMR) 2005 (1062 dwellings) (CD30).

Although the Council predicts there will be an oversupply of housing in 2009/10 and 2010/11 in relation to SP requirement, by contrast, the HNSs 2003 (2005) found that:

- the annual affordable housing need totals 600 (672) homes per annum;
- the supply of affordable homes including re-lets and assuming that the past trends of providing new affordable homes continues, totals 182 (246) homes per annum;
- there is an outstanding need for affordable housing of 418 (426) units per annum;
- there will be an increase in the numbers of people aged 80 or over by approximately 65% by 2021 (numbers in the 75+ age group will increase by 85.8% by 2021);
- 90% of newly formed households are not on the housing register;
- because of the cost of housing in Hart 80% of concealed households cannot access the local housing market (this position is considered to be worse in the 2005 update);
- New property prices are out of reach of most newly forming households.

The recommendations of the survey are that:

- The Council, in enabling/seeking to promote increases in the supply of affordable housing, should seek to provide mainly small units to meet the needs of single adults and couples and address the shortages in the stock.
- A comprehensive strategy should be developed to address the growth in elderly or frail elderly households.
- The housing needs of disabled households should be promoted.
- Planning policies should achieve 40% of subsidised affordable homes from the total of all suitable sites coming forward for planning permission over the period of the Local Plan. Each site will need to be assessed individually, targets being subject to wider planning, economic priority, and sustainability considerations and will require a flexible approach to specific site negotiation.
- The annual scale of affordable need is over 7 times the average annual new unit delivery planned over the next 2 years and justifies the exceptional case for lower thresholds.

On the face of it, the level of housing provision to meet Structure Plan housing requirements to 2011 (or 2009) is insufficient in itself to meet the affordable needs of the District. To my mind, this is a matter which can only properly be addressed as part of a comprehensive review under the new LDF system when the Council can review its policies for overall housing provision and delivery in general, and for affordable housing in particular. Nevertheless, the HNSs demonstrate that there is an acute need for affordable housing in the District at the present time and therefore the Council must do all it can to address that need.

The definition of affordable housing

Because of the high prices in the District relative to incomes, the HNSs exclude unsubsidised low cost market housing from the types of housing capable of meeting affordable housing needs. Low cost market housing would not be available to those who are unable to buy or rent. On the evidence available, this approach seems justified since, in areas of very high house prices, there is a tension, if not a contradiction, between the advice in Circular 6/98 that affordable housing should include low cost market housing and that affordable housing is for those who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market.

It would be impractical to refer in the Plan to actual income or house price levels in defining affordability, since such information would rapidly become out of date. At proposed paragraph 2.12 of the Re-deposited Draft-May 2005 First Alterations (paragraph 2.11 of Inquiry Changes December 2005), the Plan defines what the Council means by affordable housing. The definition is that used in the 2003 HNS which is derived from the relationship between local incomes and the local general housing market:

"Affordable housing is that provided, with subsidy, both for rent and low cost market housing, for people who are unable to resolve their housing requirements in the general housing market, because of the relationship between local housing costs and incomes".

I note the reference to subsidy (i.e. shared equity) is consistent with the SEERA Good Practice Guide on Assessing Housing Needs in the South East 2004.

Specifying the proportion of affordable housing sought and the factors to be taken into account in negotiating such provision

Whether the 40% requirement for affordable housing is justified and whether it should be applied across the whole District

Circular 6/98 does not envisage District-wide targets being incorporated into policy, although it does not specifically rule them out. The Circular lists a wide range of factors to be taken into account in assessing the suitability of sites to provide affordable housing. It seems to me that one of the underlying objectives of the advice in C 6/98 is the avoidance of an arbitrary and inflexible approach by Councils.

Given the substantial need for affordable housing demonstrated in the HNSs, it is necessary to maximise the provision of affordable housing, provided that doing so does not inhibit development and the achievement of other planning objectives. In this context, an indication in the Policy of the target proportion being sought across the District would help to demonstrate the scale of the need, encourage a broadly consistent approach, and is the most transparent means of alerting land-owners and developers to the Council's intentions. But alongside such an indication, it is essential that the Policy outlines the context within which affordable housing will be negotiated, namely the site specific circumstances, including the viability of the development, and the achievement of other planning objectives. These factors, along with the need for affordable housing in the locality, and the practicality of delivering the affordable housing, would also be matters influencing the type and mix of affordable housing to be provided on any particular site.

Realistic assessments of the funding available to deliver affordable housing within a reasonable period should also be made. Flexibility in both the proportion and mix of affordable housing and in the nature of the subsidy provided by the developer

may well be required to ensure that the intended affordable housing is delivered. If Policy ALT GEN 13 were modified to reflect this broad and flexible approach, then I consider that it can include a figure for the proportion of affordable housing to be sought without being unacceptably out of step with national advice.

Both the 2003 and 2005 HNSs recommend a 40% target. I note that the overall housing provision in Policy H1 of RPG9 is an annual average rate of 39,000 net additional dwellings and that RPG9 Policy H4c) says 'RPBs should monitor the overall provision of affordable housing against a provisional indicator of 18,000-19,000 affordable homes a year in the Rest of the South East area' – which I calculate to be approximately 46%-49% although proposed supporting paragraph 2.21 (2.20 Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) says approximately 50%. The Guidance states that more specific targets should be agreed in the light of local need assessments. I conclude that the HNS target of 40% is below the provisional indicator of need in RPG9 for the Rest of the South East.

Given the substantial scale of need that has been identified, which will not be fully met, I consider that an indicative overall target for the District of 40% provision of affordable housing is justified, subject to the other changes outlined to make negotiations a reality. Furthermore, the viability of this Policy has been confirmed by the Adams Integra Report "Assessment of Development Viability and Impact of Affordable Housing Policy" October 2005 commissioned by Hart DC (CD32), which demonstrated that 40% is a clear and sustainable target to achieve affordable housing in Hart.

There is no evidence of substance to indicate that such a target would inhibit development, especially if the Policy recognised the viability of development as a constraint. The Council noted that reference to this proportion as a District-wide target would mean that if some sites provide less, others might need to provide more than this figure. However, in practice, I fear that it would be unlikely that more than 40% could realistically be negotiated. Nevertheless, annual monitoring will provide the factual basis. I consider this to be consistent with affordable housing and other planning objectives being the subject of negotiation.

At the Round Table Session, Council Officers accepted that the Policy should be reworded such that the words "a minimum of" preceding 40% should be deleted and I endorse this proposed change (Inquiry Changes December 2005).

Whether the requirement for affordable housing on all sites will make the viability of small sites unviable

Objectors are concerned that policy requirements will render smaller sites and schemes uneconomically viable and will deter land owners and developers bringing land forward for development, particularly brown field sites. However, I note that the requirement for 40% affordable housing provision compares with that of several other Authorities within the sub-region. And, that further analysis carried out after the policy was drafted, has shown that residential property prices in Hart are relatively high, in comparison to the rest of Hampshire. Since the price of housing is a good indicator of land values, I do not consider that the 40% requirement will adversely affect the economic viability of sites to the extent that will prevent land coming forward for development.

The Council's proposed requirement for only 50% of affordable accommodation to be rented, with the remainder being other forms of affordable housing (such as shared ownership) which do not have as great an impact on the development value of sites, further ensures that the viability of sites will not be unduly affected.

Tenure

In the light of C6/98 and PPG3, should the reference to a specific tenure and a particular mix of financial arrangements within ALT GEN 13 and paragraph 2.24 (revised 2.23) be deleted?

Whether planning policy should attempt to determine tenure mix.

The Council acknowledges that C6/98 is clear that planning policy should not be expressed in favour of any particular form of tenure. Nevertheless, the HNSs demonstrate an acute need for rented accommodation: 50% of concealed households could not afford a rent of more than £60 per week. As the lowest private sector rents were £500-£600 a month, there was a clear mismatch. In addition, less than 10% of the existing housing stock was social rented housing. As such, the Council considers that 50% of the housing provided should be for rent. Furthermore, Mr Couttie considers that it is in the developers' interest that the Policy should give clarity to developers about what is required.

The objectors consider that the Policy should be tenure neutral and that the Policy should not be prescriptive, nor should it attempt to predetermine the outcome of negotiations. Paragraph 16 of PPG3 says that decisions about the amount and type of affordable housing should be a matter for agreement between the developer and the LPA. Paragraph B26 of Circular 05/2005 suggests that such detailed matters should be included in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

The Council stated that it was facing a serious affordable housing problem. Therefore, rather than wait for the new LDF, it had put forward the current Alterations and there was no time under the old procedures to progress SPG/SPD. Furthermore, the Council was faced with outdated planning guidance and was simply seeking the tools to do the job.

I do not consider it appropriate to specify 50% social housing for rent and 50% other forms of subsidised housing in the policy wording itself. However, in my view, the Council's objectives could be achieved by the proposed 5th paragraph of the Policy which is tenure neutral and states that "*The Council will expect the mix of accommodation in terms of sizes and tenures to reflect the findings of the Housing Needs Survey, grant availability and the location and circumstances of the site in question. These will be matters for negotiation but the Council will reject developments that conflict with the objective of widening house choice*".

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 (2.11 and 2.12 Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) of the supporting text set out respectively the definition of affordable housing and the types of affordable housing which comply with this definition. The identified need for social housing for rent is explained in supporting paragraph 2.17 (2.16 Inquiry Changes Dec 2005), and the requirement for 50:50 social housing for rent:other forms of subsidised housing is set out in supporting paragraph 2.24 (2.23 Inquiry Changes Dec 2005). As such, I believe the policy could be tenure neutral whilst the supporting text could be clear about the findings of the Housing Needs Survey which will be the subject of negotiation. Given the transitional nature of the plan, its short life, and the fact that there is no time to produce SPD, it is helpful for the supporting text to give clarity to developers as to the mix the Council seeks.

Nil Cost Land

Whether the Policy is contrary to C 05/2005

Whether nil cost serviced land is an important tool in the delivery of affordable

housing, including rented accommodation. And, whether this is equivalent to seeking a betterment levy.

Whether planning legislation has power to determine the price of land

One of the objections claims that the policy is contrary to Circular 5/05. However, I concur with the Council that this is a misreading of the Circular as the quotations from paragraphs B7 and B9 in the statement relate to infrastructure which is differentiated from affordable housing by paragraphs B12, B13 and B14 of the Circular. Paragraph B12 states "...*planning obligations can be used to secure the inclusion of an element of affordable housing in a residential or mixed use development...*"

The objectors argued that the Council did not have the power to instruct landowners to dispose of land, at any price. As such, it should not form part of the Policy but be subject to negotiation. It was suggested that the Policy could be modified to indicate that the provision of free serviced land was one of the means to secure affordable housing.

The Council says that the cash flows and financial appraisals associated with affordable housing development are such that major levels of subsidy are required particularly to provide affordable rented accommodation. Even with nil cost land, affordable rented tenure needs significant grant or other subsidy input to work. It goes on to say that free land or free serviced land for affordable housing is a common and growing practice working in many local authority areas in the South e.g. Winchester, East Hampshire, Southampton, Rushmoor, Crawley, Mid Sussex and New Forest. It says that it is a position which enables clarity for land owners and developers when it is known about sufficiently early to enable it to be factored into negotiations and appraisals.

Given that some Local Authorities go further than this, it seems to me that the position proposed by Hart District Council is a practical and workable one, particularly when viewed in the context of the confirmed intention to negotiate.

I concur with the Council that nil cost serviced land is a very important tool in the delivery of affordable housing. I do not consider that it is equivalent to seeking a betterment levy as referred to in C 05/2005 but rather that it is a key tool in securing appropriate affordable housing which as confirmed by C 05/2005 is a legitimate planning obligation aim, including rented accommodation. Furthermore, it is not a question of replacing public subsidy, nil cost land is not in itself sufficient to do that, but a case of being able to make the most of what subsidy is available.

RSL Provision

The Council accepts that Local Planning Authorities are unable to prescribe which partners developers should use to deliver affordable housing although, C 6/98 at paragraph 12 clearly regards Registered Social Landlords as the principal agencies for delivering affordable housing. The Council also appreciates that the 2004 Housing Act seeks to widen the range of affordable housing providers including the involvement of private developers. However, I am satisfied that paragraph 2.35 (2.33 Inquiry changes Dec 2005) of the supporting text recognises that involvement of an RSL may not always be possible.

I concur with the objectors that the Policy should not specify that an RSL should be the only way of ensuring that affordable housing should remain affordable since there is no basis for this in C 6/98. I acknowledge that the Council's aim was not necessarily to specify an RSL but to require a mechanism for the affordable

housing to remain in perpetuity.

Perpetuity

Whether affordable housing should be available in perpetuity.

Whether this requirement is legally enforceable.

Whether the need for affordable accommodation will exist in the future.

The policy aims to ensure that, within the framework of other legislation, affordable housing remains affordable and available to meet future housing need and that the stock of affordable housing achieved by planning agreement is not eroded by sale at a future date. This approach of ensuring that affordable housing is provided 'in perpetuity' is advocated in C6/98 and PPG3.

In particular, C6/98 indicates in paragraph 16 that both conditions and planning obligations may legitimately be used, where justified, to ensure that affordable housing is occupied either initially or 'in perpetuity', only by people falling within particular categories of need for affordable housing.

I am in no doubt that the affordable housing needs to be maintained for successive occupiers and that affordable housing needs are not going to be resolved in the near future. However, in my view, the words "*in perpetuity*" could be unduly restrictive and should be replaced with words similar to those used in 2003 HNS "*as long as it is needed*".

Thus, if a change of wording were made which might assist the provision of affordable housing without weakening the policy objective of retaining that housing as affordable for successive occupiers, then I consider that such a change should be made. A requirement to ensure that affordable housing remains as such "*so long as there is a need for it*" would meet the policy requirement, whilst avoiding the particular problem highlighted by objectors with "*in perpetuity*".

The control of affordable housing by Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) ensures that affordable housing continues to be made available to those in need. But the Council should not preclude other arrangements, since this might stifle local initiatives. Where no RSL is involved it will be necessary for either planning conditions or a legal agreement to set out the detailed mechanisms for control of both initial and subsequent occupancy. Because such circumstances are unlikely to be frequent and will need to be tailored to the specific location/form of development proposed, it is not necessary for the Plan to set out such details.

I recommend that the 7th paragraph be re-worded to say: "Planning conditions will be imposed or a legal agreement sought to ensure that the affordable housing provided remains affordable for so long as there remains a need for it".

Low cost market housing

Whether the definition and types set out by the Council at paragraphs 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15 and 2.16 (paragraphs 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, and 2.15 of Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) inclusive comply with planning guidance or whether they should be deleted on the basis that they seek to impose a specific mix of dwellings.

The key point here is that affordable housing requires subsidy and that the gap between incomes and affordability is so large in Hart that small low cost units for sale are not affordable. Hence the definition of affordable housing in the Plan which I explain at paragraph 2.1.16 above. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the types of affordable housing which comply with this definition are set out in supporting text

at paragraph 2.13 (revised 2.12).

Low cost market housing which qualifies as "affordable housing" contains therefore an element of subsidy either from free or discounted land, grant or discount. Small market units which are the cheapest new housing units are not low cost market houses, they are "starter" homes. There is a need for these small units to provide a balanced housing stock as identified in PPG3 but this is not an affordable housing issue.

Mix and clusters

Whether paragraphs 2.27-2.29 (paragraphs 2.26-2.28 of Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) of the supporting text reflects the Council's wish to relate the provision of dwelling sizes with the conclusions of the Housing Needs Survey; or whether these paragraphs should be deleted on the basis that they seek to impose a specific mix of dwellings.

Whether the requirement in paragraph 2.37 that on larger sites "the Council will expect that clusters of affordable housing will be in groups of no larger than 10 dwellings" is justified in the light of C 05/2005 to prevent concentrations of affordable housing and to ensure a balanced social mix.

Whether planning policy should attempt to prescribe the maximum size of affordable housing clusters.

Objectors considered that specifying clusters of not more than 10 units of affordable housing on larger sites is too prescriptive. The Council considers that affordable housing should be scattered throughout developments to ensure that it is integrated with market housing but its housing managers considered that it was beyond 10 units that ghettos were created. As such, the Policy is intended to give guidance. In my conclusion, the object of the Policy would be achieved without being too prescriptive by adopting the amended policy wording suggested by Officers (Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) "to seek pepper potting of affordable housing through development sites". And, by their amendment to supporting paragraph 2.37 (now paragraph 2.35)

Exception sites

Whether ALT GEN13 should include provision for exception sites for affordable housing in larger urban settlements

ALT GEN 13 is intended to replace both Policy URB13 (Affordable and Special Needs Housing policy in Section 6.4 THE URBAN ECONOMY AND RURAL CENTRES) and Policy RUR21 (Affordable Housing policy in Section 6.3 THE RURAL ECONOMY AND THE COUNTRYSIDE) in the adopted Local Plan. Adopted Policy RUR1 sets out the rural settlements to which the Policies of Section 6.3 of the Plan apply.

The supporting text to Policy RUR21 explains that all settlements defined under RUR1 are below 3,000 population. Consequently, adopted Policy RUR22 (a rural exceptions policy), which is not proposed to be altered, currently applies to settlements under 3,000 population in the rural area.

Adopted Policy URB13 has already adopted the lower threshold set out in C6/98 at paragraph 10 i) b) i.e. a proportion of affordable housing shall be provided on housing developments of 15 or more dwellings or residential sites of 0.5ha or more irrespective of the number of dwellings. Adopted Policy RUR21 relates to settlements with a population below 3,000 and adopts the lower threshold of sites of 0.25ha or more or providing 5 dwellings or more. The supporting text notes that

the Local Plan Inspector accepted the local constraints and high level of need for rural affordable housing warranted a reduction in the site threshold.

ALT GEN13 is a general policy that proposes to change the requirements for affordable housing in rural settlements such that they apply to settlements below 5,000 population (rather than below 3,000) with sites which are 0.2ha (rather than 0.25ha) or larger or that would provide 5 or more dwellings.

One objector (Peter Goddard) is concerned that the Council is trying to anticipate PPS3 when it has not yet been published and little weight should be attached to draft Government policy. C 6/98 enabled a threshold of 15 or more dwellings or 0.5 ha or more in settlements over 3,000 population. The Inspector's reports for Wokingham, Test Valley and Basingstoke supported the same threshold in respect of settlements over 3,000 population. None had gone beyond the advice in C 6/98. He emphasised that little weight should be attached to draft Government policy. Furthermore, the Council had agreed that changing the threshold for rural settlements from 3,000 to 5,000 population would result in less than 10 dwellings per annum. In accordance with the companion guide to PPS1, there needed to be clear and convincing reasons for departing from Government policy. This had not been demonstrated.

However, it is the Council's view that as the HNSs demonstrate that the scale of affordable need is over 7 times the annual new unit delivery planned over the next 2 years, that this justifies the exceptional case for lower thresholds. Broadly speaking, I consider that this would seem to be consistent with the advice in RPG9 Policy H4 vii.

In the Alterations, the Council is effectively proposing to increase the number of settlements to which the lower threshold in Policy ALT GEN 13 would apply by increasing the size threshold of the settlements to populations below 5,000. And, it proposes to bring forward more sites by reducing the site area thresholds from "0.25 ha or larger" that would provide 5 or more dwellings to "0.2 ha or larger". However, as "rural settlements" are listed in Policy RUR1 this would create a tension within the Plan in respect of the definition of Hartley Wintney and Odiham. One objector (Peter Goddard) therefore suggests that the reference in ALT GEN 13 to "5,000 population" be changed to "3,000 population".

If the reference to "rural settlements below 5,000 population" remained within ALT GEN 13" it was accepted by the Council's representatives at the RTS that Hartley Wintney and Odiham would have to be added to the list of settlements on page 34 of the Adopted Plan. In respect of the threshold, the Council wanted to see the provision of some affordable housing outside of exception sites. Whilst 10 units may not sound a lot, first, having regard to the level of affordable housing delivered in rural areas, it was significant. Secondly, if the target was raised to 40%, the figure would be higher than 10 units (I calculate it would be about 16). Thirdly, Hartley Wintney and Odiham were some of the most expensive parts of the District.

Whether Policy ALT GEN 13 should include provision for exception sites for affordable housing in larger urban settlements in order to achieve the Council's intention of achieving an increase in the quantity of affordable housing.

Whether there is justification to promote a specific site for sheltered affordable accommodation on the edge of Hook

If so, whether Policies ALT GEN 13 and ALT URB 14 be amended to justify an

allocation for this site.

By contrast (to Peter Goddard), another objector (Premier Properties Plc) seeks to retain the reference to "5,000 population" in ALT GEN13, but amend RUR1 to include populations up to 5,000.

As a consequence, (as already stated) some larger settlements would be listed under RUR1 (i.e. Hartley Wintney and Odiham) and the exception sites Policy RUR22 would therefore apply to a larger range of settlements than currently identified in the Adopted Local Plan. The objector seeks this amendment on the basis that the Council has repeatedly acknowledged the high level of need and the problems facing the delivery of affordable housing in the District.

The objector (Premier Properties Plc) noted first, the replacement Annex B to PPG3 does not define small rural communities as settlements of up to 3,000 population. Secondly, the replacement paragraph 18 to PPG3 states that "*Rural exception sites should be small, solely for affordable housing and on land within or adjoining existing small rural communities which would not otherwise be released for general market housing*". Thirdly, paragraph 5.4.4 of the Rural White paper stated that the Government wanted to encourage the use of the rural exception policy in rural settlements "but regardless of size". Finally, paragraph 3.2.1 of the Adopted Plan states that the District is mostly rural in character. As such, there seemed no reason why the policy should not be more embracing.

The objector (Premier Properties Plc) pointed to the fact that one of the Council's main policy objectives was to secure an increase in the supply of affordable housing and that they needed to do all they could to redress the housing market imbalance. If that was true, it was hard to see why the Council considered the objector's proposals to be inappropriate. Furthermore, having regard to PPG3 as amended in January 2005 and given the evidence the objector had provided about the Winchester Plan and the Rural White Paper, the Council had a mechanism, which having regard to the level of need, should be used now.

Whilst the objector considers that the extent of affordable housing need is clear, they felt that the Council's policies were unlikely to make a material difference in meeting these needs. Moreover, the level of housing provision to meet the Structure Plan housing requirements to 2011 is insufficient in itself to meet the affordable needs of the District, let alone a small proportion of it. In these circumstances, the objector felt that a more flexible and proactive approach to affordable housing provision should be adopted.

In addition to altering the percentage proportion of affordable housing, site area/dwelling number thresholds, and extending the settlement size for rural exception sites, the objector seeks to amend the policy to accept sites, not only within or on the edge of "rural settlements" but also the "larger urban settlements" in the District for solely affordable housing as "exception sites". Based on this premise, the objector also seeks to promote the allocation of a site solely for affordable housing on land at Owens Farm on the western edge of Hook (the omission site). However, in my view this would not be consistent with the recent revisions to PPG3 quoted in 2.1.30 above and in particular the definition of rural exception sites. Therefore, I do not accept the objector's suggested amendment.

Adopted Policies URB13 and RUR21 currently apply respectively to the affordable housing requirements for urban and rural sites whilst RUR22 applies to rural exception sites. I agree with the Council that the 2 matters should not be confused. The allocated sites within the adopted LP follow the search sequence in PPG3 and

as I have already concluded, there is justification for increasing the proportion of affordable housing from 25% to 40% on all sites.

I understand the acute need for affordable housing in the District, and the Council's wish to do all it can to address that need. I also acknowledge that Hart is mostly rural in character with 90% of the land in open countryside. Accordingly, the challenge for the Council is to provide enough affordable housing to rent or buy under shared ownership on the one hand, with the protection of Hart's rural environment on the other. The Housing Strategy says that the Council will seek to raise the percentage of affordable housing on new developments and actively pursue opportunities for small housing sites in rural communities and this is reflected in proposed Policy ALT GEN13.

Although no changes are proposed by the Council or the objectors to Policy RUR22, the 4th paragraph of proposed Policy ALT GEN13 cross refers to Policy RUR22 and aims to widen the scope for exceptions sites solely for affordable housing. One objector (Premier Properties Plc) has put forward a strong case for extending the size of settlements to which the rural exceptions policy (Policy RUR22) might apply. It seems to me not unreasonable to extend the range of exceptions sites that could come forward solely for affordable housing provided the need was justified and provided the sites were small.

I see no need to amend RUR1 which defines 'rural settlements'. Indeed, any such amendment could have other consequences for the plan. Instead, I propose to adopt the wording suggested by officers (Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) which refers to 'rural communities' and defines these as all settlements other than the urban areas of Fleet, Yateley and Blackwater/Hawley. As such, land within or adjoining Hook has the potential to come forward solely for affordable housing. Nevertheless, any such proposals would need to be considered in the light of recent government guidance in respect of small sites, inclusive, mixed and balanced, and sustainable communities.

Whether references should be made to Local Development Framework

I agree with the objectors that the references to LDF should be deleted from the Policy wording. Since the only mechanism for the Council to allocate sites is via the LP/LDF process, the reference to 'look to allocate sites' should also be deleted. Furthermore, since the Council is not reviewing its sites as part of these limited Alterations, it follows therefore that I cannot consider the proposal to allocate land at Owens Farm, Hook (the omission site) solely for affordable housing. This is a matter more appropriately addressed as part of a comprehensive review of the Council's Housing strategy/allocations as part of its LDF.

Whether there is a conflict between:

- *The provision of serviced sites for affordable housing at nil cost*
- *The allocation of sites solely for affordable housing in rural areas.*

Whether Policy ALT GEN 13 is consistent with recent amendments to PPG3.

Whether Policy ALT GEN 13 is contrary to C 5/05 (nil cost land).

One objector suggested it was an ironic inconsistency that the Council was creating values on agricultural land outside of development boundaries. However, I agree with the Council that there has to be some incentive to bring forward land in rural areas.

Another objector is concerned that it is not clear in ALT GEN 13 that the provision of nil cost land does not apply to rural exception sites. They suggested at the RTS inserting at the end of the 4th paragraph the words "such sites will not be required to provide fully serviced land at nil cost". The Council's representatives had no objection to this and subsequently put forward an amended wording which I endorse.

Whether there should be recognition in the policy of the needs of key workers

I concur with supporting paragraph 2.19 (2.18 Inquiry Changes Dec 2005) that key workers are a category of housing need rather than a particular type of affordable housing. As such, their needs will be met by the various types of affordable housing defined in the supporting text (and in some cases by loan schemes) rather than a dedicated form of provision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **I recommend Policy ALT GEN 13 be amended to read as follows:**

The Council will seek to negotiate the proportion of affordable housing on a site by site basis based on an overall guideline target that 40% of new dwellings should be affordable in individual schemes. Of the affordable housing to be provided, in terms of the total numbers of social housing for rent and other forms of subsidised housing, the Council will take into account:

- The nature and character of the site
- The proximity of local services
- Any particular development costs
- Any specific housing needs of the area in which the site is situated
- Any other planning obligations which may be required in connection with the development of the site.

The Council will expect fully serviced land to be provided of a sufficient size to accommodate the range and types of dwelling necessary to meet the identified housing need at nil cost.

These requirements will apply to sites which are 0.5ha or larger or that would provide 15 or more dwellings, with the exception of settlements below 5,000 population where the requirements will apply to sites which are 0.2ha or larger that would provide 5 or more dwellings.

The Council will seek to grant planning permission solely for affordable housing on land within or adjoining rural communities that would not otherwise be released for housing, in accordance with the principles of existing policy RUR22 and the amendments to PPG3. For the purposes of this policy, rural communities are all settlements other than the urban areas of Fleet, Yateley and Blackwater/Hawley. This provision will be made where there is an identified local need and it would contribute to the attainment of a mixed and balanced community. Exception sites should be small in scale in relation to the size of settlements. Such sites will not be required to provide fully serviced land at nil cost.

The Council will expect the mix of accommodation in terms of sizes and tenures to reflect the findings of the latest Housing Needs Survey, grant availability and the location and circumstances of the site in question. These will be matters for negotiation but the Council will reject developments that conflict with the objective of widening housing choice.

Affordable housing should be integrated with market housing and 'pepperpotted' throughout development sites.

Planning conditions will be imposed or a legal agreement sought to ensure that the initial and successive occupancy is restricted to those in housing need as defined by the District Council and that the affordable housing provided remains affordable for so long as there remains a need for it.

Decisions on applications for residential development will be in accordance with these policies unless the developer or landowner can demonstrate that the particular physical and environmental constraints of a site, or other planning requirements would make the specified levels of affordable housing unachievable.

This policy replaces Policies URB13 and RUR21 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 to 2006.

- **I recommend that the supporting text as set out in the Inquiry Changes to Re-deposited Draft – December 2005 be adopted in its entirety save for paragraph 2.30 which should be amended to read as follows:**

2.30 This policy will apply to all residential sites which are 0.5ha or larger or that would provide 15 or more dwellings. In settlements below 5,000 population, it will then apply to sites which are 0.2ha or would provide 5 or more dwellings, unless they are designated as rural exception sites. Where possible, affordable housing will be located within the development proposed.

2.2 POLICY ALT URB 14 & PARAGRAPHS 2.41 - 2.43

Objections

1004/398	Helical (Fleet) Ltd
1006/402	Luckmore Ltd
1014/423	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council
1016/427	Premier Properties Plc
1027/478-479	Wates Landmark Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre
0006/24-27	Wates Homes Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre
0017/99-101	Bell Cornwell Partnership
0019/137-143	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
0020/166-169	Luckmore Ltd
0036/243	Bellway Homes
0044/264-265	Hook Parish Council
0050/294	Estates Practice (Hampshire County Council)
0054/318-319	Helical (Fleet) Ltd
0073/363-365	NHS Estates

Issues

- a. References should not be made to the Local Development Framework or to revisions to PPG3; the revision of the existing Local Plan policies is premature and there has been no consultation with the development industry, landowners or village communities;
- b. The proposed alterations are contrary to planning policy and do not comply with government guidance;
- c. The 40% requirement for affordable housing is not justified and should not be applied across the whole District;
- d. Planning policy should not attempt to determine tenure mix;
- e. Negotiations for affordable housing should be on a site- specific basis;
- f. Planning legislation has no powers to determine the price of land;
- g. The Housing Needs Survey has not been made available and the evidence from it does not justify exceptional housing need in Hart;
- h. Policy ALT URB 14 should not require that 40% of sheltered housing units should be affordable;
- i. Objections to the policy for the provision for supported accommodation (ALT URB 14);
- j. Both policies (ALT GEN 13 and ALT URB 14) should not refer to Registered Social Landlords as providers of affordable housing;
- k. The policies are either too detailed or do not contain enough detailed information;
- l. The Policies are premature and should wait until PPS 3 is published;
- m. The policy should only apply to suitable sites for affordable housing;
- n. The policy should allocate sites for affordable housing;
- o. Miscellaneous.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Whether the requirements for sheltered and supported accommodation impose obstacles to the delivery of housing generally.

Whether the policy will act as a disincentive for the provision of sheltered housing schemes by specialised developers.

Whether the policy requirement to seek affordable sheltered accommodation on sites that generate 40 or more affordable units meets the need for affordable sheltered units. Or, whether a more proactive policy response is required.

Whether a policy, or an amendment, is required to recognise that the provision of sheltered housing realises other planning objectives of the Council that need to be given priority in the development of the site.

Whether a site threshold of 15 sheltered dwellings and 0.5ha should be applied in all settlements of 3,000 population or above to reflect exceptional development costs associated with sheltered housing; and the forecast 65% increase in numbers of persons aged 80 or over by 2021.

Policy ALT URB 14 needs to be read in conjunction with ALT GEN 13 which sets out the criteria for negotiations on individual sites. The requirement of 10% managed supported housing by a RSL or Health Care Trust within developments providing 40 or more affordable units is required to deliver the requirements identified by the Council's HNS. With respect to supported accommodation, I note that the requirement for 4 supported units would only be triggered by a development of 100 dwellings or more. Concern was raised as to whether appropriate agencies are available to manage units for those schemes at the lower end of the size range. However, the Council considers that provision of such units is facilitated by the supporting people programme and specialist housing association providers. As such, I do not consider that the requirements for sheltered and supported accommodation would impose an obstacle to the delivery of housing generally.

Concern was also raised as to whether the policy requirements in combination would act as a disincentive for the provision of sheltered housing schemes by specialist developers. However, the policy and supporting text makes provision for developers to demonstrate exceptional circumstances that makes specified levels of affordable housing unachievable.

One of the objectors pointed to the fact that the District had an ageing population and that this was a problem that needed to be addressed. The HNS indicated that 600 affordable units for the elderly were needed. The objector was seeking to meet some of this need via the rural exceptions policy. The Alterations proposed that on sites of 100 dwellings, only 4 would be for sheltered needs but the objector considered that a more proactive policy was needed. A second objector agreed with this, and also stressed that a lot of sheltered accommodation was in need of replacement.

Whilst I acknowledge the need for sheltered accommodation, individual schemes should have regard to recent Government guidance in respect of inclusive, mixed and balanced, and sustainable communities.

The Council clarified that Policy ALT URB 14 had 2 dimensions i.e. sheltered and supported accommodation and they were markedly different. In respect of sheltered accommodation, the Policy stated that 40% of the units were required to be affordable (i.e. in a scheme of 50 units, 20 should be affordable). However, the

Council's representatives at the RTS acknowledged that the Policy should state "up to 40%" to be consistent with the other changes that they had agreed.

The objectors consider that the reference in the policy to "a lower percentage together with a commuted sum" depart from C6/98 in that the Policy did not allow all provision to be made off site. One objector suggested there was nothing wrong with Adopted Policy URB 14. However, the Council is concerned that Adopted Policy URB14 is not delivering any affordable sheltered accommodation. Consequently, proposed Policy ALT URB14 seeks to provide some flexibility.

In my conclusion, the objectors concerns would be addressed by the Inquiry changes December 2005 proposed by Officers that developers could make provision on RSL sites in need of redevelopment. And, that in exceptional circumstances, if 40% cannot be achieved, the Council may consider it appropriate to agree either a lower percentage together with a commuted sum, or a commuted sum.

Whether ALT URB 14 attempts to impose a C Residential Institution Use Class upon a C3 application.

An objector considered references to "10%" and management by a "RSL or Health Care Trust" were unnecessarily prescriptive. He suggested they should be subject to negotiation on each case and perhaps applicable to all sites throughout the District, as opposed to just a select few.

I note that the Council had previously experienced problems in seeking sheltered and supported accommodation because there was no supporting policy in place. And, that the Council is seeking some assurance that on large sites some supported accommodation would be provided. The Council confirmed that ALT URB 14 should be read in conjunction with ALT GEN 13. As such, I consider the policy should say so.

On the evidence, the policy is necessary and the first part of the Policy aims to achieve a mixed and balanced community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **I recommend Policy ALT GEN 14 be amended to read as follows:**

Policy ALT URB14 Sheltered and Supported Accommodation

On those sites where the District Council has negotiated 40 or more affordable units, 10% of the total number of affordable units will be designated as supported accommodation; such accommodation to be managed by a Registered Social Landlord or Health Care Trust.

With regard to sheltered housing schemes, the Council will seek a target of 40% of the units to be affordable. However, in exceptional circumstances the District Council may consider it appropriate to agree either a lower percentage together with a commuted sum, or a commuted sum.

This policy replaces policy URB14 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 to 2006 and should be read in conjunction with ALT GEN13.

- **I recommend that the supporting text as set out in the Inquiry Changes to Re-deposited Draft – December 2005 be adopted in its entirety.**

3. DILLY LANE, HARTLEY WINTNEY

3.1 POLICIES ALT DEV 1A, ALT DEV 9 & PARAGRAPHS 3.1-3.4

Objections

1001/391 & 481	M. Ananin
1006/403	Luckmore Ltd
1009/406	Thames Water Plc
1013/419	HBF – Southern Region
1020/447-448	GOSE
1021/451-452	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
1023/458	South East Water
0007/38-40	Berkeley Community Villages
0010/62-64	GOSE
0014/83-86	HBF – Southern Region
0015/87,89-90	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE
0017/102-103	Bell Cornwell Partnership
0020/144-146, 155 – 165	Luckmore Ltd
0022/173-174	Linden Homes Developments Ltd (unconditionally withdrawn)
0028/216	Winchfield Parish Council
0044/266-267	Hook Parish Council
0047/278-279	George Wimpey Strategic Land
0049/282-285	Hampshire County Council
0060/333-334	Thames Water Property Services
0061/339	Clivedon Homes
0067/348	R. Ganj
0079/381-382	Hartley Wintney Action Group

Issues

- a. Justification for the re-phasing of the allocation;
- b. The site performs poorly having regard to the PPG3 sequential test/ The alteration is unnecessary having regard to PPG3 sequential test;
- c. The review of housing allocations should be undertaken as part of the Council's LDF;
- d. The Plan fails to make provision for the full Policy H4 Reserve Requirement/ The policy requires clarification as to its relationship with Policy H4;
- e. The indicative density of development is below PPG3 (ALT DEV 1A);
- f. The development of the site should have regard to its impacts on infrastructure and ecology;
- g. The re-phasing of the Dilly lane site jeopardises the provision of affordable housing provision;
- h. Development at Dilly Lane will bring nearer the coalescence of Hartley Wintney and Winchfield;
- i. Promotion of alternative sites;
- j. Minor wording changes;
- k. Objections to applications at Dilly Lane.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Proposals Map

The Council's Statement says that the First Alterations will not alter the Proposals Maps for Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006. However, during the course of the Inquiry it became apparent that there are some anomalies with the Proposals Map which it was acknowledged should be corrected. In particular, I note the Proposals Map does not show Dilly Lane as a DEV9 site but Inset Map 14 does. But the reverse happens with Clarks Farm, the Proposals Map shows Clarks Farm as DEV17a and 17b sites but the Inset Map 30 does not show them as DEV17 sites. The maps therefore require amendment with the appropriate revisions to site references in the light of these Alterations (i.e. ALT DEV 1A, ALT DEV 9 and ALT DEV17).

General background information

The Alterations relevant to the allocation of land at Dilly Lane relate to policies DEV1 and DEV9 of the Adopted Local Plan. Policy DEV1 of the Adopted Local Plan provides an overview of the housing allocations for the District in the period to 2009 which includes the identification of Dilly Lane as a new allocation for the provision of at least 150 dwellings. DEV9 is a site specific policy.

In the light of current housing completions in the District since 1996, and given identified and unidentified housing supply in the period to 2011, the Council considers that it is able to meet its SP housing requirements without the release of the Greenfield site at Dilly Lane.

Against this background, the Council seeks to amend the allocation of this site so that it no longer forms part of the Council's District-wide "baseline" housing supply (SP H2 sites) and instead contributes to the County-wide "reserve" supply (SP H4 sites). Importantly, the principle of the site's development for housing is established in the Adopted LP. The proposed Alteration relates only and specifically to the timing of the site's release.

Whether an Appropriate Assessment of the alterations on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA should have been undertaken.

In the light of a recent European Court Judgement (*Commission of the European Communities v United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*) one objector has suggested that the impact of the Plan Alterations on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA should be assessed in accordance with the Habitats Directive. As I explained when I opened the Inquiry, in this case, the decision maker (i.e. the competent authority for the purposes of the Habitats Directive) is the LPA i.e. Hart District Council. It is therefore the LPA which is required to decide what action to take in respect of the plan in the light of this report.

In terms of article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, it is the LPA in this case which must decide whether the plan is likely to have a significant effect on a site, carry out the appropriate assessment and only adopt the plan having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned. In terms of the Habitats Regulations, there is no legal obligation on the LPA to do anything, although in practice they may well have carried out an adequate appraisal before revision to the local plan was published.

It is for the LPA to decide whether, in the absence of any requirement in the Habitats Regulations, they are nevertheless under a legal obligation to comply with

article 6(3) of the Directive as an emanation of the state. It is not my function to say whether article 6 has 'direct effect' on the LPA – that is a matter for the LPA to determine on legal advice. If the LPA concludes that it is subject, then it will need to determine the extent to which any EC obligation has in fact been complied with and decide whether, in the light of the appropriate assessment the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

I will reach conclusions in this report on any factual matter raised. The LPA can then consider my conclusions in deciding the extent of their obligation to comply with the Habitats Directive and the extent of their compliance.

At the Inquiry, the Council noted first, that it had not previously undertaken an appropriate assessment because the Local Plan Alterations process commenced in May 2004 i.e. prior to the formal designation of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. Both the First Deposit Alterations, and the Re-deposited Draft were published prior to the publication of Circular 6/2005 (August 2005), the Advocate General's Opinion (June 2005) and the ECJ decision (October 2005). Secondly, the Alterations to affordable housing policies are not site specific and the sites at Clarks Farm and Dilly Lane are existing allocations, where the Alterations seek to limit and delay development respectively. In these particular circumstances, the Council considers that it could reasonably be argued that the Alterations would have no significant effects on the SPA and that no assessment is required.

However, in the light of the very recent judgement from the ECJ and in accordance with the precautionary principle the Council confirmed at the Inquiry that it would undertake an assessment prior to the adoption of the Alterations. A Consultant was appointed and a clear timetable produced.

Nevertheless, I note that, of the 7 allocated sites which remain to be developed, 5 (including Dilly Lane) lie within 2km of the SPA. At the time of the Inquiry, the Council's practice, acting on the advice of English Nature (EN) as statutory consultee, is to invite all applicants to withdraw applications for housing on sites which EN advises would have an adverse effect on the SPA because of their proximity to the SPA. EN is preparing a Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Plan which will set out the level of open space provision required for the different scales and locations of residential development within 5km of the SPA in order to ensure that any potential effect on the SPA is fully mitigated. Until the delivery plan is ready and is agreed, applicants seeking permission for residential development run the risk of refusal if they do not withdraw their application. Consequently, in my view, there is uncertainty as to the developability/deliverability of the 5 sites within 2km of the SPA.

The Council has refused (29 July 2005) planning permission for the major remaining allocation at QEII Barracks and Wakefords Copse, Church Crookham. In the event of an appeal, it seems likely that no housing would be delivered until 2009/10 at the earliest, with just 300 dwellings provided by April 2011. At worst, no housing would be provided at all in the period to 2011. In addition, the Council has also recently refused planning permission at Redfields Garden Centre and Dilly Lane which further increases the uncertainty in housing land supply.

Whether the re-phasing of the site is appropriate and justified

The starting point is the Council's housing land supply position. Policy H2 of Hampshire County Structure Plan (HCSP) requires that Hart District provides a total of 4750 dwellings in the period 1996-2011. This equates to an average of 317

dwellings per annum. As documented in the Policy H4 Monitoring Paper (2004) (CD22), completions in Hart District in the period April 1996-March 2003 totalled 2124 (whereas $7\text{years}\times 317=2219$). The Policy H4 Monitoring Paper (2005) (CD23) documents there were 567 net completions in the period April 2003-March 2004 ($2124+567=2691$ whereas $8\text{years}\times 317=2536$). Whilst the H4 Monitoring Paper for 2006 has not yet been published, interim figures made available by SEERA clarify that net completions in Hart District in the period April 2004-March 2005 totalled 642 ($2691+642=3333$ whereas $9\text{years}\times 317=2853$).

Consequently, net completions in Hart District in the period April 1996- March 2005 total 3333. This equates to an average yearly provision of 370 dpa, which exceeds the 317 dpa average required by the SP. On a pro rata basis, completions in this 9 year period exceed SP requirements by a total of 480 dwellings, with the District delivering a total of 10.5 years supply in this 9 year period.

Identified/Unidentified supply to March 2011

The H4 Monitoring Report (2005) documents that in Hart District the identified housing supply (allocations and planning permissions) from large sites is 2345 dwellings, with 133 dwellings from small sites i.e. a total of 2478 dwellings in the period 2004-2011. In terms of unidentified supply (urban capacity and windfall sites) the Report documents 400 dwellings from large sites, and 252 dwellings from small sites i.e. a total of 652 dwellings. This identified and unidentified supply in the 2004-2011 period totals 3130 dwellings.

Thus, completions (3333) together with identified and unidentified supply (3130) in the period to 2011 would result in the provision of a total of about 6463 dwellings. The Council says that this would exceed the SP requirement for this period (4750) by about 1713 dwellings without the release of the allocated site at Hitches Lane, or the Greenfield site at Dilly Lane. However, the Council accepts that this supply requires adjustment.

First, the supply figures in Policy H4 Monitoring Paper (2005) are unadjusted i.e. they have not been appropriately discounted to reflect the fact that not all dwellings that have the potential to be delivered in the period to 2011 will be delivered. The 2004 and 2005 H4 Monitoring Papers indicate that identified supply from large sites should be discounted by 5%-15%, with unidentified supply from large sites being discounted by 15%. Applying an average discount of 10% to the identified supply from large sites as referenced above (the middle of the indicated discount range) – the supply to 2011 reduces to 2243 dwellings, and applying a 15% discount to the unidentified supply from large sites – the supply reduces to 592 dwellings i.e. a total of 2835 dwellings.

In addition, the most recent identified/unidentified supply figures extend only to March 2004. The Council accepts, therefore, that the 642 housing completions in 2004/05 will therefore have reduced this future supply. By removing these 2004/05 completions, identified/unidentified supply for 2005-2011 period reduces to a total of 2193 dwellings.

Finally, the Council acknowledges that this supply figure needs to be adjusted to reflect the likely delay in achieving planning permission at the Queen Elizabeth Barracks (QEB). The Council originally envisaged planning permission being granted by negotiation with development commencing in 2006/07 and a total of 700 units being completed by 2011. However, the Council refused planning permission for the development in July 2005 on the basis of the scheme's environmental impacts, and the proposals are now due to be heard at appeal in

autumn 2006. Accordingly, this will delay the commencement of development and the likely level of completions in the period to 2011. As such, the Council assumes that there will not be any completions at QEB until 2009/10 and that the site will only deliver 300 completions by 2011 i.e. 400 fewer than originally envisaged.

Although not mentioned by the Council, it seems to me that the deliverability of the other sites within 2km of the SPA is also in question i.e Redfields Garden Centre (40 units), DERA site (100 units), the reserve site at Hitches Lane (260 units) and Dilly Lane itself (150 units).

Taking into account all of the Council's adjustments, the identified/unidentified supply in the 2005-2011 period is 1793 dwellings. When added to existing completions to March 2005 (3333), this produces a total supply of 5162 dwellings in the period to 2011. This is 376 dwellings (or 1.2 years supply) in excess of SP requirements for this period (4750). These figures do not include the development of either the Greenfield allocation at Hitches Lane or the Greenfield site at Dilly Lane, the subject of this Alteration.

Sensitivity testing

The Council has tested its housing supply figures having regard to potential reductions in supply. First, in the event that none of the unidentified supply from windfalls and urban capacity sites came forward in the period to 2011, supply would reduce by 592 units – this would result in an overall shortfall of 216 units. Whilst the Council considers this scenario to be unrealistic, it considers that it could be addressed by the release of the site at Hitches Lane (260 units). However, as I have already stated, the developability/deliverability of this site is in question.

Secondly, in the event that there are no completions from the allocated QEB site in the period to 2011, supply would fall by 300 units. However, the Council says that given the overall excess in supply, the District would still exceed Structure Plan requirements by 76 units, without the release of Hitches Lane or Dilly Lane. But, as noted above, I question the deliverability of these sites as well as Redfields Garden Centre (40 units), and the DERA site (100 units).

South-east plan

Whilst I accept that the South-East Plan (SEP) is still emerging, and therefore it should carry limited weight, I nevertheless, recognise that housing supply requirements in the period 2006-2026 will be likely to alter.

The emerging SEP identifies Hart within the North Hampshire Sub-Area where a total of 26,000 houses are proposed in the 2006-2026 period. The recent Hampshire County Council consultation paper 'Where Shall We Live' (September 2005) (CD20) puts forward 3 options for the accommodation of this growth. In Options 1 and 2, Hart District would be allocated a total of 3,200 dwellings over this 20-year period, with Option 3 resulting in a total of 5,600 dwellings.

Whilst these figures have not been finalised, it is notable that under all 3 options the annual housing requirement for Hart District post-2006 will be lower than that currently required by the SP. Under Options 1 and 2, this requirement would equate to a total of 160 dpa (almost exactly half of the current requirement) and under Option 3, a total of 280 dpa (approximately 12% lower than the current requirement).

Since Options 1 and 2 both focus the majority of development at Basingstoke, it is not unreasonable to assume that either of these 2 options would be most likely to

be endorsed. This would be a logical and sustainable approach having regard to the significant environmental constraints in Hart and Rushmoor District's, and given that Basingstoke is by far the largest settlement in the North Hampshire Sub-Area, with a higher order range of facilities and superior infrastructure. I concur with the Council that the fact that 2 of the 3 options adopt this approach seems to support this view.

Based on either Option 1 or Option 2, Hart's housing requirement in the 2006-2011 period would be 800 dwellings – i.e. 785 fewer than the current SP requirements for the same period. The requirement for the period 2006-2009 would be 480 dwellings. In such circumstances, based on the completions and identified and unidentified supply, Hart would exceed its housing requirements to 2011 by a total of 1161 units.

Clearly housing supply is not an exact science. However, I have taken account of all of the foregoing factors, together with the transitional nature of this plan, and the fact that these Alterations will only be saved until 2009. It seems to me the likelihood is that the Council will be able to meet its housing requirements to 2011 without any contribution from the allocated sites at Hitches Lane or Dilly Lane. As such, I consider that the re-phasing of the Greenfield site at Dilly Lane to a Policy H4 reserve site is justified in accordance with the plan, monitor and manage (PMM) approach to housing supply, and will not affect the Council's ability to meet its housing requirements. Should the site be required, I am also satisfied that there is a mechanism for its release.

Whether the site performs poorly having regard to the PPG3 sequential test.

Whether the Alteration is unnecessary having regard to PPG3.

Whether the Alterations should provide a 10 year housing supply/identify 5 years supply on the Proposals Map/extend the plan period to 2011.

Paragraph 38 of PPG3 states that *local authorities should have regard to the policy contained in this PPG as material considerations which may supersede policies in their plan.* It goes on to say that *Where the planning application relates to development of a Greenfield site allocated for housing in an adopted local plan ... it should be assessed, and a decision made on the application, in the light of the policies set out in this guidance.*

Although the Dilly Lane site was identified in the Adopted Local Plan prior to the publication of PPG3 in 2000, the Plan itself was adopted afterwards. Furthermore, as set out in the introductory text to the 'Proposals for New Development' Chapter of the Local Plan (page 78), whilst the Local Plan allocations were made prior to the publication of PPG3, the Council adopted a sequential approach to the selection of sites for housing, and established a number of site selection criteria based upon the principles of sustainability. The assessment criteria which were adopted fit very closely with the criteria subsequently included within PPG3. As such, I consider that the Council's process in identifying its housing allocation in the Adopted Local Plan accords with the guidance in PPG3.

Dilly Lane is a Greenfield site which lies within the defined settlement boundary of Hartley Wintney which itself is a key settlement. The site lies in the second tier of the PPG3 search sequence i.e. extensions to urban areas (based on the urban areas defined in the LP and the Council's Urban Capacity Study) and after previously developed land within the urban areas.

The Council accepts that paragraph 38 of PPG3 states that applications for the

development of Greenfield sites allocated in Local Plans should be assessed against the guidance in PPG3. And, I acknowledge that the supporting text to the Adopted LP would enable the Council to delay the development of the Dilly Lane site.

However, the Council also points to paragraph 34 of PPG3 which says that *Sufficient sites should be shown on the plan's proposals map to accommodate at least the first 5 years (or the first 2 phases) of housing development proposed in the plan. Site allocations should be reviewed and updated as the plan is reviewed and rolled forward at least every 5 years. LPAs should monitor closely the uptake of both previously-developed and Greenfield sites and should be prepared to alter or revise their plan policies in the light of that monitoring. However, it is essential that the operation of the development process is not prejudiced by unreal expectations of the developability of particular sites nor by planning authorities seeking to prioritise development sites in an arbitrary manner.*

This guidance is supplemented by that in *'Planning to Deliver: The Managed Release of Housing Sites'* which states that in the light of monitoring "...it will be important to consider whether the plan's approach to the managed release of sites remains valid" and whether a "...change of approach to the ranking of sites or in the assignment of sites to phases" is required. Furthermore, the same guidance is clear that there are a number of situations which may cause a local authority to alter/replace its plan, which include a situation whereby *significant windfalls coming forward have consistently led to excess supply*. As such, I concur with the Council that it should under PMM take an active approach to the phasing of housing sites in its Local Plan and should not rely on general guidance in PPG3 to provide phasing.

One representation supports the Council's re-phasing of the Dilly Lane allocation, but has sought that the Council goes further and deletes the allocation completely on the basis that it pre-dates guidance in PPG3. However, as I have already stated the allocation of Dilly Lane complies with the guidance in PPG3. Furthermore, the principle of the allocation is established in the Adopted LP and the extent of this Alteration relates only to the timing of the site's potential release.

As stated above, the Council considers these Alterations to be intentionally limited and that it would be inappropriate and impractical to apply the advice in PPG12 and PPG3 regarding length of the plan and the undertaking of a full review of sites at this stage and that it would negate the purpose of these limited Alterations. Nevertheless, a complete review should be undertaken as part of the LDF process which is currently underway.

Whether the review of housing allocations should be undertaken as part of a review of housing provision generally/ as part of Local Development Framework

The aim set out in PMM is a level of completions that provides for the rate of housing development identified in the plan. Government guidance in *'Planning to Deliver'* sets out clearly the circumstances in which plan alteration or replacement may be warranted. One of these is where *significant additional windfalls have come forward, consistently leading to excess of supply*. The Council considers that housing completions in the District in the period since 1996 have significantly exceeded the level of provision required by the Structure Plan. Furthermore, the Council considers that the Structure Plan requirements to 2011 can be met without the release of the Greenfield site at Dilly Lane. Similarly, the Identified Housing Supply 2004-2011 (unadjusted) in *Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2005* does not include amongst other sites, the Dilly Lane site because it is not considered to be

required to meet the district's baseline housing requirement. But, it does note that it could be developed before 2011 if it was required. As a consequence, the Council is proposing to adjust the phasing of the site's release.

In these circumstances, I agree with the Council that it is wholly appropriate to undertake this phasing adjustment as part of a Local Plan Alteration, and that guidance in 'Planning to Deliver' is clear that an alteration is an appropriate method of doing so. Contrary to what one objector says, the Council says that this alteration process is a statutory development plan review process and is a wholly appropriate vehicle for such a change.

Whether the Plan fails to make provision for the full Policy H4 Reserve Requirement

The HCSP 1996-2011 (Review) (adopted January 2000) provides a housing distribution sufficient to accommodate the full dwelling requirement of the 1994 RPG. However, this development is phased in the form of a 'base-line' plus 'reserve' position. SP Policy H2 establishes the base-line housing provision for the period 1996-2011 of a total of 80,290 dwellings (with 4,750 in Hart) while SP Policy H4 establishes an additional reserve provision of 14,000 additional dwellings (with 1,500 in Hart).

The Adopted LP did not attempt to make provision for the possible additional requirements of Policy H4 (up to 1,500 dwellings) because it was adopted prior to the requirement being confirmed in Revised RPG9 and the finalisation of a mechanism for the monitoring or release of reserve sites. At the time, it was envisaged that this would be the subject of a subsequent alteration to the plan. However, I note that the current Alterations do not seek to make provision for the full SP Policy H4 Reserve requirement.

The Council says that whilst the Adopted Local Plan extends only to 2006 (although I note it allocates housing to 2009), the SP requirement for 1,500 dwellings is in the period to 2011. Therefore, having regard to the different time horizons, the Council considers that the identification of only a proportion of the Countywide reserve is appropriate and that the identification of the remainder, if required, will be considered as part of the Council's LDF. In the circumstances, this is not an unreasonable approach.

Whether the Policy requires clarification as to its relationship with Policy SP H4

The Council acknowledged that the amended Policy wording to ALT DEV 1A sought by some of the objectors to clarify that the Dilly Lane site would 'contribute to' rather than 'meet' the reserve housing requirement of SP Policy H4 more accurately described the situation. Consequently, the Policy was amended accordingly when it was re-deposited.

Another objection seeks to amend ALT DEV 1A to clarify further its relationship to Structure Plan Policy H4. Additional wording was added to provide further clarity. But, I agree with the Council that it would not be appropriate to repeat the provisions of the SP and other published documents relevant to the H4 mechanism.

Whether the Alterations should have regard to the Barker Report and ODPM's consultation document 'Planning for Housing Provision'

I concur with the Council that the Barker Report and ODPM's "Planning for housing provision" are not Government policy. As such, they cannot be determinative of the approach I have taken in the consideration of the presently proposed plan policies. However, whilst the adopted Development Plan will be the starting point for future

development decisions, as and when new Government guidance is published, it will be a material consideration. If decision makers decide not to follow relevant statements of Government planning policy, they must give clear and convincing reasons. (See ministerial statement 17 June 2004; ODPM consultation paper).

The indicative density is below PPG3 Guidance

Policy ALT DEV 1A maintains the Adopted Local Plan reference to the site's allocation for 'at least 150 dwellings'. Having regard to the size of the site (8Ha), some objectors consider that this advocates a density of development below that in PPG3 i.e. 30-50 dwellings per hectare. However, first, I note that this approximate capacity has taken account of the site's constraints. Secondly, since the Policy refers to 'at least' I consider this to be a minimum. Consequently, at such time as the site is released, there could be a greater quantum of development which would be determined having regard to the merits of particular proposals.

Whether the development of the site should have regard to its impacts on infrastructure and ecology

Some objections identify requirements for the developers of the Dilly Lane site to pay for necessary improvements to the water supply and sewerage networks associated with development. In addition, others have sought to ensure that the Council protects Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) adjacent to the Dilly Lane site from encroachment by development, and that a comprehensive ecological survey is required with any planning application. Whilst I acknowledge that these objections have raised important issues that are relevant to the development of the Dilly Lane site in respect of infrastructure and ecology, I am satisfied that these matters would be appropriately addressed at the development control stage. As such, I do not consider it appropriate to address them through amendments to Policies ALT DEV1A or ALT DEV 9.

One objector challenges the re-allocation of the Dilly Lane site as a reserve housing site on the basis that it is the only major residential allocation in Hartley Wintney and therefore its re-phasing would jeopardise affordable housing provision.

I acknowledge that the Dilly Lane site is the only major residential allocation in Hartley Wintney and it could potentially deliver a minimum of about 60 units of affordable housing (40% of 150). However, the allocation was not made specifically on the basis of its ability to deliver affordable housing. As such, I agree with the Council that it should not be retained unnecessarily as part of its baseline housing supply, or indeed released for development on the basis that it could deliver affordable housing. Whilst I accept that there is an unmet affordable housing need in the district (as indeed is the case in the majority of, if not all, Districts in the Region) the LP Alterations seek to amend the Council's affordable housing policies to increase affordable housing supply across the District.

Whether development at Dilly Lane would bring nearer the coalescence of Hartley Wintney and Winchfield.

Winchfield Parish Council objects to the retention of the Dilly Lane allocation on the basis that its development would bring nearer the coalescence of Hartley Wintney and Winchfield. However, the principle of development at Dilly Lane has already been established in the Adopted LP and is not relevant to the proposed Alteration which the Council intends only to relate to the timing of the site's release. Nevertheless, I note that the previous Local Plan Inspector did not

consider that the development of this site would bring about the unacceptable coalescence of the 2 settlements.

Whether any alternative sites should be promoted

Two objections seek the deletion of the Dilly Lane allocation and its replacement with alternative sites at Moulsham Lane, Yateley and Dachs Lodge, Fleet. However, the principle of the allocation of the Dilly Lane site is established in the Adopted LP and its selection for development accorded with PPG3. The Council seeks the proposed Alteration specifically in relation to the timing of the site's release in accordance with PPG3 and 'Planning to Deliver'.

Given the limited nature of the current Alterations, it is not appropriate for me to consider the allocation of alternative sites. This is a matter more appropriately addressed as part of a comprehensive review of the Council's housing strategy/allocations as part of its Local Development Framework.

Whether there should be minor wording changes to the Policy

Two objections sought to amend the wording of Policies ALT DEV 1A and ALT DEV9 to clarify that these policies delete Policy DEV9 in the Adopted Local Plan. However, I am satisfied that the proposed wording makes clear that they replace the relevant elements of Policy DEV1 and replace Policy DEV9 in its entirety. Therefore, I do not consider that any changes are required in this regard.

One objection seeks for the supporting text to the policy to set out the Council's reasons for the re-phasing of the Dilly Lane site. However, in my view, it would not be appropriate to include such justification in the wording of the Policies themselves. The reasons for my recommendations are within this Report.

Objections to applications at the Dilly Lane site

Some objections appear to relate to specific applications at the Dilly Lane site rather than this Local Plan Alteration. As such, I have no jurisdiction to deal with those objections which should be made to specific development proposals as part of the development control process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Amend the Proposals Map and Inset Map 14 to show Dilly Lane as the ALT DEV9 site.**
- **Adopt the wording for Policies ALT DEV1A and ALT DEV 9 Dilly Lane, Hartley Wintney and the supporting text as set out in Inquiry Changes to Re-deposited Draft – December 2005.**

4. CLARKS FARM, DARBY GREEN

4.1 POLICY ALT DEV 17 & PARAGRAPHS 4.1 - 4.7

Objections

1003/395-397	Cllr. D. Benham
1011/409	Highways Agency
1012/410-414	Linden Developments Ltd
1020/449-450	GOSE
1021/453	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
1023/457	South East Water
0007/41-43, 45	Berkeley Community Villages
0010/65-68	GOSE
0015/91-92	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE
0022/175-179	Linden Homes Developments Ltd (unconditionally withdrawn)
0027/215	R.W. Haile
0035/233-240	The Yateley Society
0037/245	L. & S. Rooks
0039/247-249	G. C. Hennell
0042/252	A. Collett
0043/253-257	C. Farmer
0052/303-304	P. J. Craighill
0057/327	Yateley Town Council
0060/335-336	Thames Water Property Services
0062/340	D. T. Benham
0063/341-343	Mr & Mrs B. A. Holloway
0065/345	D & P Roberts
0067/347	R. Ganj
0068/349-351	S. Barron
0069/352-353	J. M. Colbert
0070/354-355	M. F. & J. Schroeder
0071/358-361	Hampshire County Council (358 - 359 conditionally withdrawn)
0074/373-374	D. J. Murr

Issues

- a. There is no evidence of a need for this allocation or for small business units as referred to in the altered policy;
- b. Clarks Farm should be allocated for alternative uses;
- c. There is no justification for a 2500sqm limit on development/ the scale of development should be that which does not exceed the footprint of existing development;
- d. The proposed alteration will have an unacceptable impact on existing highway infrastructure capacity/safety, will urbanise the Strategic Gap and result in the loss of agricultural land, impact detrimentally on landscape character and be detrimental to visual amenity;
- e. The allocation should be deleted and the site returned to agricultural use as part of the Strategic Gap;
- f. The types of employment uses allowed should be specified/limited;
- g. The employment allocation will increase the need for housing;
- h. The Clarks Farm allocation should not include the open land to the north of the composting area;
- i. The policy should require that a design statement is produced to accompany any development proposals/the character of development should tie with existing development;
- j. Promotion of Land at Dachs Lodge, Redfield;
- k. Criterion ii) of the policy should be amended to state that development should be located in a way that 'appears' to widen the gap;
- l. Criterion v) of the policy should be amended to state publicly accessible open space rather than public open space;
- m. The policy should not refer to the procedure by which the Council will determine an application.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

The Council's Statement says that the First Alterations will not alter the Proposals Maps for Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006. However, during the course of the Inquiry it became apparent that there are some anomalies with the Proposals Map which it was acknowledged should be corrected. In particular, I note the Proposals Map does not show Dilly Lane as a DEV9 site but Inset Map 14 does. But the reverse happens with Clarks Farm, the Proposals Map shows Clarks Farm as DEV17a and 17b sites but Inset Map 30 does not show them as DEV17 sites. The maps therefore require amendment with the appropriate revisions to site references in the light of these Alterations (i.e. ALT DEV 1A, ALT DEV 9 and ALT DEV17)

Whether there is evidence of a need for this allocation or for small business units as referred to in the altered policy

The Council does not dispute the fact that there is no evidence of need for an employment allocation. The Clarks Farm site was originally allocated for redevelopment in 1997, as a Pre-Inquiry Change to the now adopted Local Plan. The allocation was made on the basis that, at that time, the emerging Plan was considered to be deficient in its employment land supply. Subsequently, the Council says that circumstances have changed and on a purely quantitative or qualitative basis there is no direct need to retain this allocation.

The site has an established Class B2 general industrial use and consequently could be used for any such use without the need for planning permission. And, the composting area is previously developed land. However, from the evidence submitted at the Inquiry, it appears that *the covered area to custom compost production* was granted approval in 1964 subject to a condition stating that the building shall only be used for the production of compost and for no other purpose whatsoever. As such, any change of use of the covered area would be in breach of the condition. With these factors in mind, I consider it appropriate, within the limited scope of these Alterations, to retain the allocation of the site for employment purposes but to review the extent of any new development.

Given the sensitivity of the Clarks Farm location within the Strategic Gap, partly falling within and partly adjacent to the Darby Green Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings I also consider it appropriate to seek to manage its potential redevelopment. In so doing, the form, siting and scale of potential new development can be controlled and influenced, and the site's impact on the Strategic Gap, the adjacent Conservation Area and listed buildings, and residential amenity improved. The deletion of the allocation would fail to secure such benefits.

I note that whilst the Council anticipates that the employment use would take the form of small scale units for small or starter firms, this is not based upon an assessment of a particular demand for such units but instead, having regard to an acceptable form of development appropriate in this sensitive location in the countryside, Strategic Gap, and adjacent to a Conservation Area and listed buildings. Notwithstanding this, the policy does not require such units but anticipates them. Accordingly, the Council notes that, if evidence was provided by an applicant to demonstrate, over a reasonable period of time, that there was no demand for such units and that larger units could be satisfactorily accommodated, it would consider such proposals.

Whether Clarks Farm should be allocated for alternative Uses

There are some objections to the continued allocation of the Clarks Farm site for employment purposes, that instead seek the site's allocation for a range of alternative uses including a medical use, housing and a garden centre. However, as I have said, the scope of these Alterations is limited. Accordingly, they do not seek to address the principle of the site's existing allocation for employment purposes, or its established Class B2 general industrial use. Instead, in the light of government guidance which has emerged since the site was originally identified for development, the Council seeks via these Alterations only to provide guidance as to what it considers to be the appropriate scale of development for what is technically an out of town/out of settlement location. In these circumstances, it is not appropriate to consider the allocation of the site for any alternative uses as part of this focussed alteration process.

Nevertheless, the suitability of all Local Plan allocations will be considered thoroughly as part of the Council's emerging Local Development Framework and at that time, it will be appropriate for objectors to put forward alternative sites for development, or to put forward alternative uses for existing allocations.

Whether there is justification for a 2,500sqm limit on development/ Whether the scale of development should be that which does not exceed the footprint of existing development

A number of objections have challenged the Council's justification for the proposed 2500sqm floorspace limit, with one objection seeking to amend the limit such that development should not exceed the footprint of existing development on site.

Because the allocation of the Clarks Farm site for employment purposes was made in 1997, the allocation preceded government guidance in *PPG13: Transport 2001*, *PPS1: Delivering sustainable Development (2005)* and *PPS6: Planning for Town Centres (2005)*. But, I note that, the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 adopted in December 2002 referred to the then recent revisions to PPG13 and to the fact that the LPA would review the policy when the local plan was next altered/replaced. As such, it is not unreasonable to consider it as part of these Alterations.

PPG13 at paragraph 4 identifies 3 primary objectives relevant to planning and transport: the promotion of more sustainable transport choices, accessibility to jobs by public transport, walking and cycling, and reducing the need to travel, especially by car. Paragraph 6 states that in order to deliver these objectives local authorities should when producing development plans, seek to focus major generators of travel demand in city, town and district centres and near to public transport interchanges and ensure that development including jobs, offers realistic choice of access by public transport, walking and cycling.

More recent guidance in PPS1 (paragraph 3) supports PPG13 objectives, and states that sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning. More specifically, it requires local planning authorities to ensure that they focus developments that attract a large number of people, especially retail, leisure and office development, in existing centres to promote their vitality and viability, social inclusion and more sustainable patterns of development (paragraph 27).

Most recently, government guidance in PPS6: Planning for Town Centres is clear that wherever possible, growth should be accommodated within existing centres (paragraph 2.4). In terms of the scale of development permitted, the guidance states that it should be directly related to the role and function of a particular centre and its catchment. The objective is, therefore, that major developments

should not be located in small/local centres (paragraph 2.42). The guidance makes no provision for the location of major development outside town centres. Having regard to PPS6's objectives, I agree with the Council that this guidance does not support the allocation of major scale development outside any identified centre, and particularly not outside any identified settlement.

The Adopted LP refers to Yateley and Blackwater as town centres and it is clear from the Proposals Map that they are the next largest settlements after Fleet. However, the Clarks Farm site lies outside the settlement boundary for both Yateley and Blackwater and is therefore in an out-of-town location (PPS6, Annex A, Table 2).

I acknowledge that the site is within 2km walk distance of Sandhurst Station and a significant proportion of its residential area; within 2km of almost half the residential area of Yateley; within 2km of more than half the residential area of Blackwater and only slightly beyond 2km of Blackwater Rail Station. And, it falls within a 5km cycle distance of the Rail Stations at Wellington, Sandhurst, Blackwater and Camberley. It is within a 5km cycle distance of residential areas within Yateley, Sandhurst, Wellington, Crowthorne, Blackwater, Hawley, Camberley and parts of Farnham.

Furthermore, the site is located on the route of several bus services, and there are bus stops immediately outside the site on Reading Road. The evidence suggests that the most useful bus service in the context of commuters is the strategic Route 3 that connects Yateley with Camberley and Aldershot and has a service every 30 minutes.

Given the foregoing factors, I do not consider that the site could be described as lying close to a public transport interchange. As such, it would not be appropriate to locate a major generator of travel demand on the site. The question therefore arises as to what might be considered as 'minor' scale development. The Council points to paragraph 53 and Annex D of PPG13. Annex D sets out the maximum parking standards for a range of 'major' developments above the relevant thresholds. Paragraph 53 makes clear that these do not apply to 'small developments' that is those below the relevant thresholds. In the case of 'B1 including offices', Annex D sets the threshold at 2,500sqm. Furthermore, the Council points to the recently Adopted Berkshire Structure Plan 2005 which also defines 'major' development as one which involves a net increase in...office floorspace of more than 2,500sqm.

In these circumstances, it is not unreasonable for the Council to consider development above 2,500sqm to be 'major' and therefore to limit development in this out-of-town location to below 2,500sqm.

Whether a development of 2,500sqm would be commercially viable.

One objector is concerned that a development of 2,500sqm would not achieve a redevelopment since there would be no financial incentive to proceed. The objector points to the minutes of the council's Cabinet Meeting in June 2003 and highlights, in particular, its recommendation that the scope of the Alterations should include the potential of the site to accommodate all 'viable' options. However, having reviewed all the evidence before me, it seems that at that Cabinet meeting 2 Councillors stressed the importance of the Strategic Gap and urged Councillors to consider 'all available options including alternative non-urban uses rather than just housing'. The minutes then document that Members agreed that all viable options should be considered. In these circumstances, arguably what the Council sought to

do was consider a wider range of potential uses other than just housing. As such, it was not an indication that the Council agreed that commercial viability was a key test.

One of the primary reasons for the allocation of Clarks Farm site in the Adopted LP, and the primary reason for its retention as part of this Alteration process, is the Council's desire to reduce the impact of development on the Strategic Gap, conservation Area, listed buildings and residential amenity generally. However, such development must have regard to relevant Planning Policy Guidance. As I have already concluded, current guidance is clear that development in locations such as this should be limited to that of a minor scale. And, I am satisfied that the threshold of 2,500sqm is justified.

If such a scale of development proves not to be financially viable in the longer term, the Council accepts that the site is likely to remain in its current use. Whilst this is not the Council's preferred option, I note that the Inspector in 2001 concluded that the present use of Clarks Farm has a rural character which has no adverse impact upon the countryside between the 2 adjoining built up areas, and it does not detract significantly from the Strategic Gap objectives. Therefore, whilst the site could be improved, this does not, by itself, justify any type or quantum of development. As such, I do not consider that the issue of commercial viability is of particular relevance to this LP Alteration.

Whether the proposed alteration will have an unacceptable impact on existing highway infrastructure capacity/safety, will urbanise the strategic gap and result in the loss of agricultural land, impact detrimentally on landscape character and be detrimental to visual amenity

Clarks Farm benefits from an established Class B2 general industrial use by virtue of its historic use as a mushroom composting plant. As such, the land is not, and has not been, in agricultural use for many decades. In terms of the potential urbanisation of the Strategic Gap and impact on the landscape character/visual amenity, the existing Local Plan allocation provides no specific limit on the acceptable scale of development. The Council via the proposed Alteration seeks to limit development to 2500sqm, which would be significantly less than the volume of existing buildings/structures on site. I concur with the Council that this, together with its ability to influence the form and siting of new development would result in a reduced impact on the Strategic Gap, landscape character and visual amenity.

In terms of the site's impact on the highway network, Clarks Farm is an existing employment allocation with no specific limit on the acceptable scale of development. The proposed limit of 2,500sqm would ensure that development is of a "minor scale". As such, the proposed Alteration is likely to reduce any impact on the highway network. But, in any event, both the existing policy and that now proposed include a requirement that development must not exceed the capacity of the highway network. Consequently, I do not consider that there would be an unacceptable impact on existing highway infrastructure capacity.

In terms of highway safety, having particular regard to the site's location close to the Frogmore Campus (school/leisure complex) I consider that the limitation of development to 2500sqm would ensure that traffic movements from the site are low. Furthermore, planning permission could be refused, in any event, if the Highway Authority considered there to be an issue of highway or public safety, or if appropriate measures to improve highway/public safety could not be secured.

One objection is concerned that the proposed development would result in

unacceptable off-site parking. However, the Council cannot under planning legislation prevent the parking of cars on the public highway. Nevertheless, the on-site parking provision would form part of any planning application.

Another objection seeks that the policy includes reference to the impact of development on the landscape character's sensitivity. However, it seems to me that the limitations on the siting, scale and design of development as set out in criteria (i) to (iv) of the policy (or criteria (i) to (v) of the Policy as set out in Inquiry Changes December 2005) are sufficient to ensure that the development has due regard to the sensitivity of the site.

Some objections have sought that the Council protects sites of Importance for Nature conservation, and requires an ecological survey, flood risk and sewerage capacity assessment respectively in relation to development proposals. However, I agree with the Council that no specific wording is required in Policy ALT DEV 17 in this regard and that issues of flood risk and ecological protection will be fundamental parts of the development control process and the relevant assessment will be required at that time.

My overall conclusion is that this criteria based policy would prevent an unacceptable impact on existing highway infrastructure capacity/safety and that it would preserve the Strategic Gap, the character and appearance of the Darby Green Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings (Clarks Farmhouse and Pond Farm).

Whether the allocation should be deleted and the site returned to agricultural use as part of the strategic gap

A number of objections have sought that the Clarks Farm employment allocation be deleted in order to enhance the character and openness of the site, leaving the site identified as a Strategic Gap. However, whilst the site has the appearance/character of an agricultural use, its historic use for composting purposes means that it benefits from a Class B2 General Industrial Use, albeit the store on the site was specifically conditioned to be used only for composting. Consequently, the site could be used for any general industrial purpose without a requirement for planning permission, irrespective of any allocation (or a lack thereof) in the LP. Given the higher values associated with an industrial use as opposed to an agricultural use, it is highly unlikely that the site would ever return to agricultural use.

In these circumstances, I agree with the Council that it is pragmatic to have a criteria based policy that aims to make the most beneficial use of the site whilst protecting the Strategic Gap.

Whether the Clarks Farm allocation should include the open land to the north of the composting area/The whole site should not be treated as brownfield

A number of objections have sought the deletion of the open land to the north of the main composting area at Clarks Farm from the Policy DEV17 allocation, and stated that the Council should not treat the whole site as brownfield.

The extent of the Policy DEV17 allocation is established in the adopted LP and is not proposed to be amended. The allocation specifically includes land to the north of the developed composting area to ensure that the redevelopment of the main area is linked to improvements to, and the future management of, the open land to the north. The inclusion of this northern area within the Policy DEV17 allocation in no way indicates that the Council considers it to be brownfield land, or that

development in this area is acceptable. Indeed, the Local Plan Proposals Map and Policy DEV17 as adopted, and the proposed Alteration (i.e. Policy ALT DEV17) are all clear that the northern part of the site is designated specifically for use as open space and landscaping only.

One objection seeks to have the area of open land to the north of the main composting area removed from Policy DEV17 allocation on the basis that the area is adequately protected by policies for the countryside and Blackwater Valley and so there is no justification for its inclusion. Furthermore, he considers that the Council's proposals for footpath and cycleways through the larger site are undesirable and urbanising.

I acknowledge that there are Policies in the LP relevant to the land in the countryside and Blackwater Valley, which apply to this undeveloped northern area of the larger allocation. However, whilst these policies limit/control development, they do not provide any basis for securing the future management of this open space, or the provision of footpaths/cycleways in association with development at Clarks Farm.

Consequently, I agree with the Council that it is necessary to include this undeveloped area within Policy DEV17 allocation in order to secure these benefits. I note that this approach was supported by the previous Local Plan Inspector in endorsing this allocation. Furthermore, the provision of footpaths and cycleways through the larger site will increase the opportunity for people to access the site by foot/cycle via the railway station at Blackwater. It will also provide the opportunity for better pedestrian/cycle access from the Frogmore Campus to the station. Failure to provide such opportunities would be contrary to government guidance in PPG13 and the principles of sustainability.

As to the impact of such pathways through the site, I consider that with careful design they need not have a materially urbanising effect. In terms of public safety, I acknowledge that paths through this site would not benefit from high levels of natural surveillance. Consequently, such links should not be promoted for use by unaccompanied children.

Whether the types of employment uses allowed should be specified/limited

Policy DEV17 of the Adopted LP identifies the Clarks Farm site for employment uses within Classes B1 and B2 (light industrial and general industrial). It does not provide for Class B8 storage and distribution uses.

It seems to me that Class B8 would not necessarily have a greater impact than a general industrial use. Therefore, provided that the criteria of the Policy were met, Class B8 uses should not reasonably be prevented. Consequently, I would agree with the Council that in reviewing the Policy, it is appropriate to allow employment uses generally, which could include Class B8 storage and distribution.

A number of objections have sought that the use of the site is limited to Class B1 and Class B8 uses, in order to limit the impact of development on the amenities of the surrounding area. However, whilst Class B1 or B8 uses might be preferable in this location, given the established Class B2 use of the site, I do not consider it appropriate to specifically exclude Class B2 uses.

One objection considers that the proposed Alteration could open the floodgate to the potential future use of the site. However, I note that the site, in any event, benefits from an established industrial use and it is already allocated for development in the Adopted LP. But, since the Council's proposed Alteration seeks

primarily to limit the scale of development, it would result in a policy that would more clearly define the future use of the site.

Whether the employment allocation will increase the need for housing

One objection is concerned that the allocation of the site for employment purposes will increase the need for housing. However, given that the site benefits from an established industrial use and it is already identified for employment development in the Adopted Local Plan, the scale of which is not specifically limited, then the proposed alteration which seeks to limit the scale of development would not have any material impact on the need for housing in the adjoining area. Nevertheless, the provision of employment development close to 2 main residential areas would provide the opportunity for local residents to work closer to home which could obviate the need to out-commute. As such, it could result in some travel efficiency benefits.

Whether the Policy should require the submission of a design statement/development should accord with existing architectural character

One objection relates to the failure of the altered policy to include specific reference to the requirement for a design statement in relation to the redevelopment of this site. However, I do not consider this to be necessary because the matter is addressed by Policy GEN4 of the Adopted LP which requires that applicants submit Design Statements with applications for planning permission. The policy recognises that this will be particularly important in relation to more complex or large scale proposals, although I note, in this case, the Council has sought to reduce the scale of development.

Another objection seeks that redevelopment of the site ties in with the existing architectural character of the area in terms of its appearance, mass and scale. I am satisfied that proposed Policy ALT DEV 17 provides sufficient guidance on the bulk and massing of development. Furthermore, policy should not be too prescriptive. Therefore, detailed issues relevant to the exact form and appearance of the development should be considered as part of the development control process.

Whether land at Dachs Lodge, Redfield, Fleet should be promoted as an alternative to the allocation of the site at Clarks Farm

One objection seeks to promote a site at Dachs Lodge, Redfield, Fleet for either employment or residential development as an alternative to the allocation of the site at Clarks Farm. However, as stated before, the principle of employment development at Clarks Farm is established in the Adopted LP. The Council is seeking only to provide additional clarity as to the scale of development that it considers to be acceptable. In these circumstances, it is not appropriate to consider the potential allocation of alternative sites as part of this limited Alteration process. Instead, the Council's allocations, and its employment strategy as a whole, will be considered in the production of its Local Development Framework – a process which will provide objectors with the appropriate opportunity to promote other sites.

Whether the wording of the criteria should be amended, and/or whether further criteria should be inserted

Whether criterion i) should be amended

The objector is concerned that unless a limit on the size and bulk of development is introduced, which is significantly less than that of the existing barn (he proposes 1/6 of the bulk), then new development under the revised policy could achieve a similar size and bulk. However, the existing barn has a footprint of approximately 4,355sqm and a volume of approximately 37,456sqm. As such, I do not consider that it would be possible to re-create the size and bulk of this building with the proposed limit on development of 2500sqm. It seems to me that proposed criterion i) (criterion ii) in December 2005 Inquiry Changes) by virtue of limiting development to 2,500sqm, would result in development which would have a lesser impact than that of the existing barn, and would therefore result in improvements to the Strategic Gap and the Conservation Area.

However, whilst it has always been the Council's intention, in allocating and proposing to retain the allocation of Clarks Farm site for redevelopment to secure improvements to the Strategic Gap, Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings the justification for the quantum of development is an issue of planning policy/principle. Consequently, the justification is based on the maximum quantum of development that the Council considers to be appropriate in this out of town/out of settlement location, having regard to relevant national planning policy guidance.

Whilst I consider it necessary to limit development to 2,500sqm, I am satisfied that the other policy criteria seek to ensure that development will not be overbearing and will have no adverse visual impact.

Whether the objector's proposed criterion iA) should be inserted

The objection seeks to include an additional policy criterion requiring the retention of the existing outbuildings adjacent to Reading Road.

First, I concur with the Council that these buildings are of limited quality. Secondly, the Council's Darby Green Conservation Area Statement is clear that these small scale buildings were included within the Conservation Area only on the basis that they maintain the link with the agricultural past. Thirdly, I consider that it is possible that buildings of a similar scale but an improved appearance could be provided as part of redevelopment proposals. This could enhance the setting of Clarks Farmhouse whilst retaining the character of this part of the Conservation Area. Consequently, I do not accept that the policy should specifically require the

retention of these particular buildings.

Whether criterion ii) of the Policy should be amended to state that development should be located in a way which 'appears' to widen the gap

The objection seeks to replace the reference in criterion ii) of Policy DEV17 (criterion iii) in December 2005 Inquiry Changes) that development should 'physically widen' the narrow gap between Darby Green and Yateley with the words that new development should be located in a way which 'appears' to widen this gap. The Council acknowledges that it is not possible to physically widen the identified Strategic Gap between Darby Green and Yateley without demolishing properties on the edge of either or both settlements. It says that the purpose of this criterion is to ensure that redevelopment of the site physically widens the area of undeveloped land/gap between Darby Green and Yateley through the appropriate siting of buildings. However, it seems to me that there could be many innovative ways of widening the 'apparent gap' whereas there are somewhat limited ways of 'physically' widening the gap. As such, I prefer the objector's wording.

Whether criterion v) of the policy should be amended to state publicly accessible open space rather than public open space

The objection has sought to replace the reference to 'public open space' in criterion v) (criterion vi) of December 2005 Inquiry Changes) by the words 'publicly accessible open space', on the basis that it is not proposed to designate this land to the public. The Council accepts that the northern area of the allocation is not proposed to be dedicated to the public and that it is instead to be made available for public use. The objector's proposed wording therefore seems to me to be more appropriate.

Whether Criterion vii) requires amendment

The objector seeks to amend Criterion vi) of the policy to state that development must not exceed the capacity of the 'local' or 'wider' transport network. Whilst I understand this point relative to the requirement for a thorough assessment of the highway implications of any development, I consider that the Council's proposed policy reference to the capacity of the 'highway network' encompasses the objector's more specific references and does not need to be amended.

Whether proposed criterion viiA) should be inserted

The objection seeks to add a new criterion that limits development to 2500sqm and clarifies that this limit is due to the site's poor accessibility. However, I consider that the Council's proposed reference to 2500sqm in the main body of the policy is appropriate and sufficient to clarify the appropriate scale of development. As such, an additional criterion is not necessary.

Whether proposed criterion viiB) should be inserted

The objection seeks to add a new criterion limiting the size and character of development such that the access shall not require the construction of a new roundabout or other significant roadworks on Reading Road within the Strategic Gap or Darby Green Conservation Area.

The Highway Authority has confirmed, in principle, that a development of up to 2500sqm will not require a roundabout access and that it could be accessed via a simple priority junction. As such, I agree with the Council that the roadworks required in association with such minor scale development will not be significant.

Therefore, I do not consider it necessary to include the objector's proposed criterion viiB).

Whether proposed criterion viiC) should be inserted

The objection seeks to include a further criterion requiring sufficient car parking to be provided on site to ensure that there will be no car parking off site. However, as stated elsewhere, it is not possible under planning legislation to prevent off-site car parking, irrespective of the number of car parking spaces to be provided on the site. Any off-site car parking would be a matter for highway/traffic legislation.

In any event, planning policy at national, regional, strategic and local level expresses parking standards as maxima relevant to floorspace provided. The intention is that these standards are reduced in more sustainable locations, not increased in less sustainable locations. I accept that Clarks Farm has somewhat limited public transport accessibility. As such, I consider that the maximum parking standards should apply for this type of development. But, it would be contrary to policy guidance at all levels to seek to increase provision beyond these adopted maxima.

Whether proposed criterion ix) should be deleted

The objection seeks the deletion of the reference to car parking being addressed within a commuter plan, on the basis that he does not consider that it could make any significant impact on car dependence, given the site's location. However, in the light of up-to-date government guidance, the Council's policy should look to reduce car use/journeys. As such, this issue should be considered as part of any commuter plan although this would have to be balanced with what is realistically achievable in this location.

Whether the supporting text requires amendment

An objection proposes an additional paragraph (4.5A) in the supporting text to the policy, to add further detail relevant to the highways assessment required in relation to development. However, in my view the scope and extent of the highway assessment is a detailed matter more appropriately addressed as part of the development control process.

Since I conclude elsewhere that the land to the north of the composting area should remain part of the Policy DEV17 allocation, in accordance with the adopted policy, I also consider it is essential to retain criterion a) to supporting paragraph 4.6 to prevent rat-running through the site.

The objection seems to have misunderstood the intention of this criterion since it does not require or encourage an access from Darby Green Lane. Instead, it seeks to prevent a situation whereby there are 2 accesses to the site, one on Reading Road and one on Darby Green Lane, with no restrictions on through traffic.

Whether the Policy should refer to procedural issues

An objection seeks to delete the reference in the supporting text to the fact that applications will be determined by Committee, on the basis that this is a procedural rather than a policy matter.

The Council acknowledges that the method of determining an application is not normally referenced in a Local Plan. However, it considered when originally allocating the site that an exception was warranted at Clarks Farm. Members considered that because of the very sensitive location of the site in the Strategic

Gap, and adjacent to a Conservation Area and listed buildings, any proposals for redevelopment should be considered at Committee. In order to emphasise the importance and sensitivity of the site, and to provide clarity for applicants, it was determined to include reference to this procedure in the Adopted LP. Since the site remains as sensitive and important as it was at the time of its original allocation, the Council considers that it is appropriate to retain the wording from the Adopted LP. Furthermore, it considers that to remove this reference would indicate that the sensitivity of the site had in some way diminished since its original allocation, and it would also remove clarity for potential applicants.

However, whilst I do not question the importance or sensitivity of the site, in my view, it is inappropriate to have a reference to procedure either in the policy or the supporting text.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **I recommend that Inset Map 30 be amended to show Clarks Farm as DEV17a and 17b sites, consistent with the Proposals Map.**
- **I recommend Policy ALT DEV17 be amended to read as follows:**

Policy ALT DEV17 Clarks Farm, Darby Green

The site known as Clarks Farm, Darby Green, as shown as Area a) on the Proposals Map is considered suitable for redevelopment for Class B1 employment use up to 2,500 sqm or other employment development with similar levels of employment. Development should take place in a landscaped setting, subject to the removal of the existing uses together with the following criteria:

- i) The scale of redevelopment shall accord with the objectives of sustainable development, taking into consideration the site's accessibility as a location, its status as a previously developed site outside any identified settlement, and its existing and potential lawful uses;
- ii) The redevelopment of the site (including car parking, the curtilages of buildings, roads and other infrastructure requirements) should aim to reduce the footprint of the existing developed area. In respect of any new buildings, they should not exceed the bulk and height of the existing main barn building granted planning permission in 1964;
- iii) New development should be located in a way which appears to widen the narrow gap between the south-eastern tip of Yateley and the western edge of Darby Green and which generally enhances the perception of this area as a Strategic Gap between settlements.
- iv) New development should be sensitively designed to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Strategic Gap and the Darby Green Conservation Area;
- v) Development must not have an overbearing impact on nearby residential properties and must avoid adverse visual impact on the listed buildings of Clarks Farmhouse and Pond Farmhouse.
- vi) Development must include a comprehensive management plan for the informal publicly accessible open space and the protection of wildlife habitats on the land

and lakes between the site and the River Blackwater and the land between the site and residential properties to the east;

- vii) All cables on the site and on the publicly accessible open space must be placed underground;
- viii) The capacity of the highway network must not be exceeded as a result of development on this site;
- ix) Footpaths and cycleways will be provided to link the site with the publicly accessible open space, the River Blackwater, Darby Green Lane and the Frogmore School and Community Campus;
- x) A commuter plan and a transport strategy, including the provision of car and cycle parking will be prepared to encourage journeys to work by means other than the private car.

This policy replaces Policy DEV17 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 to 2006.

- **I also recommend the following changes to the supporting text (Inquiry Changes to Re-deposited Draft December 2005):**

Delete criterion 4.6 e) of supporting text.

HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN – FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY

WEEK 1 PROGRAMME as at 30 November 2005

DATE	MORNING (10am - 1pm)	AFTERNOON (2pm - 5pm)
<p>TUESDAY 29 November 2005</p> <p>DAY 1</p>	<p>Opening of the Inquiry Inspector's Introduction</p> <p>Opening Statement by Hart District Council</p>	<p>CLARKS FARM ACCOMPANIED SITE VISIT Meet on roadway outside Clarks Farm farmhouse shortly before 2pm.</p>
<p>WEDNESDAY 30 November 2005</p> <p>DAY 2</p>	<p>CLARKS FARM (ALT DEV17) The Yateley Society (Informal Session) LPP0035 (233-240)</p> <p>Councillor Adrian Collett (Informal Session) LPP0042 (252)</p>	
<p>THURSDAY 1 December 2005</p> <p>DAY 3</p>	<p>AFFORDABLE HOUSING ROUND TABLE SESSION (LT GEN 13, ALT URB14) Wates Landmark Ltd & Redfields Garden Centre LPP0006/LPP107 Taylor Woodrow Devts Ltd LPP0019/LPP1018 Luckmore Ltd LPP0020/LPP1006 Peter Goddard LPP0051</p>	<p>Messrs A & WM White LPP1015 Premier Properties Plc LPP0024/LPP1016 Fleet & Crookham Civic Society LPP0031 /LPP1008</p>
<p>FRIDAY 2 December 2005</p>		<p>(until 1pm only)</p>

HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY

WEEK 2 PROGRAMME as at 30 November 2005

DATE	MORNING (10am - 1pm)	AFTERNOON (2pm - 5pm)
<p>MONDAY 5 December 2005</p> <p>DAY 4</p>	<p>No morning sitting</p>	<p>AFFORDABLE HOUSING (LT GEN 13, ALT URB 14) Premier Properties Plc (Informal Session) LPP0024/LPP1016 (427-428)</p>
<p>TUESDAY 6 December 2005</p> <p>DAY 5</p>	<p>DILLY LANE (ALT DEV 1A & 9) Luckmore Ltd (Formal Hearing) LPP0020/LPP1006 (144-146, 402-403)</p>	<p>contd.</p>
<p>WEDNESDAY 7 December 2005 and THURSDAY 8 December 2005</p>	<p>There will be no Inquiry sittings on Wednesday 7 December 2005 and Thursday 8 December 2005</p>	
<p>FRIDAY 9 December 2005</p>		<p>(until 1pm only)</p>

HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY

WEEK 3 PROGRAMME as at 30 November 2005

DATE	MORNING (10am - 1pm)	AFTERNOON (2pm - 5pm)
MONDAY 12 December 2005		
TUESDAY 13 December 2005 DAY 6	CLARKS FARM (ALT DEV 17) Linden Developments Ltd (Formal Hearing) LPP1012 (410-414)	contd.
WEDNESDAY 14 December 2005 DAY 7	CLARKS FARM (ALT DEV 17) Linden Developments Ltd (Formal Hearing) LPP1012 (410-414)	contd. Closing Statement by Hart District Council Inspector's closing remarks

HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY

APPEARANCE LIST

DAY 1 - Tuesday AM 29 November 2005

The Inspector, Dr Jane Stiles, opened the Inquiry.

Miss Anne Williams of Counsel presented an Opening Statement on behalf of Hart District Council

Tuesday PM

Accompanied Site Visit to Clarks Farm

DAY 2 – Wednesday AM 30 November 2005

INFORMAL HEARINGS

Clarks Farm

Dr Richard Johnson on behalf of The Yateley Society

Mr Peter Tipton on behalf of The Yateley Society

Councillor Adrian Collett on behalf of The Yateley Society

Councillor Adrian Collett on behalf of himself

Mr Adam Ross BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

DAY 3 – Thursday 1 December 2005

ROUND TABLE SESSION ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mr David Parker MSc BA(Hons) DMS FCIH (Pioneer Property Services Ltd) on behalf of Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd.

Mr Nick Paterson-Neild BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI (Barton Willmore) on behalf of Luckmore Ltd. and on behalf of Wates Landmark Ltd. & Redfields Garden Centre

Mr Roger Turnbull BSc MSc MRTPI (Barton Willmore) on behalf of Peter Goddard

Mr David Mallett FRICS (JTS Partnership) on behalf of Messrs A & WM White

Mr Douglas Bond BA MRTPI (Woolf Bond Planning) on behalf of Premier Properties Plc

Mr Colin Gray on behalf of Fleet & Crookham Civic Society

Mr Richard Harris BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Richard Dixon BSc(Hons) MRICS (Adams Integral) on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Simon Jenkins BSc(Hons) MSC DipTP DMS MRTPI MCAH (Adams Integral) on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr David Couttie FCIB DMS (DCA Ltd.) on behalf of Hart District Council

DAY 4 Monday PM 5 December 2005

Informal Session

Affordable Housing – Omission site: Owens Farm

Mr Douglas Bond (Woolf Bond Planning) on behalf of Premier Properties Plc

Mr Richard Harris (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

DAY 5 Tuesday 6 December 2005

Formal Hearing

Land at Dilly Lane, Hartley Wintney

Miss Mary Cook of Counsel on behalf of Luckmore Ltd.

Mr Nick Paterson-Neild (Barton Willmore) on behalf of Luckmore Ltd.

Miss Anne Williams of Counsel on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Adam Ross (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

DAY 6 Tuesday 13 December 2005

Formal Hearing

Clarks Farm, Darby Green, Yateley

Dr Richard Johnson on behalf of The Yateley Society

Mr Christopher Boyle of Counsel on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd

Mr Bob Sellwood BA DipTP MRTPI FRICS (Sellwood Planning) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Adrian Henson (Hurst Warne) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Mike Axon BSc(Hons) MIHT (Savell Bird & Axon) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Ms Sarah Reynolds BSc(Hons) DipLD MA MLI (The Landscape Partnership) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Simon Tannahill (Linden Developments) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd

Miss Anne Williams of Counsel on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Adam Ross (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Allan Cox BSc(Hons) MS MLI (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

DAY 7 Wednesday 14 December 2005

Formal Hearing

Clark Farm, Darby Green, Yateley

Mr Christopher Boyle of Counsel on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Bob Sellwood (Sellwood Planning) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Adrian Henson (Hurst Warne) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Mike Axon (Savell Bird & Axon) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Ms Sarah Reynolds (The Landscape Partnership) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd.

Mr Simon Tannahill (Linden Developments) on behalf of Linden Developments Ltd

Miss Anne Williams of Counsel on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Adam Ross (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

Mr Allan Cox (Broadway Malyan) on behalf of Hart District Council

Miss Anne Williams of Counsel presented a Closing Statement on behalf of Hart District Council

The Inspector, Dr Jane Stiles made closing remarks but did not formally close the Inquiry.

**HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

INQUIRY LIBRARY LIST as at 10/01/06

Ref. No.	Title	Date
CD1	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 - 2006	April 2003
CD2	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit)	May 2004
CD3	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Copies of Responses	By 9 July 2004
CD4	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Report on Responses to Representations (Broadway Malyan)	March 2005
CD5	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(Redeposit)	May 2005
CD6	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations (Redeposit) – Copies of Responses	20 July 2005
CD7	Hart DC: Proposed Responses & changes to Duly Made Representations – First Deposit Draft May 2004 (Broadway Malyan)	February 2005
CD8	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations (Redeposit) - Report on Responses to Representations (Broadway Malyan)	13 September 2005
CD9	PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM)	2005
CD10	PPS6: Planning for Town Centres (ODPM)	2005
CD11	PPS9: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation (ODPM)	August 2005
CD12	Circular 6/98: Planning & Affordable Housing (DETR)	8 April 1998
CD13	Circular 06/05: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation, Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System	16 August 2005
CD14	PPG3: Housing (DTLR)	March 2000
CD15	PPG13: Transport (DTLR)	March 2001
CD16	Planning to deliver – the managed release of housing sites (ODPM)	27 October 2005
CD17	Housing completions in the South East (ODPM – SE England)	2005
CD18	Hart District Council: Housing Needs Survey Final Report 2003 (David Couttie Associates Ltd.)	2003
CD19	Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996 – 2011 (Review)	December 2000
CD20	Hants CC: Where shall we live? (Consultation document)	2005
CD21	Hants CC: Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2003	2003
CD22	Hants CC: Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2004	2004
CD23	Hants CC: Policy H4 Monitoring Paper 2005	2005
CD 24	Hants CC SPG: Implementing Policy H4	24 November 2005
CD25	Hart District Council: Affordable Housing First Alteration: Background Paper	2005

**HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATIONS
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

INQUIRY LIBRARY LIST as at 10/01/06

Ref. No.	Title	Date
CD26	Inquiry document: List of Conditionally and Unconditionally Withdrawn Representations	November 2005
CD27	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Notes of Affordable Housing Round Table Session	1 December 2005
CD28	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Proposed Amendments by Hart DC from RTS and meeting with Premier Properties Plc	1 & 5 December 2005
CD29	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Housing Information	20 December 2005
CD30	Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996 – 2006. First Alterations(First Deposit) – Housing Completions data	20 December 2005
CD31	GOSE Guidance on Housing Trajectories, Version 1	13 September 2005

APPENDIX4HDC

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITED/RE-DEPOSITED ALTERATIONS

Miscellaneous

Proposal/ Status Paragraph	Objector No./ Rep. No.	Name	
	1/2	English Nature	No Comment
	2/3	RSPB	No Comment
	3/4	National Grid Transco	Not Duly Made
	9/54	DEFRA	No Comment
	11/69, 390	Highways Agency	Objection
[UW]	33/223	Scott Brwonrigg	Objection
	55/320	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council	Not Duly Made
	72/362	Rushmoor Borough Council	No Comment
	77/378	Network Rail	No Comment

Affordable Housing

Proposal/ Status Paragraph	Objector No./ Rep. No.	Name	
GEN13	4/5-7	E. Lawrence	Objection
GEN13	5/8-12, 16-18	Lean & Co.	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	6/13- 15, 19-27	Wates Homes Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre	Objection
GEN13	7/28- 37	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
GEN13	8/46-53	The Odiham Society	Objection
GEN13	10/55-61	GOSE	Objection
GEN13	[72 CW] 12/70-73	Longstreet Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	13/74-75	Dr. R Pinchin	Objection
GEN13	14/76-82	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
GEN13	15/88	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Support
GEN13	16/93-95	Horizon Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	17/96-101	Bell Cornwell Partnership	Objection
GEN13	18/104-106	MH Character Homes	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	19/107-143	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14 [151 & 153 CW]	20/147-154, 166-169	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
GEN13	21/170	Surrey County Council	Support
GEN13	22/180-182	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13	23/183-190	Flavia Estates Ltd	Objection
GEN13	24/192-199	Premier Properties Plc	Objection
GEN13	25/200-207	Friday Street	Objection
GEN13	26/208-214	The Conville Family	Objection
GEN13	31/219	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Support
GEN13	31/220	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Objection
GEN13	32/221-222	The Crondall Society	Objection
GEN13	[all UW] 33/224-228	Scott Brownrigg	Objection
GEN13	34/229-232	Carson & Company	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	36/241-243	Bellway Homes	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	44/258-265	Hook Parish Council	Objection
GEN13	45/268-271	BT Plc	Objection
GEN13	46/272-275	Fairview New Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	47/276-277	George Wimpey strategic Land	Objection
GEN13	48/280-281	Y. Fuller	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	50/286-295	Estates Practice (Hampshire CC)	Objection
GEN13	51/296-302	P. Goddard	Objection
GEN13	53/305-313	McCarthy Stone Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	54/314-319	Helical (Fleet) Ltd	Objection
GEN13	56/321-324	Ashridge Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	58/328	South Wanborough Parish Council	Support
GEN13	59/329-332	Carlton Construction	Objection
GEN13	61/337-338	Cliveden Homes	Objection
GEN13	[UW] 66/346	Fordham Research Ltd	Objection
GEN13	[357 CW] 71/356-357	Hampshire County Council	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	73/363-372	NHS Estates	Objection
GEN13	75/375-376	Blackwater Valley & Hart PCT	Support

APPENDIX4HDC

GEN13	76/377	V. Street	Objection
GEN13	78/379-380	Portsmere Ltd	Objection
GEN13	80/383	P. Todd	Objection
GEN13	81/384-388	Eversley Parish Council	Objection
GEN13	82/389	Mattingley Parish Council	Objection
GEN13	1002/392	Surrey County Council	Support
GEN13/ URB14	1004/398	Helical (Fleet) Ltd	Objection
GEN13	1005/399	Hartley Wintney Parish Council	Support
GEN13/ URB14	1006/402	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
GEN13	1007/404	South Wanborough Parish Council	Support
GEN13	1008/405	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Objection
GEN13	1010/407-408	George Wimpey UK Ltd	Objection
GEN13	1013/418	HBF Southern Region	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	1014/420-424	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council	Objection
GEN13	1015/425	A. & WM White	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	1016/427-428	Premier Properties Plc	Objection
GEN13	1017/429-430	Eversley Parish Council	Objection
GEN13	1018/431-442	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Objection
URB14	1019/443	Environment Agency	No Comment
GEN13	1022/454	English Heritage	No comment
GEN13	1024/459-461	Fairview New Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	1025/462-468	C. Leversha	Objection
GEN13	1026/469-471	The Odiham Society	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	1027/472-479	Wates Landmark Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre	Objection
GEN13	1028/480	V. Street	Objection

Dilly Lane, Hartley Wintney

Proposal/ Status	Objector No./	Name	
Paragraph	Rep. No.		
DEV1A/ DEV9	7/38-40	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
DEV9	10/62-64	GOSE	Objection
DEV9	14/83-86	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	15/87, 89, 90	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Objection
DEV9	17/102-103	Bell Cornwell Partnership	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	20/144-146,155 -165	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
DEV9	21/171	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV9	[all UW] 22/173-174	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
DEV9	28/216	Winchfield Parish Council	Objection
DEV9	44/266-267	Hook Parish Council	Objection
DEV9	47/278-279	George Wimpey Strategic Land	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	49/282-285	Hampshire County Council	Objection
DEV9	60/333-334	Thames Water Property Services	Objection
DEV1A	61/339	Cliveden Homes	Objection
DEV9	67/348	R. Ganj	Objection
DEV9	79/381-382	Hartley Wintney Action Group	Objection
DEV9	1001/391 & 481	M. Ananin	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	1002/394	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV1/ DEV9	1005/400-401	Hartley Wintney Parish Council	Support
DEV1A/ DEV9	1006/403	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
DEV9	1009/406	Thames Water Plc	Objection
DEV9	1013/419	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	1019/444-445	Environment Agency	No Comment
DEV9	1020/447-448	GOSE	Objection
DEV9	1021/451-452	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	1022/456	English Heritage	No Comment
DEV9	1023/458	South East Water	Neutral

APPENDIX4HDC

Clarks Farm, Darby Green

Proposal/ Status Paragraph	Objector No./ Rep. No.	Name	
DEV17	7/41-43, 45	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
DEV17	10/65-68	GOSE	Objection
DEV17	15/91-92	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Objection
DEV17	21/172	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV 17	[all UW] 22/175-179	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
DEV17	27/215	R.W. Haile	Objection
DEV17	29/217	Mr & Mrs A. Thomas	Support
DEV17	30/218	N. Porteous & A. Shaw	Support
DEV17	35/233-240	The Yateley Society	Objection
DEV17	37/244	L. & S. Rooks	Support
DEV17	37/245	L. & S. Rooks	Objection
DEV17	38/246	J. Virgo	Support
DEV17	39/247-249	G. C. Hennell	Objection
DEV17	40/250	J. Burt	Support
DEV17	41/251	A. Burt	Support
DEV17	42/252	A. Collett	Objection
DEV17	43/253-257	C. Farmer	Objection
DEV17	52/303-304	P. J. Craighill	Objection
DEV17	57/327	Yateley Town Council	Objection
DEV17	60/335-336	Thames Water Property Services	Objection
DEV17	62/340	D. T. Benham	Objection
DEV17	63/341-343	Mr & Mrs B. A. Holloway	Objection
DEV17	64/344	Mr & Mrs A. Tonks	Support
DEV17	65/345	D & P Roberts	Objection
DEV17	67/347	R. Ganj	Objection
DEV17	68/349-351	S. Barron	Objection
DEV17	69/352-353	J. M. Colbert	Objection
DEV17	70/354-355	M. F. & J. Schroeder	Objection
DEV17	[358 & 359 CW] 71/358-361	Hampshire County Council	Objection
DEV17	74/373-374	D. J. Murr	Objection
DEV17	1002/393	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV17	1003/395-397	Cllr. D. Benham	Objection
DEV17	1011/409	Highways Agency	Concern
DEV17	1012/410-414	Linden Developments Ltd	Objection
DEV17	1019/446	Environment Agency	No Comment
DEV17	1020/449-450	GOSE	Objection
DEV17	1021/453	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Objection
DEV17	1022/455	English Heritage	No Comment
DEV17	1023/457	South East Water	Neutral

APPENDIX5HDC

OBJECTIONS TO DEPOSITED/RE-DEPOSITED ALTERATIONS

Proposal/ Status Paragraph	Objector No./ Rep. No.	Name	
-	1/2	English Nature	No Comment
-	2/3	RSPB	No Comment
-	3/4	National Grid Transco	Not Duly Made
GEN13	4/5-7	E. Lawrence	Objection
GEN13	5/8-12, 16-18	Lean & Co.	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	6/13- 15, 19-27	Wates Homes Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre	Objection
GEN13	7/28- 37	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	7/38-40	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
DEV17	7/41-43, 45	Berkeley Community Villages	Objection
GEN13	8/46-53	The Odiham Society	Objection
-	9/54	DEFRA	No Comment
GEN13	10/55-61	GOSE	Objection
DEV9	10/62-64	GOSE	Objection
DEV17	10/65-68	GOSE	Objection
-	11/69, 390	Highways Agency	Objection
GEN13	[72 CW] 12/70-73	Longstreet Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	13/74-75	Dr. R Pinchin	Objection
GEN13	14/76-82	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
DEV9	14/83-86	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
GEN13	15/88	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Support
DEV1A/ DEV9	15/87, 89, 90	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Objection
DEV17	15/91-92	Hart & Rushmoor District Group CPRE	Objection
GEN13	16/93-95	Horizon Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	17/96-101	Bell Cornwell Partnership	Objection
DEV9	17/102-103	Bell Cornwell Partnership	Objection
GEN13	18/104-106	MH Character Homes	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	19/107–143	Taylow Woodrow Developments Ltd	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9	20/144-146,155 -165	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14 [151& 153 CW]	20/147-154, 166-169	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
GEN13	21/170	Surrey County Council	Support
DEV9	21/171	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV17	21/172	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV9	[all UW] 22/173-174	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
DEV 17	[all UW] 22/175-179	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13	22/180-182	Linden Homes Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13	23/183-190	Flavia Estates Ltd	Objection
GEN13	24/192-199	Premier Properties Plc	Objection
GEN13	25/200-207	Friday Street	Objection
GEN13	26/208-214	The Conville Family	Objection
DEV17	27/215	R.W. Haile	Objection
DEV9	28/216	Winchfield Parish Council	Objection
DEV17	29/217	Mr & Mrs A. Thomas	Support
DEV17	30/218	N. Porteous & A. Shaw	Support
GEN13	31/219	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Support
GEN13	31/220	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Objection
GEN13	32/221-222	The Crondall Society	Objection
-	[UW] 33/223	Scott Brwonrigg	Objection
GEN13	[all UW] 33/224-228	Scott Brownrigg	Objection
GEN13	34/229-232	Carson & Company	Objection
DEV17	35/233-240	The Yateley Society	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	36/241-243	Bellway Homes	Objection
DEV17	37/244	L. & S. Rooks	Support
DEV17	37/245	L. & S. Rooks	Objection
DEV17	38/246	J. Virgo	Support
DEV17	39/247-249	G. C. Hennell	Objection
DEV17	40/250	J. Burt	Support
DEV17	41/251	A. Burt	Support
DEV17	42/252	A. Collett	Objection
DEV17	43/253-257	C. Farmer	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	44/258-265	Hook Parish Council	Objection
DEV9	44/266-267	Hook Parish Council	Objection
GEN13	45/268-271	BT Plc	Objection
GEN13	46/272-275	Fairview New Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	47/276-277	George Wimpey strategic Land	Objection

APPENDIX5HDC

DEV9		47/278-279	George Wimpey Strategic Land	Objection
GEN13		48/280-281	Y. Fuller	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9		49/282-285	Hampshire County Council	Objection
GEN13/ URB14		50/286-295	Estates Practice (Hampshire CC)	Objection
GEN13		51/296-302	P. Goddard	Objection
DEV17		52/303-304	P. J. Craighill	Objection
GEN13		53/305-313	MaCarthy Stone Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13/ URB14		54/314-319	Helical (Fleet) Ltd	Objection
-		55/320	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council	Not Duly Made
GEN13		56/321-324	Ashridge Homes Ltd	Objection
DEV17		57/327	Yateley Town Council	Objection
GEN13		58/328	South Wanborough Parish Council	Support
GEN13		59/329-332	Carlton Construction	Objection
DEV9		60/333-334	Thames Water Property Services	Objection
DEV17		60/335-336	Thames Water Property Services	Objection
GEN13		61/337-338	Cliveden Homes	Objection
DEV1A		61/339	Cliveden Homes	Objection
DEV17		62/340	D. T. Benham	Objection
DEV17		63/341-343	Mr & Mrs B. A. Holloway	Objection
DEV17		64/344	Mr & Mrs A. Tonks	Support
DEV17		65/345	D & P Roberts	Objection
GEN13	[UW]	66/346	Fordham Research Ltd	Objection
DEV17		67/347	R. Ganj	Objection
DEV9		67/348	R. Ganj	Objection
DEV17		68/349-351	S. Barron	Objection
DEV17		69/352-353	J. M. Colbert	Objection
DEV17		70/354-355	M. F. & J. Schroeder	Objection
GEN13	[357 CW]	71/356-357	Hampshire County Council	Objection
DEV17	[358 & 359 CW]	71/358-361	Hampshire County Council	Objection
-		72/362	Rushmoor Borough Council	No Comment
GEN13/ URB14		73/363-372	NHS Estates	Objection
DEV17		74/373-374	D. J. Murr	Objection
GEN13		75/375-376	Blackwater Valley & Hart PCT	Support
GEN13		76/377	V. Street	Objection
-		77/378	Network Rail	No Comment
GEN13		78/379-380	Portsmere Ltd	Objection
DEV9		79/381-382	Hartley Wintney Action Group	Objection
GEN13		80/383	P. Todd	Objection
GEN13		81/384-388	Eversley Parish Council	Objection
GEN13		82/389	Mattingley Parish Council	Objection
DEV9		1001/391 & 481	M. Ananin	Objection
GEN13		1002/392	Surrey County Council	Support
DEV17		1002/393	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV1A/ DEV9		1002/394	Surrey County Council	No Comment
DEV17		1003/395-397	Cllr. D. Benham	Objection
GEN13/ URB14		1004/398	Helical (Fleet) Ltd	Objection
GEN13		1005/399	Hartley Wintney Parish Council	Support
DEV1/ DEV9		1005/400-401	Hartley Wintney Parish Council	Support
GEN13/ URB14		1006/402	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
DEV1A/ DEV9		1006/403	Luckmore Ltd	Objection
GEN13		1007/404	South Wanborough Parish Council	Support
GEN13		1008/405	Fleet & Crookham Civic Society	Objection
DEV9		1009/406	Thames Water Plc	Objection
GEN13		1010/407-408	George Wimpey UK Ltd	Objection
DEV17		1011/409	Highways Agency	Concern
DEV17		1012/410-414	Linden Developments Ltd	Objection
GEN13		1013/418	HBF Southern Region	Objection
DEV9		1013/419	HBF – Southern Region	Objection
GEN13/ URB14		1014/420-424	Blackwater & Hawley Town Council	Objection
GEN13		1015/425	A. & WM White	Objection
GEN13/ URB14		1016/427-428	Premier Properties Plc	Objection
GEN13		1017/429-430	Eversley Parish Council	Objection
GEN13		1018/431-442	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Objection
URB14		1019/443	Environment Agency	No Comment
DEV1A/ DEV9		1019/444-445	Environment Agency	No Comment
DEV17		1019/446	Environment Agency	No Comment
DEV9		1020/447-448	GOSE	Objection
DEV17		1020/449-450	GOSE	Objection
DEV9		1021/451-452	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Objection
DEV17		1021/453	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Objection
GEN13		1022/454	English Heritage	No comment

APPENDIX5HDC

DEV17	1022/455	English Heritage	No Comment
DEV1A/ DEV9	1022/456	English Heritage	No Comment
DEV17	1023/457	South East Water	Neutral
DEV9	1023/458	South East Water	Neutral
GEN13	1024/459-461	Fairview New Homes Ltd	Objection
GEN13	1025/462-468	C. Leversha	Objection
GEN13	1026/469-471	The Odiham Society	Objection
GEN13/ URB14	1027/472-479	Wates Landmark Ltd & Redfield Garden Centre	Objection
GEN13	1028/480	V. Street	Objection