

APPENDIX 4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES & ACTIONS TAKEN

A4.1 The table below sets out all the responses to the consultation on the draft LDF and Core Strategy SA Scoping Report which took place from 1st April – 13th May 2011. It also indicates what actions were taken as a result of those responses.

Consultee	Summary of Response	Actions Taken
Environment Agency	No response received.	No action taken.
Natural England	Plans and Programmes section indicates that the South East Plan should be given limited weight. Natural England would disagree with this approach as it should be given full weighting up until that time when the plan is removed.	Amended section on South East Plan.
	HDC Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy for the SPA should be added to the plans and programmes section.	Interim Avoidance Strategy added to Plans and Programmes section.
English Heritage	No response received.	No action taken.
Campaign to Protect Rural England (North East Hampshire)	Suggest including the following in the plans and programmes section: Biodiversity Action Plan, Water Catchment Area Plans, Landscape Character Assessments, Market Town Appraisals, Village Design Statements, Conservation Area Appraisals, Parish Plans.	UK and Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plans added to plans and programmes section. Landscape Character Assessments are considered in the baseline section, as are Conservation Areas. Other items are considered too detailed to include, but will inform more detailed parts of the LDF when those are prepared.
	Should acknowledge that there is a need for more cultural activity and recreation as well as leisure facilities.	Amended list of key issues.
	Include the threat to essential facilities in rural parishes as an important consideration under Character, Vitality and Viability.	Added reference to use of rural facilities to key issues.

	Key issues section should include reference to surface water flooding.	Amended key issues table.
	Should refer to apprenticeships and “life-long” learning under education. Education does not end with schooling.	There is limited information available on this topic therefore this has not been included. However, if CPRE know of baseline information on this topic Hart could include, amendments could be made.
Highways Agency	Indicated no response.	No action taken.
Sport England	Acknowledge and pleased to note that leisure and recreation is included in SA objective SA3. However, there should be more detail regarding how the appraisal will be undertaken, and should include issues and criteria such as: will the plan protect playing fields and indoor and outdoor sports facilities? Will the plan improve access to green infrastructure? Will the plan increase participation in sport? The link SA3 has with SA2 and health should also be noted.	These issues will be covered as part of the assessment process.
	Sport England hold information on Local Sports Profiles which could be included in baseline section.	Some information added to baseline section under Health and Well-Being, Cultural Activity, Leisure, and Recreation.
Thames Water	A key sustainability objective should be for new development to be co-ordinated with infrastructure and to take into account capacity of existing infrastructure. The list of sustainability objectives should therefore make reference to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to service development. The satisfactory provision of water and sewerage infrastructure should form an integral part of the SA.	Objective SA10 covers water quality, objective SA13 covers flooding, and objective SA16 covers resource use. The issues raised can be covered under those existing SA objectives therefore the objectives have not been altered. Water infrastructure will also be considered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the Core Strategy.
	The following indicator is suggested: Number of developments approved against the	Indicator suggested has been included in the draft monitoring schedule.

	recommendation of the statutory water/sewerage undertaker on low pressure / flooding grounds.	
	When reviewing development and flood risk it is important to recognise that water and/or sewerage infrastructure may be required to be developed in flood risk areas. Flood risk sustainability objectives should therefore accept that water and sewerage infrastructure development may be necessary in flood risk areas.	Point noted and will inform the assessment process.
	Flood risk sustainability objectives should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' as identified in Appendix C of PPS25 and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure is not in place ahead of development.	Point noted and will inform the assessment process.
Hampshire County Council (Ecology)	The report proposes a logical SA methodology and the SA objectives are wide ranging and encompassing.	No action taken.
	Green infrastructure is not referred to, but needs to be established within the Core Strategy and should be included as a key sustainability objective.	Green infrastructure is referred to under health and well-being, cultural activity, leisure, and recreation through reference to the PPG17 study and areas of open space owned by the Council. This issue will be covered in more detail in an Open Space DPD. Objective SA3 is thought to cover the issue of green infrastructure.
	UK Biodiversity Action Plan and Hampshire BAP should be included in Plans and Programmes section.	UK BAP and Hampshire BAP added to Plans and Programmes section.
	Biodiversity baseline information should include details on distribution of Hampshire BAP species as well as other protected species.	This information will be considered when proposing to develop specific sites, but is considered too detailed for inclusion in the LDF SA.
	Biodiversity Opportunity Areas should be included	Reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas added to baseline

	in the baseline. Scoping Report needs to make reference to geology and geological conservation. Any Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGs) present within Hart should be considered.	section. Soil quality dealt with in soil quality section. Not aware of any RIGs within Hart. HCC to advise Hart if there are any such sites in the District.
Wokingham Borough Council	The importance of considering cross-boundary issues is stressed.	Core Strategies/Site Allocations DPDs from neighbouring authorities added to the plans and programmes section, including summaries of what strategic developments are planned.
	There is no separate assessment of whether SEA is required or not.	No action has been taken as the SA which will be undertaken will incorporate SEA (as indicated on the front cover of the document). SEA requirements will then be checked by completing the Quality Assurance Checklist included in Appendix I. There is only a need to screen for SEA if proposing <i>not</i> to carry it out.
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Indicated no response.	No action taken.
Eversley Parish Council	Refer to a response made to the Council's Draft Issues and Options paper on 22 nd Feb 2006. Object to settlement hierarchy having different parts of Eversley in different tiers.	Noted for settlement hierarchy evidence document. No change made to SA as comment relates to evidence base document rather than the SA itself.
Long Sutton and Well Parish Council	Response related to settlement hierarchy.	Noted for settlement hierarchy evidence document. No change made to SA as comment relates to evidence base document rather than the SA itself.
The Yateley Society	Requested sections on the purpose of the report and the status of the current Local Plan during the LDF process.	The purpose of the SA documents are set out, and the various stages are set out in Table I.1 of the Scoping Report (March, 2011). The status of the Local Plan during the LDF process is set out in the Core Strategy itself, rather than the SA.
	Requested that a time frame of the various consultation stages is included so that sufficient	The timetable for consultation stages is set out in Hart's Local Development Scheme which is available on the website.

	resources can be mustered.	
	Requested inclusion of PPS12 in plans and programmes section.	The plans and programmes section is restricted to those relevant for the assessment. Although the Core Strategy will follow the processes set out in PPS12, this will not have an affect on the SA.
	Requested inclusion of Conservation Area Reports in plans and programmes section.	The plans and programmes section is limited to the most relevant documents and is not an exhaustive list. The presence of Conservation Areas has been taken into account in the baseline section of the report.
	Asked when other plans and programmes will be listed and reviewed.	Other plans and programmes will be listed and reviewed as is seen necessary in the Scoping Reports to accompany other documents of the LDF which follow the Core Strategy.
	Regarding the sustainability issues and problems in Table 2.2, it is suggested that the community be given an opportunity to respond to indicate their likes and dislikes.	Table 2.2 is a summary of the key issues which have been drawn from the evidence base set out in the baseline section and the review of relevant plans and programmes. It is not a list of likes and dislikes of the community. However, any comments on the key issues are welcomed. This can be done via consultation on the SA documents.
	Request re-wording of SAI as the term “decent” is difficult to qualify in this context, suggest “To provide suitable and affordable housing for everyone.”	Objectives have been based on the South East Regional Sustainability Framework, and also uses wording from PPS3. No change made to wording of SAI.
	Suggests that SA9 refers to Conservation Areas.	Conservation Areas are covered under SA7 on the historic environment.
	Suggest adding numerous plans and strategies in relation to climate change and SAI2.	As noted above, the plans and programmes section is not an exhaustive list and is restricted to the most relevant documents.
	Regarding Table 2.4 and 2.5 it is suggested that a weighting factor be applied.	Weighting is not considered appropriate, as the approach is mainly qualitative rather than quantitative.
	Requested that comprehensive list of stakeholders be included.	The statutory environmental consultees are listed, but the list of other consultees is constantly changing therefore has not been included. SA documents are available on the Council’s website,

		therefore anyone can respond to the consultation.
	Requested a compliance schedule be drawn up in accordance with accepted QMS protocols. Checks should be against measurable items and not unquantifiable issues.	Appendix I is considered to be adequate quality assurance as it indicates that all requirements of the SEA Directive have been met.
	Requested a QA checklist be produced showing stakeholders comments and HDC actions and responses.	This table performs that function.
	In relation to EU Directive 91/271/EEC quality should refer to waste water.	Quality will include dealing with waste water.
	In relation to EU Directive 2008/50/EC omit “where possible” as air pollution can be avoided and prevented.	Although it is accepted that air pollution can be avoided and prevented, this may not be possible if at the same time meeting other objectives, such as meeting housing need. More houses on the edge of settlements is likely to mean more cars and longer journeys, but this cannot be avoided without failing to meet housing need.
	Much of the baseline information is based on predictions that occurred many years ago and are out of date. How will HCC and HDC ensure that data is updated to aid more accurate forecasting?	The baseline information section includes the most up-to-date information that is readily available to the Council. The Council will set out a monitoring schedule for the Core Strategy which will cover all aspects of sustainability. The Council will then collect and publish data on an annual basis to ensure that data is as up-to-date as possible.
	Core Strategy should identify the provision of eco-friendly energy installations and promote their growth through the planning system.	Point noted for the Core Strategy.
The Theatres Trust	Welcomed inclusion of objective SA3. Asked if the requirement for additional cultural facilities could be added as a key issue. More coverage of cultural activity requested, including theatres, cinemas, libraries and museums.	Requirement for additional cultural facilities added as a key issue.

Councillor Mrs Radley	Asked for detail on previous SA Scoping Reports.	Previous Scoping Reports are superseded by more recent documents therefore there is no reason to refer back to these. However, they can be made available on request.
	Definition of Sustainable Development does not appear to provide any consideration to impact on the current established situation.	The definition of sustainable development provided is the standard definition used across the world.
	Asked for more information on the five principles of sustainable development from the UK framework of sustainable development 'Securing the Future.'	More information is available in the document referred to by HM Government (2005) 'Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy.'
	Suggests that SA and SEA are advisable for SPDs as well as DPDs.	The Scoping Report indicates minimum requirements, but the Council can decide to do a more detailed assessment than is required if it so wishes.
	Need to analyse and evaluate baseline information.	Some analysis of baseline information is provided, but further analysis and evaluation will take place as part of the plan-making process as documents for the LDF are progressed.
	Need for flexibility in a 20 year plan highlighted.	Point noted for the Core Strategy.
	Asks which plans and programmes are likely to change.	Over time new plans and programmes are prepared, and existing ones are updated. Hart cannot always anticipate this, but will keep the Scoping Report up-to-date as changes are made within reason.
	Asks for national policy statements and guidance on issues such as education, highways and health to be included in plans and programmes section.	PPG13 on Transport has been included as the national policy on transport, but there is no national planning policy on education and health.
	With regards to PPG24 Planning and Noise, it is asked why there is no statement about aircraft noise and Public Safety Zones.	Information added to baseline section on Transport.
	Asked for clarification on what the "plan area" covers.	The plan area is Hart District.
Various other items.	Points noted for the Core Strategy.	
Mark Leedale	It is essential that the scoring system does not lead	Although it will be necessary to reject certain development options as

Planning	to the rejection of particular development options at an early stage. At other Councils quantitative processes have been used to reject sustainable sites. It is therefore welcomed that the assessment will be a qualitative assessment by officers.	development plans progress, this will be based on a qualitative assessment rather than a quantitative assessment.
	Local Plan policies should not be relied upon as part of the assessment. Several of these include out-of-date approaches, such as gaps. A review of relevant documents will help to avoid out-of-date approaches.	Local Plan policies will not be relied upon, the review of up-to-date plans and programmes will be of more relevance.
	The Plans and Programmes section should include “Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention” which is a companion guide to PPSI.	The plans and programmes section is limited to the most relevant documents and is not an exhaustive list.
	Baseline section under states the effects of the SPA. Unless the local authority can more strongly influence Natural England, then sustainable development will not be achievable within and on the edge of the main settlements. Hart should designate additional SANGs as a matter of urgency.	Hart continues to work with Natural England and its other partner authorities on providing an avoidance and mitigation solution to deal with the effects of development on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The need for additional SANG will be considered as part of the LDF.
	The affordable housing need evidence is questioned. Providing for the level of need suggested is not achievable.	Although evidence on affordable housing need suggests that there is a substantial need for affordable housing, this will be set against viability evidence. It is accepted that the need for affordable housing will not be met because it would not be viable.
	In terms of energy demand, reference is made for the scope to develop large-scale wind farms in the District. Given the constraints set out in the evidence base it is difficult to envisage how this will be achieved.	Constraints will be taken into account in planning for renewable energy generation.
	Welcomes the assertion that development will be	No action taken.

	necessary on greenfield sites.	
	In terms of secondary education, it would appear that the evidence points to the advantages of housing development in Yateley.	No action taken.