Draft Local Plan Consultation

We are preparing a new Local Plan which will guide development in the district up to 2032. The Draft Local Plan contains planning policies and site allocations, including where new housing and employment development will take place.

You can find all supporting information to this consultation online via www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan or hard copies of the consultation documents are available to view at the Hart District Council Offices, Town and parish council offices and public libraries across the district.

All valid comments (electronic or written) and the name(s) of the respondent will be made publically available. Personal contact details will remain confidential.

We encourage you to respond to our Draft Local Plan consultation using our online form available at www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-consultation. However if you wish, you can use this word version of the response form and email to or post to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.

This form contains two comments sections. If you wish to make more than two comments please copy and paste the boxes as required.

All comments must be submitted no later than 5pm on Friday 9 June.

* Indicates a required field.

Response form

Are you a: *
☒ Resident
☐ Business
☐ Agent
☐ Other (i.e. Community interest group)

If Resident please complete:
Name* Rebecca and Angelo Arulchelvam
Address
Phone number
Email*
If Business please complete:
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation* Click here to enter text.
Job title Click here to enter text.
Business address Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.

If Agent please complete:
Agent details
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation* Click here to enter text.
Job title Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.
Client details
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation Click here to enter text.
Address* Click here to enter text.

If Other please complete:
Please specify Click here to enter text.
Name* Click here to enter text.
Completing details on behalf of Click here to enter text.
Address* Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.

☐ Please tick this box if you do not want to be contacted about Local Plan documents or updates

**Comment 1**

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s:* 36

Section/Policy number:* 116

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.
Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *
☐ Support
☒ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Disagree that Murrell Green is best option- Appropriate evidence has not been produced- Sustainability Assessment compares 1800 homes at Murrell Green with 3000 at Winchfield, why not like for like of 1800 each? - It is not separate to Hook- It will compete with Hook when Hook Neighbourhood Plan is trying to improve Hook centre- No scope for future post 2032 expansion- Not the preferred choice of 2016 consultation- Hart should look again for new settlements including a smaller Winchfield. See attachment for evidence from Hart District Council. Page 12 Onwards

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *
☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please complete the comments section as before.

Comment 2

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s:* 36

Section/Policy number:* 114

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *
☐ Support
☒ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Incorrect statement - The most favoured option by the public in the 2016 Refined Housing Options consultation was “Approach 3: Focus growth on a new settlement at Winchfield”. Distorting facts will lead to loss of public confidence - Distorting facts will risk rejection of the plan by planning inspector. 59% voted for this option, therefore 2nd and 3rd preferences need not be considered.

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

Comment 3

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☐ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☒ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s:* 27

Section/Policy number:* 8.2

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?*

☐ Support
☐ Oppose
☒ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *
Options 2 to 5 (which include Murrell Green) are not in line with the results of the earlier public consultation in 2016. - The option chosen by the vast majority was for a new settlement at Winchfield of 3000+ houses (Option 6 in this current document). - The dispersal strategy was a secondary choice, not the primary choice so little weight should be accorded to it. - Winchfield could be re-examined as an initial site for 1,800 homes which would provide the scope for future expansion beyond this Local plan period should it be necessary.

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☑ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

Comment 4

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☑ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s: * 70

Section/Policy number: * 222 policy SC5

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *

☐ Support
☑ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Delete the 87 homes identified as required to be allocated for Hook in light of the > 60% expansion already underway. There is no basis for this number nor does the Draft Plan highlight the number of houses that make up the 3144 which have been approved in Greenfield or Brownfield sites. Housing in Hook has increased by 29.4% since 2011. See attached letter. Page 12 onwards. Information Hart District was reluctant to provide
when asked at the consultation day nor is it made available on the consultation paper. The attached letter provides the necessary breakdown.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?**

☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 5**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:** 48

**Section/Policy number:** 158 policy MG6

**Paragraph:** Click here to enter text.

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**

☒ Support
☐ Oppose
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:**

Support Local Gaps to maintain distinct communities- recognise high value of rights of way through local gaps. No development should take place North of Hook (Hook Garden Centre), preserving the gap as well as ensuring no further expansion into Greenfield sites. North of Hook is taking on 370 houses (70 Reading Road North and 300 on B3349 north of Sainsbury site). As per the attached letter, housing in Hook has increased by 29.4% since 2011. That is an additional 915 dwelling (see Appendix 1 of attached letter). 915 contributes 29% of 3144 houses approved since 2011. of 3144 houses approved since 2011 (see Appendix 1 of attached letter).
Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 6**

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s:* 37

Section/Policy number:* 118

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?*

☒ Support
☐ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Support decision not to have Urban Extensions- These were rejected in previous consultation- No school can be delivered with Urban Extensions- Developer contributions to infrastructure are fragmented with Urban Extensions.

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☒ Yes
☐ No
Comment 7

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s: * 33, 34

Section/Policy number: * 101, 103

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *
☐ Support
☒ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

The affordable housing uplift is arbitrary and not justified. - Affordable housing uplift now being claimed to be as a general and very large contingency figure. - Including a large contingency here will mandate the houses are built, quite possibly unnecessarily

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

Comment 8
Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☒ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s: * 93

Section/Policy number: * 313

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *

☐ Support
☒ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

It is accepted that Hook requires additional shops, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments, and hot food takeaway floorspace. But services required by Hook must be located in Hook, not in another separate settlement. The shops on the Hook Parade are ripe for detonation and not renovation.

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☐ Yes
☒ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

Equality monitoring questions – Please note that these fields are not mandatory.

The information that you provide below will help us identify which different demographic groups have engaged with this consultation.

How would you describe your ethnic group?

☐ White
☐ Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups
Asian or Asian British  
Black or Black British  
Other – please specify Click here to enter text.  
I would rather not answer

If White please complete:  
White British  
White Irish  
White Traveller (including Gypsy, Roma or Irish traveller)  
Other White background

If Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups please complete:  
White and Asian  
White and Black African  
White and Black Caribbean  
Other Mixed background

If Asian or Asian British please complete:  
Nepalese  
Bangladeshi  
Indian  
Pakistani  
Chinese  
Other Asian background

If Black or Black British please complete:  
African  
Caribbean  
Other Black background

Do you consider yourself to have a disability as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (2005)?
Definition: A person has a disability for the purposes of this Act if s/he has a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on her/his ability to carry out day-to-day activities.

Yes  
No  
Don’t know  
I would rather not answer

What is your gender?  
Male
Female
I would rather not answer

In which age category are you?
Under 18
18 – 24
25 – 34
35 – 44
45 – 54
55 – 64
65 – 74
75 +
I would rather not answer

Thank you for completing this form.

Please email this response to planningpolicy@hart.go.uk or send it to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.
Hart District Local Plan (Draft Local Plan 2011-2032)

The council and the councillors are NOT transparent in the information they have provided in the proposed local plan. The local plan lacks detail. Until such detail is available to all residents the Hart District Local Plan is NOT fit for consideration.

1. Simply put residents need to understand what makes up the 3144 number in detail (Appendix 1). District Councillor and employees present could NOT provide this information at Hook consultation day on 2nd of May.

2. Why has Hook been allocated a further 87 dwellings in addition to the already approved developments (see Appendix 1)

3. Clarity around why the chosen option of Winchfield is no longer in consideration?

What happened to Winchfield?

The consultation from 2015/16 clearly shows overwhelmingly the expansion at Winchfield was the most preferred option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach 1 Dispersal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Approach 1 Dispersal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Approach 1 Dispersal</td>
<td>28.83%</td>
<td>46.86%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 2 Extension</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Approach 2 Extension</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
<td>47.02%</td>
<td>40.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 3 Winchfield</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Approach 3 Winchfield</td>
<td>58.58%</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59% of the first preferences was for Approach 3 – Winchfield. It was clearly the most preferred option of the Hart District residents. If the democratic process was adopted and it should be followed through with approximately 2/3 of residents preferring the option over any other.

1 Refined Housing Options Consultation 2016 responses
Hart District Council has not provided any information to its resident as to why the overwhelmingly chosen option is not being taken to the next stages of planning.

**Not in Hook**

Hook as an area has taken on number of new developments in the last 3-4 years. Further 915 dwellings have been approved by Hart District Council (see Appendix 1)

Hook has roughly 3108\(^2\) dwelling this increase amounts approximate increase of 29.4% of houses since 2011 census (see Appendix 1).

In addition, there is the development Sainsbury site which was granted approval 3 years ago.

This increase is not in line with the population growth in UK. Population growth in UK is 0.8%\(^3\).

In addition, Hook is taking on 29.1% of the 3144 approved houses that makes up the Hart District Plan (see Appendix 1).

**Murrell Green and other Green Space development around Hook**

Winchfield will give approximately 2200 houses (by 2032) and a further 800 beyond 2032. Whereas Murrell Green will only give 1800\(^4\). Winchfield will deliver 400 more houses by 2032, compared to Murrell Green. These additional houses will limit or stop further expansion of Hook into the Greenspaces around North/North East of Hook. In addition, it might also stop expansion of other villages within Hart District.

In addition, there are number of brownfield sites within the boundaries of Hook under consideration. *(See total of planned developments in Appendix 1)*

**Amenities and essential services**

- B3349 – is already a congested, further 370 houses as well as Sainsbury will enter onto B3349. The B3349 will become unusable and traffic will get worse.
- B3349 – has had major accidents between Hook and Rotherwick (including a fatality) in the last 6 years. Ask of Hampshire roads to reduce the speed limit fell on deaf years.
- B3349 – has to be crossed by Hook Allotment users as well as walkers on a regular basis.
- A30 – likewise with Murrell Green and new developments in North East/Reading Road Hook will all have to use A30, B3349 and other artery roads to access the station, M3 and M4.

---

\(^2\) Hart claims that the 2011 Census shows the average in Hart is 2.5 per household, so this would be 3,108.

\(^3\)https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/articles/overviewoftheukpopulation/february2016

\(^4\) Draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2011-2032
- Murrell Green will send further 1800+ cars onto A30 heading towards Hook. As these houses will have to access station, M3 and M4.
- Then the other amenities – schools, dental practices, shops etc. Where are these going to be developed?
- Other infrastructure needs to support the unabated growth in housing
- Sewerage capacity needs to be increased all proposed new developments have to create holding tanks so as to not to place strain on the existing treatment plant

Hart District Local Plan should consider:

1. **Respect the views of its residents** and adopt the Approach to develop Winchfield (59% of first preferences in any other democratic process there will be NO need for a run-off or need to take into account 2nd or 3rd preferences).

2. **Developing Winchfield clearly creates a new community** that is not linked to Fleet, Hartley Wintney or Hook. Whereas Murrell Green becomes an extension to Hook.

3. If Murrell Green is the option, the shortfall of 400+ houses should be catered out of Winchfield (see Appendix 3) and no other villages should have to share the burden. After all 59% of the residents selected as the preferred option.

4. **Stop all further greenfield developments around Hook** for the foreseeable future (maybe beyond 2032).

5. **Brownfield sites should deliver the additional housing within the boundaries of Hook**, not expand into Greenspace around North/North East of Hook (Sites 111&294) or elsewhere. If the brownfield sites around Hook that are under consideration were to be developed it will increase the new dwellings being developed in Hook to (Appendix 2). Expansion on brownfield sites will mean Hook alone will expand by around 40+% (planned and proposed) from the last census in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50% of 865 is Converted</th>
<th>433</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% of 865 is Converted</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed increase in Total</th>
<th>Total New Housing</th>
<th>Planned and Potential Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% additional available brownfield sites (433) and approved expansion (915)</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% additional available brownfield sites (217) and approved expansion (915)</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 New Homes Sites Booklet January 2016
Hope Hart District Council starts to respect the resident’s views and opinions and not be swayed by rich builders and land owners.

Likewise Hart District Council should consider the development of brownfield sites instead of expand into greenspace.

Thanking You

Rebecca and Angelo Arulchelvam
Appendix 1 – Information provided by Hart District Council (Rob Leeson, Mike Morris and Brian Burchfield)

**Hart District Council** - Could not provide this information at the consultation days. Was ONLY made available when one had to send a detail table seeking the council to complete it with a deadline placed on receiving the data back.

### Proposed Office Conversions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence House</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa House</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D (HP)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantage House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Wimpey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Offices (2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rob Leeson’s Comments**

- Providence House 107 Yes 107
- Europa House 116 Yes 77 Note 77 included
- Building D (HP) 80 No
- Vantage House 15 No
- Taylor Wimpey 100 No
- Virgin Offices (2 & 3) 300 No

### New Dwellings already approved on greenfields sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East Hook</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Road</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ridge Farm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rob Leeson’s Comments**

- North East Hook 550 Yes 548 Note loss of 2 makes net 548
- Reading Road 70 Yes 70
- High Ridge Farm 60 Yes 60

### New Dwellings currently applied for by developers on Brownfield Sites in Hook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rawlings Site</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence House Site</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa House Site</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartley House Site</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke House Site</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in May 2017 Consultation</strong></td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rob Leeson’s Comments**

- Rawlings Site 110 No
- Providence House Site 101 No
- Europa House Site 71 No
- Bartley House Site 102 Yes 53 Note 53 known at time of cut-off
- Pembroke House Site 78 No Not clear what this refers to

### Total Household in Hook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rob Leeson’s Comments**

- Total Household in Hook 3108
- Proposed increase since 2011 29.4%

**Contribution to the 3144 houses (as per the diagram above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>915</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rob Leeson’s Comments**

- Total in May 2017 Consultation 915
- Contribution to the 3144 houses (as per the diagram above) 29.1%
Appendix 2 (additional brownfield sites under consideration by Hart District Council)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed office conversions</th>
<th>Potential Other Brownfield Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa House</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D (HP)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantage House</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Wimpey</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Offices (2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New dwellings already approved on greenfields sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ridge Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Dwellings currently being applied for by developers on Brownfield Sites in Hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rawlings Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartley House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke House Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 50% of 865 is Converted                                                          | 433                               |
| 25% of 865 is Converted                                                          | 217                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed increase in Total</th>
<th>Total New Housing</th>
<th>Planned and Potential Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% additional available brownfield sites (433) and approved expansion (915)</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% additional available brownfield sites (217) and approved expansion (915)</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix 3 – Winchfield

On Wednesday 24th of May at the Hook Village Meeting. Councillors Rob Leeson, Mike Morris and Brian Burchfield were represented the council.

At the meeting Brian Burchfield the main reason Winchfield could not be considered as it will not start yielding housing for another 10 years.

Therefore, the consultation in January 2016 indicated Winchfield would yield 2200 dwelling from 2018 to 2032. Average of 157 dwelling per year (2200/14).

Therefore in 2028 Winchfeld will start yielding, and for the next 4 years until 2032. Therefore, Winchfeild should be able to yield 600 houses.

“Hart District Local Plan (Draft Local Plan 2011-2032) should have 600 houses in Winchfield”, instead of the BIG ZERO.

Let’s all the communities take responsibility and share the burden.