



WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

www.winchfield-pc.org.uk

Chairman • Meyrick Williams • Pepper Box, Sprats Hatch Lane, Winchfield, Hook, Hampshire RG27 8DD • Tel: 07980 660001
• e-mail: meyrick@csmw.co.uk

Clerk • Alison Ball • e-mail: winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com • Tel: 01256 397009

BY EMAIL

For the attention of Mr Andrew Ashcroft
c/o Hart District Council
Civic Offices
Harlington Way
Fleet
GU51 4AE

cc Mr Daniel Hawes, HDC

25th July 2023

Dear Mr Ashcroft,

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012 (as amended) Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for your Clarification Note of 6th July which was forwarded to Winchfield Parish Council by Hart District Council.

The Parish Council is grateful to you for your initial comments and appreciates your helpful suggestions and supportive feedback on content and layout.

The Parish Council's considered response to the points for clarification is below and addresses the points in the order raised. This is followed by a table which, for completeness, addresses all the Reg 16 Representations in numeric order with the summarised comments provided by Hart and an additional column which contains our updated responses.

We also appreciate the time-scale you propose and look forward to your Examination Report in due course.

Yours sincerely

O M Williams

Meyrick Williams
Chairman
cc Mr Daniel Hawes – Hart District Council

Point 1

Policy NE3

Our response to the Examiner's query on this policy also incorporates comments on the representations from Pearson Strategic Ltd/Kim Hull (Representations 19 and 24).

Winchfield Parish Council commissioned a specific Landscape Report on Brenda Parker Way in September 2022 and this appears as section 3 in the Evidence Base which accompanied the Plan at Reg 14 and Reg 16 consultations. Regrettably the Footnote relating to this report was missing from the Reg 16 version of the WNP. The report adds information covering nine factors and landscape quality details which are significant in defining the importance of this landscape corridor as 'high'.

Policy NE3 refers specifically to Brenda Parker Way and the need to safeguard this path, its historic landscape setting and ancient trees from future development. As noted by the representations from Pearson Strategic and Mr Hull the land to east and west of the path has previously been submitted to Hart District Council for assessment as land which would be developed should future planning permission be obtained. Winchfield Parish Council anticipates that the Hart Local Plan may, when reviewed, propose major development which will impact both Parishes of Hook and Winchfield and include this important path.

It is noted that the Landscape Report indicates that the landscape value and importance of the Brenda Parker Way warrants its own policy.

The first sentence of the policy designates the corridor. This is shown on Figure 5.8. It is considered important that where a policy has a geographical application, this should be shown on a map. However, it is accepted that this figure could be clearer. The pink dash line on Figure 5.8 shows the location of the corridor.

We accept Figure 5.8 requires further amendment; the corridor itself (the pink dash line) is the Brenda Parker Way. The grey/green shaded area alongside with the green dash line is to show the extent of the tree canopy. We accept this should be labelled "illustrative" and that the precise extent of the tree canopy should be determined at Masterplanning or planning application stage based on appropriate surveys and evidence.

The Parish boundary is shown in the legend by the solid black line.

If the Examiner considers it necessary, other legends could also be removed where they do not pertain to the Brenda Parker Way.

The second sentence of the policy could be moved to the supporting text if felt necessary.

The third sentence of the policy is important to retain. This is because having designated the corridor, the policy sets out what development may be appropriate in the corridor and its setting. The Landscape Report refers to the path and its setting. Setting is a well-established concept in planning, particularly referred to in the context of historic structures or features. Setting usually refers to the surroundings, in this case, of the Brenda Parker Way. Setting can evolve or change over time and is not just visual, but can be functional or, for

example, have a historic link or be in the way the path might be experienced. The Landscape Report references a number of qualities which include the ancient look and feel and a strong sense of enclosure in places. It also references character as one of those attributes. We have carefully considered the amendments to the policy wording put forward in representations, but consider that a reference solely to character is not sufficient and does not satisfactorily encompass the entirety of the very special distinctiveness of the path. We accept that setting can change over time and therefore accept that the setting of the path is not geographically defined at this point in time. We do however feel strongly that a reference to setting should be retained in the policy which we have tried to word positively.

Policy P&C1 is a more generic policy for public rights of way in the Parish which would allow, in certain circumstances, for the path to be re-routed to facilitate approved development or alternative provision made. Given the history, landscape and ecological importance of Brenda Parker Way as detailed in the evidence document and the anticipated future development potential of the land to either side of it Winchfield Parish Council feels strongly that Policy NE3 is necessary as a stand-alone policy. Policy NE3 safeguards the corridor; it would not prevent development, but ensures that any development safeguards this corridor which has high landscape and historic value and importance.

In Hart it is no longer possible to request the application of TPO status to ancient trees if no planning application has been made which might threaten their survival. We have seen examples in the parish of trees being damaged or felled prior to development applications being made, Winchfield Parish Council wishes to do all possible to prevent damage to, or the loss of, this historic path.

This is the current text in the Reg 16 version of the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan

Brenda Parker Way.

5.27. To the north west of the parish is a 'green lane', an ancient sunken footpath on the Winchfield / Hook Parish boundary. This path, a section of the Brenda Parker Way which is a part of the National Footpath Network has, for some years been a BOAT (Byway Open to All Traffic). The permitted use of wheeled vehicles has caused considerable damage to the path and the flora on either side. As the most historic path in the Parish there is significant evidence of rare and notable species of flora and the overhead canopy provided by the ancient trees is a vital wildlife corridor. Application is being made for this path to be classified as a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) and to reclassify the BOAT as a bridleway thereby restricting other uses which may cause further damage to this historic route.

Proposed additional text to become new para 5.28 and para 5.29

5.28. A world first project is currently underway mapping sunken lanes to analyse and understand their cultural value; the initial findings will be published by Natural England in 2023. This path is, in places, up to five metres wide although at times so sunken that adjacent fields are difficult to see. Land to the west is fenced and land to the east is newly fenced in part. The fence line runs behind the ancient trees that line this path which provides an important wildlife link between woodland habitats. The overhead canopy creates a strong

sense of enclosure contributing to the paths ancient look and feel which is distinctive in the parish. The definition of a landscape corridor extending to or beyond the current canopy line of these ancient trees would afford some protection to their roots.

5.29. To provide further protection to this important path Winchfield Parish Council is working with Hook Parish Council to safeguard the historical and biodiverse importance of the path and its setting which is defined as a landscape corridor in the Winchfield Landscape Character Assessment (April 2022) and in The Brenda Parker Way Landscape Report (September 2022). For the avoidance of doubt this plan does not make any formal designations within the Parish of Hook.

Policy NE3: Brenda Parker Way (existing policy, no change)

The Brenda Parker Way corridor as shown on Figure 5.8 has been designated to safeguard the ancient sunken path or 'green lane' which is part of Brenda Parker Way. This section of the long-distance path is a shared Parish boundary between Hook and Winchfield. Development which safeguards the Brenda Parker Way corridor and its setting will be supported.

Proposed actions:

1. Provide a replacement map to include the northern tip of the Parish boundary as requested by representations.
2. Amend the legend to include the green dash line which, on this aerial map, currently denotes the canopy line of the trees.
3. Add a notation to say that this canopy line is illustrative and that the actual extent of the corridor should be precisely defined based on evidence at any Master planning or planning application stage.
4. Add the hedge (unbroken green lines) symbol to the legend.
5. Add a footer 'See Appendix 'D', The Evidence Base, for The Brenda Parker Way Landscape Report

Point 2

At your suggestion Policy HE2 will be amended by changing the order of the paragraphs to read as follows:

Policy HE2: Non-designated Heritage Assets

In Winchfield the Non-designated Heritage Assets comprise:

- The Old School / The Old School House
- The Oast House
- The Grange
- Triangle Cottage

- The Memorial Tablet in St Mary's Church
- The Chase
- The Mural at Winchfield Station
- Cranfield Cottages
- The Winchfield Inn
- Winchfield Lodge
- The Barley Mow Public House.
- The Brickyard and Kiln

The significance of Non-designated Heritage Assets, including buildings, structures, features, archaeological sites, and gardens of local interest should be conserved where possible

Proposals for any works that effect the significance or lead to the loss of a Non-designated Heritage Asset must be supported by a proportionate analysis of the significance of the asset to enable a balanced judgement to be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss of significance to the Non-designated Heritage Asset.

Point 3

Representation #11 from the Fisk Family Trust.

It is noted that the representation agrees that Winchfield has a number of key views worthy of protection.

View #20 is, as described in Appendix A2, Winchfield's Key Views, the first sight of the rural nature of Winchfield arriving from Dogmersfield to the south into the Canal Conservation Area. The settlement of The Hurst lies behind this view of the pub, an iconic village welcome.

View #23 shows the rural scene between the two settlements of the Hurst and Winchfield Court as only glimpses of Winchfield Court, the Historic Workhouse, are available when the trees are in leaf.

Hungerford Farm, shown on the map relating to view 23 but not mentioned in any text and only just visible in the wide- angle picture, is owned by the Fisk family. Winchfield Parish Council is unclear from their representation why they are opposed to the inclusion of these two views. Winchfield is a rural village and most of the views as you travel around the village are of fields and farmland which are part of its intrinsic value as a 'place'.

Summary of all Reg 16 responses to Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan with Hart District Council and Winchfield Parish Council responses.

Updated in response to the clarifications requested by Mr Ashcroft (6th July 2023, Plan Review Examination Clarification Note)

Rep number	Name and Organisation	HDC Summary of Representation	WPC proposed action or response
001	Richard Carr, Transport for London	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan	No further action required
002	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan	No further action required
003	Louise Wright	Strongly object to the proposal. Current infrastructure cannot cope with new developments and no improvements have been made. Questions why such a large number of housing developments have to take place in Hart. There has been insufficient focus on brownfield sites which could be used. Moved to Fleet because of the countryside and with Winchfield built on will now be reliant on access to Caesars Camp which is protected as it is military land.	This appears to be a high level complaint about HDC Planning and does not have specific relevance to WNP
004	Bryan Whyatt	Notes the Plan only includes provision for 6 – 8 social houses. If the Plan is accepted the Council will not be able to build in this area and questions where future homes will go. Winchfield station will be under utilised and community assets generated by a new development will be lost. The Plan should not be adopted unless it has more housing in it.	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements
005	National Highways	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.	No further action required
006	Alison Abley	Objects to the Neighbourhood Plan as it falls short of the number of affordable homes needed across the District. Winchfield is no more precious than other areas. The Plan lacks specificity about housing delivery.	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements

007	Sport England	<p>Sets out a generic response setting out that it is essential that neighbourhood plans comply with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to paras 98 and 99. Reference is made to Sport England's role as a statutory consultee and in protecting playing fields and to Sport England guidance.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans can use up to date evidence prepared in support of Local Plans or where this does not exist then proportionate evidence should be prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan. Reference is also made to the need to ensure new developments are designed so that they provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.</p>	Should significant development take place WPC would strongly support the requirement for opportunities to be included which would promote and encourage healthy lifestyles and communities.
008	Coal Authority	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.	No further action required
009	Gary Comerford	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan.	No further action required
010	Dave Ramm	Supports attempts to deliver a permissive footpath to divert walkers off Bagwell Lane and highlights the history of the Three Castles Path. Would also like an off-road path link from Winchfield FP3 to FP6 in the Neighbourhood Plan	Will continue to pursue any opportunity to achieve this outcome
011	Trustees of Fisk Family Trust	Policy NE2 Protection of Key Views – support the protection of key views but oppose the inclusion of views 20 and 23. Comment generally that although there are a number of key views that should be protected many of the proposed views are across farmland with little merit.	Key Views Document, Appendix A2, provides clarity on the importance of each view. Winchfield is a rural village, the majority of which is indeed farm land. Please see point 3 in the response which precedes this table
012	Paul Jackaman	Policy BE1 New Development – identifies that there is no specific reference to sustainable development in the Policy despite being linked to Objective 3. Suggests additional reference is added and notes that between pages 69 and 77 'sustainability' is only mentioned twice.	Sustainable development is fully supported in various terminologies throughout the Plan.
013	Crookham Village Parish Council	Suggest that the Plan makes it clear that Winchfield do not want to share the pain of new development felt by other areas. Questions the claim to be the 'green lung' of Hart and consider that the policies act as a barrier to any noticeable contribution to meeting the national housing shortage. Note that Winchfield is traversed by a motorway and has a railway station but has been spared any serious development. The Plan as proposed should not be 'made' as it is mostly designed to 'thwart' future housing development.	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements and would welcome a small development on PDL should such land become available.

014	Thames Water	<p>Section 7.47 to 7.48 Water. Waste water and water efficiency – support these sections in principle but consider that they could be improved. Note that water/wastewater infrastructure is essential to any development and a key sustainability objective should be for new development to be coordinated with the infrastructure it demands. Developers and local authorities are encouraged to engage with Thames Water at an early stage in the development process.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should seek to ensure there is adequate waste water (and water supply) infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>Suggested new water/wastewater infrastructure Policy/text is proposed</p> <p>Section 7.43 to 7.45 Flooding – note that the NPPG requires a sequential approach in areas known to be at risk of flooding, It is important to recognise that water or sewerage infrastructure may be required within areas at risk of flooding and this should be recognised in flood risk sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Recognise it is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system and therefore support para 7.45 in this respect.</p> <p>Site allocations – note there are no new site allocations to comment on.</p>	The comments are noted however the Plan does not propose any development. The existing text aims to provide proportionate guidance.
015	National Gas Transmission	Owns and operates the high pressure gas transition system across the UK. Identifies that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	No further action required
016	Sarah Cramer and Petition	<p>Opposed to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The number of respondents to the survey was low for a plan to be agreed. Only 35 people have responded. The need for a Neighbourhood Plan was based on a survey stating that 6-8 social housing residencies are required. Plan is unclear whether residents from surrounding villages may be eligible – this does not meet the criteria of the survey.</p> <p>Policy BE1 New Development – concerned about potential expansion of the settlement boundary to Shapley Grange, House and Lodge without discussion with residents. It is not clear if it is proposed to make Shapley a settlement.</p> <p>Local residents are opposed to any development in the area Shapley House, Shapley Grange or Shapley Lodge area – a petition signed by 24 people has been submitted – see below.</p> <p>Questions why the two sites being proposed outside the Neighbourhood Plan process are not included.</p>	<p>No decision on an RES site has been made. The development of a RES site is supported in Policy BE2 but final decisions are beyond the scope of this Plan.</p> <p>Public responses to a possible RES will be welcomed and addressed at the Engagement meeting in July.</p> <p>There is no existing Settlement Boundary at Shapley and one has not been defined at Reg 16 Consultation.</p>

		<p>Questions whether additional services will be provided to accommodate the increase in houses.</p> <p>Petition – petition against the proposal for affordable rented housing in Option 1 sets out 8 grounds of objection including object to the inclusion of an element of market housing, lack of nature surveys and the need for replacement of loss of habitat. The focus should be on brownfield land and is not needed to meet the 5 Year housing land supply, concerns about waste, sewage and flooding and access issues and disruption to existing residents. The petition includes copies of comments residents have made to the proposed affordable housing development.</p>	
017	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<p>The MOD has an interest within the area covered by the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan as it contains areas that are washed over by safeguarding zones that are designated to preserve the operation and capability of defence assets and sites. RAF Odiham benefits from safeguarding zones drawn to preserve the airspace above and surrounding the aerodrome to ensure that development does not form a physical obstruction to the safe operation of aircraft using that aerodrome. Additionally, RAF Odiham is washed over by a statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone, designed for birdstrike risk to be identified and mitigated.</p> <p>The MOD should be consulted within the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan of any potential development within the statutory technical safeguarding zones that surround RAF Odiham which consists of structures or buildings exceeding statutory safeguarding technical criteria, or any development in the statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone surrounding RAF Odiham which includes schemes that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation in order that appropriate assessments can be carried out and, where necessary, requests for required conditions or objections be communicated.</p>	MoD requirements noted and would be addressed in development proposals
018	Hart District Council	<p>Welcomes the changes that have incorporated following previous comments on the Neighbourhood Plan. Suggested text changes are addressed below.</p>	<p>Typos, missing para and page numbers will be corrected.</p> <p>WPC has carefully reviewed the Reg 16 suggestions and observations relating to the referenced paragraphs and will amend as shown.</p>
		Para 1.7	Add the words 'as shown on map 1 above' and also add 'Figure 1.1' to the map of the Parish,

		Para 1.22	Para 1.22 Typo will be corrected
		Para 3.12	Para 3.12 Typo will be corrected
		Para 4.14. Objective #7 refers to traffic management and rural criminality.	Para 4.14 Clearly states the purpose and status of this objective and recognises it is not a development and use of land matter, but it is nonetheless important to capture the totality of the community's objectives for the Parish and its Neighbourhood Plan.
		Policy NE1 Landscape Character Suggest some edits and re-ordering of the policy for clarity and to avoid repetition and questions the use of 'retains and reinforces'.	<p>As suggested a map will be provided to show the six defined landscape areas and the policy will include a footnote to indicate that the maps of settlement boundaries can be found at Figures 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3</p> <p>The edits to the policy will be made as suggested and the amended policy is shown here:</p> <p>Policy NE1: Landscape Character.</p> <p>Development should respect the key characteristics of the landscape character areas identified and described in the Winchfield Landscape Character Assessment. Development will be permitted where it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Respects and where possible reinforces the key characteristics of the parish, having regard to the relevant landscape character area description, b) is designed and sited to harmonise with the existing landscape, and c) provides landscape impact mitigation measures as part of the proposal where needed. d) can be accommodated in the existing landscape without having an unacceptable impact, by reason of height, scale, materials, siting, and location, e) avoids physical and visual coalescence with the neighbouring settlements of Fleet, Hook, Hartley Wintney and Dogmersfield. <p>Proposals for new development or change in the use of land outside the defined settlement boundaries of Winchfield Court, Winchfield Hurst and Beauclerk Green should be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal that demonstrates how the proposal meets the criteria 'a' to 'e' above.</p> <p>New Footnote: The maps of settlement boundaries can be found at Figures 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3</p>

		Paras 5.23 – 5.26. Coalescence with neighbouring parishes	Paras 5.23 -5.26 will, as suggested, be moved to become 5.17 – 5.20 to improve legibility of the plan.
		Policy NE2 Protection of Key Views Suggest some minor edits to the Policy.	<p>Suggested legibility improvements will be actioned and additional maps, references and footnotes supplied. The wording of the policy will be re-ordered and the amended policy is shown here:</p> <p>Policy NE2: Protection of Key Views</p> <p>Development proposals will not be supported which have an unacceptable impact on the characteristics of important views identified by Figure 5.5 and 5.6.</p> <p>Key views from public vantage points in Winchfield, as identified by Figure 5.5, will be retained and reinforced to maintain the attractiveness of distinctive views within the Parish.</p> <p>Proposals for development within the key views should be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal that demonstrates how the proposal will retain and reinforce the view(s).</p>
		Policy NE3 Brenda Parker Way – query whether all the text is required in Policy.	Please see Point 1 in the response which precedes this table.
		Policy NE4 (glossary definition additions)	The definitions for ‘major’ and ‘minor’ will be added to the glossary.
		Policy NE5 Dark Skies Suggest adding a requirement for lighting assessments. CPRE light pollution map, original source link needed	<p>As suggested the policy will be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Policy NE5: Dark Skies</p> <p>To maintain Winchfield’s Dark Skies a lighting assessment in support of proposals involving the installation of outdoor lighting will be required.</p> <p>All proposals involving the installation of outdoor lighting should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the minimum level necessary for the secure and safe operation of the development and b. minimize light spillage and glare (especially where the development is in the countryside or on the edge of a settlement) and c. not have an adverse impact upon highway safety, landscape character, biodiversity, or designated heritage assets. 19 <p>A link to the CPRE map will be provided.</p>

		Para 5.65	<p>Para 5.65 – as suggested the word ‘ecological’ will be added between ‘the’ and ‘integrity of the SPA.’</p> <p>The words ‘as set out in the Adopted Local Plan’ will be added to the end of the second paragraph.</p> <p>The error in the legend to figure 5.10 will be corrected.</p>
		Policy HE1. Heritage Assets. Minor word changes proposed for clarification.	<p>Additional wording as suggested will be added to HE1 to ensure conformity with HLP32.</p> <p>The footer which referenced the Appendix ‘D’, The Evidence Base, chapter 15, ‘Designated Heritage Assets’ has been lost in the Reg 16 version and will be reintroduced.</p> <p>Text will be added to para 6.38 to reference the map shown in Figure 6.3</p>
		Para 6.42. Non-designated Heritage Assets Request for locations to be shown on a map.	<p>The footer which referenced the Appendix ‘D’, The Evidence Base, chapter 16 ‘Non-designated Heritage Assets’ has been lost in the Reg 16 version and will be reintroduced. Comprehensive details about each asset are in this chapter.</p> <p>The locations of these assets are shown on Figure 6.3. Text will be added to para 6.41 to reference the map shown in Figure 6.3</p>
		Policies BE 1 and BE2 Text amendments for clarity.	<p>Policy BE1, As suggested the words ‘are expected to take place’ will be replaced with ‘will be supported’</p> <p>Policy BE2 The words ‘outside and in close proximity’ will be replaced with ‘adjoining or in close proximity to’</p> <p>This will ensure policy BE2 is in line with NPPF para 16d & 16e.</p>
		Policy BE4 Development Design Considerations Suggest some rewording to avoid being overly restrictive.	<p>It is considered that development of residential gardens would be inappropriate given the character of the local area. It is considered that the policy has regard to paragraph 71 of the NPPF. It is not necessary to refer to the national standards in criterion j.</p>

		<p>Policy BE5 Residential Parking Note that these exceed the proposed District Standards set out in the consultation SPD. Query whether the evidence is consistent with that in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Policy BE5 reflects the proposal in the draft Hart SPD that NPs may, in some circumstances, require parking standards which are specifically appropriate to rural rather than urban conditions.</p> <p>The supporting text for the policy sets out the local circumstances and makes reference to the criteria in para 107 of the NPPF. Furthermore this policy replicates a made NP policy that has been successfully operated.”</p>
		<p>Minor Plan Updates In addition to the actions stated above.</p>	<p>Post examination the plan will be amended to reflect Examiners modifications. The Introduction, Foreword and paragraphs relating to plan stages and time lines will be updated.</p>
019	Pearson Strategic Ltd	<p>Policy NE3 Brenda Parker Way, paragraphs 5.27 to 5.28 and Figure 5.8.</p> <p>Note that the background to these representations is the promotion of Shapley Heath, a new settlement within the Parishes of Winchfield and Hook and identified in the Submission version of the Hart Local Plan but removed as a result of the Local Plan examination. Notes that the WNP recognises that is review is based on the possibility of Shapley Heath being reconsidered in the future.</p> <p>Figure 5.8 – suggests that the map is currently cropped and should be amended to show the whole route and proposes other amendments to this Figure for clarity including identification of the corridor in the key.</p> <p>Consider that a precise delineation of a corridor to the east of Brenda Parker Way to delineate a safeguarding zone to mitigate the impact of any future development on this feature can only really take place at planning application stage, when a proposal has been presented and is being assessed/evaluated in the round. Up until that point the establishment of an objective in Policy NE3 is reasonable but attempting to delineate with precision is not. Any map-based delineation should be clearly identified as illustrative. Are content with the boundary as drawn on Figure 5.8, but it should be labelled as illustrative if it is retained.</p> <p>Suggest it may be the case that the examiner determines that safeguarding of Brenda Parker Way should only be expressed in terms of a planning objective, without recourse to the mapping of an illustrative corridor.</p>	<p>The Plan will be amended to reflect the most up to date position and the outcome of the Examiners modifications.</p> <p>Please see Point 1 in the response which precedes this table.</p>

		<p>Policy NE3 – query interpretation of the Policy. Suggest removal of the second sentence and rewording of the remainder including for example to make clear that it is the ‘character’ of Brenda Parker Way that needs to be considered.</p> <p>Conclude that if there is to be a corridor, it should be made clear that the boundary is illustrative and additions should be made to the key. Policy NE3 can achieve its objectives without any indicative safeguarding corridor being identified on a plan The actual wording of Policy NE3 needs to be streamlined/refined so that it retains its focus on BPW itself (as per the Regulation 14 wording).</p>	
020	North East Hants Ramblers	<p>Consider the Plan well written and well thought through. Would support any proposal to downgrade Hook Byway 1 to a bridleway or even a footpath. Question whether para 8.6 is discussing Three Castles Path? Agree with comments about walking along Bagwell Lane and would welcome an alternative off road route.</p>	<p>Three Castles Path is another national long distance path, part of which is the same route as Brenda Parker Way. Para 8.6 will be amended to reflect this and an additional footnote will be added for clarity.</p>
021	Michael Odell	<p>Opposing the option for Site 1 in Shapley. There has been a previous refusal and concerns include traffic safety issues, drainage, impact on biodiversity and difficult pedestrian access.</p>	<p>No decision on an RES site has been made. The development of a RES site is supported in Policy BE2 but final decisions are beyond the scope of this Plan.</p> <p>Public responses to a possible RES will be welcomed and addressed at the Engagement meeting in July.</p>
022	Network Rail	<p>Notes that the Neighbourhood Plan identifies a settlement boundary around Beauclerk Green/Station Road. The proximity of this settlement, and potential for additional development within this, to the rail network will require consultation with Network Rail. Consider that this could provide an opportunity to secure improvements to the rail network and its surrounds to aid current and future residents.</p> <p>Reference to the potential for securing access improvements could be made within existing Policy P&C1. However, would also encourage a standalone Policy that highlights local transport issues and improvements, especially in the context of the rail station. By doing so, this could cover a suite of possible improvements to benefit residents and users of the station and Network Rail could work with residents and the Neighbourhood Plan to secure these.</p>	<p>Noted but no action required</p>

023	Hampshire County Council, Public Health	<p>Note the reduction in travel to work by bicycle or foot between 2011 and 2021 and consider this concerning as it is not consistent with the local area's aims around climate change, sustainability, and physical activity.</p> <p>Recommend specific reference to active travel within the plan (e.g., in relation to car parking, paths, and housing), and include any specific actions to address the drop in journeys by bicycle or on foot detailed in paragraph 7.55.</p>	Noted and would be addressed in development proposals.
024	Kim Hull	<p>Policy NE3 Brenda Parker Way, paragraphs 5.27 to 5.28 and Figure 5.8. Note that the background to these representations is the promotion of Shapley Heath, a new settlement within the Parishes of Winchfield and Hook and identified in the Submission version of the Hart Local Plan but removed as a result of the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>Notes that the WNP recognises that its review is based on the possibility of Shapley Heath being reconsidered in the future.</p> <p>Figure 5.8 – suggests that the map is currently cropped and should be amended to show the whole route and proposes other amendments to this Figure for clarity including identification of the corridor in the key.</p> <p>Consider that a precise delineation of a corridor to the east of Brenda Parker Way to delineate a safeguarding zone to mitigate the impact of any future development on this feature can only really take place at planning application stage, when a proposal has been presented and is being assessed/evaluated in the round. Up until that point the establishment of an objective in Policy NE3 is reasonable but attempting to delineate with precision is not. Any map-based delineation should be clearly identified as illustrative. Are content with the boundary as drawn on Figure 5.8, but it should be labelled as illustrative if it is retained.</p> <p>Suggest it may be the case that the examiner determines that safeguarding of Brenda Parker Way should only be expressed in terms of a planning objective, without recourse to the mapping of an illustrative corridor.</p> <p>Policy NE3 – query interpretation of the Policy. Suggest removal of the second sentence and rewording of the remainder including for example to make clear that it is the 'character' of Brenda Parker Way that needs to be considered.</p> <p>Conclude that if there is to be a corridor, it should be made clear that the boundary is illustrative and additions should be made</p>	<p>This representation is a near duplicate of 019 from Pearson Strategic. As these two respondents are owners of the land adjacent to or on which this footpath is located at the Winchfield Parish Boundary. WPC will make every effort to work with land owners and Hook Parish Council to achieve an acceptable outcome for all parties.</p> <p>Please see Point 1 in the response which precedes this table.</p>

		to the key. Policy NE3 can achieve its objectives without any indicative safeguarding corridor being identified on a plan The actual wording of Policy NE3 needs to be streamlined/refined so that it retains its focus on BPW itself (as per the Regulation 14 wording).	
025	Natural England	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan	Noted but no action required