

Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Reg16 Representations

June 2023

Representations that mention affordable housing site options are related to a recent consultation by English Rural for a rural exception site in Winchfield that can be found at [Winchfield \(englishrural.org.uk\)](http://englishrural.org.uk)

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
001	Richard Carr, Transport for London	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
002	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan
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.
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.
005	National Highways	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.
006	Alison Abley	Objects to the Neighbourhood Plan as it falls short of the number of affordable homes needed across the District.

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		Winchfield is no more precious than other areas. The Plan lacks specificity about housing delivery.
007	Sport England	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. 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.
008	Coal Authority	Confirm has no comments on the Neighbourhood Plan.
009	Gary Comerford	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan.
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
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.
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.

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
013	Crookham Village Parish Council	<p>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.</p>
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 co-ordinated 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>

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		Site allocations – note there are no new site allocations to comment on.
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.
016	Sarah Cramer and Petition	Opposed to the Local Plan. 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>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>Questions whether additional services will be provided to accommodate the increase in houses.</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

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		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.
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>
018	Hart District Council	Welcomes the changes that have incorporated following previous comments on the Neighbourhood Plan. Various comments requesting polices

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		and text are edited to ensure clarity and precision and references are up to date – including para’s 1.7,1.22, 3.12, 4.14, 5.23 – 5.26, Policy NE4 (Glossary), 5.65, Fig 5.10, Policy BE1 and BE2,
		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’.
		Policy NE2 Protection of Key Views – suggest some minor edits to the Policy.
		Policy NE3 Brenda Parker Way – query whether all the text is required in Policy.
		Policy NE5 Dark Skies – suggest adding a requirement for lighting assessments.
		Policy HE1 Heritage Assets – minor word changes proposed for clarification.
		Policy BE4 Development Design Considerations – suggest some rewording to avoid being overly restrictive.
		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.
019	Pearson Strategic Ltd	<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. 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</p>

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		<p>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 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>

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
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?</p> <p>Agree with comments about walking along Bagwell Lane and would welcome an alternative off road route.</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>
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>
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</p>

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
		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.