

## Hart District Council Comments on the Regulation 16 Submission Fleet Neighbourhood Plan, March 2019

Hart District Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan: Submission version (the Plan) and the Council's comments, as local planning authority (LPA), are set out in the table below. We recognise that the Plan has been prepared within the context of an evolving Local Plan and also national policy and would therefore commend the Town Council on its progress.

The Council is landowner of some sites affected by policies in the Submission Neighbourhood Plan and these relate to Policy 1 Fleet Civic Quarter Zone and Policy 12 in the context that it may relate to Bramshot Farm. A separate letter is submitted setting out comments made by the Council as landowner.

### Local Planning Authority (LPA) Comments

#### General note:

There is a need to help secure drafting consistencies throughout the Plan. There are instances throughout the Plan where different terminology is being used for the same thing and there are also Policy compliance tests included without any supporting information as to how an applicant for planning permission, or the decision maker, should view those tests.

Planning policies should:

- Relate to development and use of land
- Be based on relevant robust evidence (not just public opinion)
- Be locally distinctive and add value
- Not be unduly onerous (i.e. stifling development)

Furthermore, every Policy has to be clearly written with no ambiguity, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals (NPPF 2012 para 42, or NPPF 2018 para 16).

The Fleet Neighbourhood Plan contains frequent mention of "proposals that include the loss of [sometimes referred to as "mature" trees or front garden trees] and hedgerows will not be supported". The issue for the decision-maker is that save for exceptional circumstances no tree and in all cases no hedgerow is subject to planning control.

Fleet Town Council contest this as the NFCA derivation regarding front boundary treatment includes "hedges".

Within a design context such features can make a significant contribution to character and amenity and it should be clear to a decision maker that it is in these circumstances that they should be considered in a planning policy context and the LPA would ask that this is reflected in any policy wording.

Throughout the Neighborhood Plan there is frequent mention in the context of development being required to "conserve and enhance" the character of the area particular in the context of Conservation Areas. In the first instance it is not practical to achieve both within the same context but, the statutory test is to "preserve or enhance" the special architectural or historic interest, and the character or appearance of the area (Section 69 of The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act). In this regard Policies in the NPPF are not aligned with statute in circumstances where statute should remain paramount.

The LPA requests that the Neighborhood Plan is adjusted accordingly.

Paragraph /Page No	Changes Requested	Reason	FTC Comments
General	For clarity it would be helpful to be consistent with formatting for example, the map on page 23 identifies the sub-zones in capital letters but lower case letters throughout the policies. There is also a mixture of methods used to define lists within policies, for example numbers, Roman numerals or bullet points		Proposed to amend the map at page 23 so all references are in lower case
Page 2 (3 <sup>rd</sup> para)	It is recommended that rather than referring to "Development Control" the appropriate terminology "Development Management" is used.	This would be consistent with national terminology	Agree to amend
1.8	"... The District Council anticipates that the new Local Plan will be adopted <del>by the end of 2018</del> <b>in 2019</b> and hence the Town Council is mindful that this new Local Plan is likely to replace the saved policies of the Hart District Local Plan ahead <del>of or soon</del> after the examination of the neighbourhood plan".	Update	Accept it is the latest position, this is a moving target
1.11	"The HLPSS <del>2016-2032</del> also highlighted (at paragraphs 106-7) that Hart District might be obliged to take some of the "overspill" new homes from Surrey Heath and that Hart's housing needs might have to be further revised, given the changes proposed by Government to the methodology for assessing housing need which are not intended to be finalised until <u>mid2019</u> " <del>late in 2018.</del> "	Firstly, for consistency (elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan the Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites is simply referred to as "HLPSS") and the second change represents an update on the stage the HLPSS has reached.	Title should be in full at the first reference and the same acronym should be used thereafter - accepted
1.19	Policy SS2 Hartland Village' (ex. Pyestock) on which <del>outline consent</del> <b>a hybrid planning permission (part full, part outline)</b> has been granted, lies within the Neighbourhood Plan Boundary. The <del>consent planning permission</del> includes proposals for 1500 homes with associated social/community infrastructure, open space and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) mitigation. <del>In resolving to grant planning permission for this site,</del> The planning conditions require a comprehensive approach to development which demonstrates	To reflect the position that planning permission was granted in July 2018	Accept proposed amendment.

	<p>how the development will integrate with and complement its surroundings. These include measures to connect the site to Fleet Town Centre. It is likely that many new residents of Hartland Village will look to Fleet Town Centre, rail station and other services, to meet their day to day needs, which is why improved connections and sustainable travel options should be encouraged to reduce pressure on the local highway network. The key objective of the neighbourhood plan to enhance the retail and cultural offer of Fleet Town Centre by improving its attractiveness and accessibility therefore has additional significance set against retail competition from other centres.”</p>		
1.40	<p>“The North Fleet Conservation Area designated under the provisions of Section 69 of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation areas) Act 1990 requires the Local Planning Authority to preserve <b>or and</b> enhance the special architectural and historic character <b>or and</b> appearance of the designated area. Areas within and on the perimeter of the area have been affected by modern higher density developments and it is now ever more important to preserve and enhance the special character of the area and protect its historic significance to the character of Fleet Town.”</p>	To ensure consistency with the Act.	Accept amendment.
1.42	<p>The conservation area provides contrasting areas of residential development, some of it laid out in a grid pattern, and some set to either side of gently curving roads. Historic maps confirm that few buildings remain of pre-1846 date, or even of 1890. The majority of the buildings appear to therefore date to between 1890 and 1922, or even later, with several streets not being completed until the 1930s. However, the spacious plots, with the mainly detached houses set back from the road behind mature trees and other planting, provide the defining feature of the conservation</p>	To better reflect the adopted Conservation Area appraisal.	Accept proposed addition.

	area. It is this sylvan quality, allied to some unmade roads, grass verges, and (in places) undulating topography, which gives the conservation area its special character <b><u>albeit there is some established development which is of merit dating from late C19th and early C20th up to the 1940's</u></b>		
1.6.3	...These now form part of this I Submission Plan.	Typo	Accept
Pages 20 & 23	Policies Map – the whole length of Harlington Way should be included within Zone 1 and Zone 1A.	Visually and functionally the omitted stretch of Harlington Way is part of Zone 1	Agreed, plan can be amended.
2.12	In its Saved Local Plan Policy F1, Hart District Council outlines the commitment “to support Fleet's position as the District's principal shopping centre by concentrating principal retail uses along Fleet Road, encouraging a mix of uses in order to maintain the centre's vitality and securing environmental quality. Where appropriate, landscaping schemes will be encouraged in association with new developments in order to enhance the attractiveness of the town centre”. <b><u>Policy ED5 of HLPSS also outlines the commitment to Fleet Town Centre; “Fleet town centre will be the main focus for future town centre development in the District. As set out in Policy ED4, there is capacity for additional retail floorspace (Class A uses) to be located within Fleet town centre over the plan period.”</u></b> Within that context, our Neighbourhood Plan seeks to identify the areas that are available to make a difference to our town.	Recommend including reference to the HLPSS.	The Town council has an issue with accepting the inclusion of a reference to ED4 of the HLPSS. This policy relies on old, out of date evidence and counters later more relevant evidence from the Grimsey Report and the Timpson Report that the town centre should no longer focus solely on retail development
2.22	“The policies support proposals for new development or the improvement of existing premises provided that they meet the <b><u>objectives criterion set out outlined below above....</u></b> ”	It is not clear what “objectives” are being referred to? Policy 1 contains matters that are better described as “criterion”	Accepted.
Policy 1 Fleet Civic Quarter Zone 1	The Council’s concern is that the Policy as written allows for no flexibility which could unintentionally stifle potential		– accept that the Policy title should be Zone 1a. We need to seek additional clarification from the

	<p>redevelopment of the site and does not recognise that there may be relocation of existing uses elsewhere. We would therefore suggest that the Policy be reworded as follows to allow for flexibility in uses when certain conditions are met. Some specific points: Title – should this be Zone 1A not Zone 1? We have suggested deletion of 2ii as this does not seem relevant to Zone 1A which does not include open space or The Views. We have suggested that the need to ensure there is no loss of public parking provision should apply across the town centre rather than just to Zone 1A as this restricts potential redevelopment opportunities across this site. Suggested revised wording: <b>Development proposals within Zone 1A as identified in the policies area map below, and currently occupied by the Gurkha Square public car park, the Hart District Council Offices, The Harlington, Fleet Library, and Victoria Road public car park, will be supported where:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>It is consistent with a comprehensive master plan for the whole site;</u></b> 2. <b><u>It will not result in an overall loss of public parking</u></b></li> <li>2. <b><u>provision within the town centre;</u></b></li> <li>3. <b><u>Building uses and layouts have regard to the general design principles set out in Policy 10 and are designed to provide positive enclosure and oversight of the public realm with active frontages which contribute to the vibrancy of the area;</u></b></li> <li>4. <b><u>Having regard to local topography, any buildings located adjacent to The Views are appropriate in layout, scale and massing. Development proposals that</u></b></li> </ol>		<p>Following discussions with the District Council we are prepared to accept the majority of the proposed amendments, but question</p> <p>1) why additional criteria are applied to developments adjacent to the Views. This part of the site will be developed along with the overall development plan and be subject to normal planning scrutiny along with the rest of the development area. We see no need to single out this specific area.</p> <p>2) If additional criterion iv means that provision of any of the facilities “in i-iii above” means provision within Zone 1a or anywhere within the town centre. This can have a significant impact on the intention of the policy which aims to focus public services in one area to maximise the interaction between the service and create a community focal point to the town centre.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p><u>would not provide for the following uses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>a performance/civic centre</u></li> <li>ii. <u>a library</u></li> <li>iii. <u>facilities to accommodate Hart District Council and Fleet Town Council civic functions will only be supported if it is demonstrated that:</u></li> <li>iv. <u>a suitable replacement facility of a similar or improved nature is provided for the uses specified in criteria i.-iii. above; or</u></li> <li>v. <u>the existing premises/use are no longer required.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Alternative town centre uses will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they support the vitality of the town centre, and are justified to ensure the viable redevelopment of the site</u></p>		
2.23	<p>This policy sets a framework for the future redevelopment of the area defined as the “Civic Quarter” which includes the Hart District Council offices, The Harlington and the Fleet Library buildings. It also includes <b>two public car parks</b> <del>open space uses: Gurkha Square and Victoria Road, which is currently a parking area; an “at grade” car park accessed off Victoria Road and ‘The Views’ proposed as a Local</del></p>	<p>The Views is not within land covered by Policy land Gurkha Square and Victoria Road are both public car park</p>	<p>Comment accepted</p>
2.27	<p>The layout and scale of development are not fixed by the policies as these will be tested and agreed through subsequent design work. However, it will be necessary to demonstrate the landowners’ support for the framework and for further consultation to be carried out. <del>This should be encouraged and should happen alongside the Neighbourhood Planning process.</del></p>	<p>It is not clear what the propose of the latter part of this paragraph is to serve?</p>	<p>Comment accepted</p>
2.30	<p>“It <b>also</b> supports Hart District Council’s Local Plan Saved Policy F1 which outlines a commitment to</p>	<p>Recommend including reference to the draft HLPSS.</p>	<p>Comment accepted</p>

	<p>encourage “a mix of uses in order to maintain the centre’s vitality and securing environmental quality” adding that “where appropriate landscaping schemes will be encouraged in association with new developments in order to enhance the attractiveness of the town centre”. <b><u>It also supports draft Policy ED5 of HLPSS.</u></b> This approach is entirely in line with the Grimsey Review 2 (July 2018) conclusions which highlight the need to reshape town centres into community hubs which incorporate health, housing, arts, education, entertainment, leisure, business/office space, as well as some shops, while developing a unique selling proposition.”</p>		
2.31	<p>“The opportunity to create the Civic Quarter will be through collaboration between Hart District Council, Hampshire County Council and Fleet Town Council, <del>the three main land owners</del>. Hart District Council <del>owns</del> and currently occupy the Civic Offices adjacent to Harlington Way <b><u>as well as the Gurkha Square and Victoria Road public car parks.</u></b> Fleet Town Council owns the land occupied by the War Memorial in Gurkha Square. Hampshire County Council <del>owns</del> the land and building forming Fleet Library immediately adjacent to Gurkha Square. The Harlington, which includes a performance space and accommodates a number of community uses, is owned by Hart District Council <del>and has been leased to Fleet Town Council.</del>”</p>	<p>For accuracy and to improve clarity. Fleet Town Council also has no lease on The Harlington.</p>	<p>We would propose the following amendment: “The opportunity to create the Civic Quarter will be through collaboration between Hart District Council, Hampshire County Council and Fleet Town Council. Hart District Council owns and currently occupies the Civic Offices adjacent to Harlington Way as well as the Gurkha Square and Victoria Road public car parks. Fleet Town Council owns the land occupied by the War Memorial in Gurkha Square and that part of Harlington Way within Zone 1a. Hampshire County Council owns the land and building forming Fleet Library immediately adjacent to Gurkha Square. The Harlington, which includes a performance space and accommodates a number of community uses, is owned by Hart District Council, but managed by Fleet Town Council.</p>
Page 24	<p>Policy 2 - Land between Victoria Road &amp; Gurkha Square (Zone <del>1a</del> <b>1b</b>) The development of the land fronting onto Fleet Road between Victoria Road and Gurkha Square, as identified in the policy</p>	<p>The refence to “<i>suitable</i>” town centre uses introduces unnecessary ambiguity. The Policy creates further ambiguity through reference to ancillary areas that will “<i>contribute to the function,</i></p>	<p>Following clarification from the District Council we accept the proposed amendment as development of Zone 1a</p>

	<p>Zone 1 Policies Areas map (page 23), for <b>suitable</b> town centre uses will be supported <del>provided that any development to the rear of the retail frontages including the existing residential dwellings, servicing, parking and ancillary areas will contribute to the function, use and environment of the civic quarter as proposed in Policy 1</del></p>	<p><i>use and environment of the civic quarter as proposed in Policy 1</i>" There is however, no indication as to what such uses may comprise and paragraph 2.35 is silent on how the decision- maker should react to such a requirement. Secondly, ambiguity is reinforced through the link to Policy 1 (which should be read as a standalone basis – para2.26) with no reference to how the decision maker should react to a development proposal that comes forward on Policy 2 in the absence of anything having been delivered or planned under the stand alone Policy 1.</p>	<p>cannot be relied upon to come ahead of development in the adjacent Zone 1 sub zones. The proposal is very bland and allows any town centre use to come forward</p>
<p>Policy 3 (page 25)</p>	<p>Land on the corner of Reading Road North &amp; Fleet Road (Zone 1eC) The comprehensive redevelopment of land on the junction of Reading Road North and Fleet Road, as identified as Zone 1eC on the policies area map, will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the built form, massing and scale create a strong corner that contributes to the function of this area as key gateway to the town (up to a maximum of four storeys for new development);</li> <li>ii. <b>town centre</b> uses are proposed <del>compatible with Policy 1 and</del> which include retail at ground level (predominantly A1 and A2) with residential or commercial above; iii The policy supports a layout that improves pedestrian access and connections to <del>a Town Square and</del> the town centre, with consideration given to traffic flow and safe pedestrian crossings at road junctions; <del>and iv. the character of the development is in keeping with the overall character of the Civic Quarter and Layout and uses will contribute to the commercial, civic and cultural activities of the Civic Quarter – 2</del></li> </ul>	<p>The concern is that in the absence of any effect having been given to Policy 1 (what happens if Policy 1 is never implemented) the decision maker has no idea how to responds to criteria iii. or iv. In effect, the latter criteria are in danger of stifling any potential development opportunity. There is also ambiguity in the second criterion with reference to uses <i>"compatible with Policy 1.</i> To be effective the Policy should be adjusted to refer to town centre uses.</p>	<p>Again the suggested amendment is accepted so that the Policy stands alone and is not longer conditional on any development within Zone 1a.</p> <p>Condition iv should be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy 4 – Land off Harlington Way (Zone</p>	<p>"Redevelopment of the two land parcels either side of the Harlington Way junction with Reading Road</p>	<p>The site lies outside the HLPSS defined Primary Shopping Area and whilst under Policy ED5 retail uses will be</p>	<p>Following discussion with the District Council it is acknowledged that any links</p>



<p>1d)</p>	<p>North as identified on the policy map will be supported provided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The built form, scale and massing create an appropriate gateway to the Civic Quarter and a positive relationship to the Campbell Place Extra Care housing,</li> <li>ii. 2.Layout and uses contribute to the commercial, civic and cultural activities of the Civic Quarter,</li> <li>iii. 3. Existing landscape and trees which contribute to the setting are retained, and</li> <li>iv. Active frontages are created to provide surveillance of the footpath/cycleway link from The Views to Calthorpe Park</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Subject to being in compliance with HLPSS Policies ED4 and ED5, Uses that are compatible with Policy 1 and include</u></b> retail at ground floor level (predominately A1 and A2 with residential or commercial above will be supported.”</p>	<p>supported, HLPSS Policy ED4 states that for “developments of main town centre uses on sites outside of designated centres, or sites that are not allocated for such uses, the sequential test must be applied unless they are located in the countryside and are for developments of less than 100 sqm”</p>	<p>to development with Zone 1a need to be removed.</p> <p>Some direction as to whether references to Policies within the Draft Local Plan should be introduced into the Neighbourhood Plan will be appreciated. The Neighbourhood Plan has been drafted on the basis of the current Local Plan, but it is acknowledged that time has moved on and the status of the Draft Local plan is more sound.</p>
<p>Policy 5 – Leisure and Night Time Economy – Fleet road between Upper Street &amp; the Oatsheaf crossroads (Zone 2) (Pages 26-27)</p>	<p><del>Proposals for change of use to Use Class A1, A3, A4 and A5 will be supported. Any change of use from Use Class A1-5 to other categories except C1, D1 and D2 which support the Civic Quarter proposals, will not be supported. Where appropriate, residential use above retail units will be supported, provided that the active frontage is not compromised and that satisfactory residential amenities can be achieved.</del></p> <p><b><u>Proposals for development within Use Classes A1-A5 or uses within Class C1, D2 and D3 will be permitted. The loss of ground floor A1-A5 Use Class uses will not be supported.</u></b></p>	<p>The issue with this Policy is that it relates to changes of use only but is silent on potential redevelopment proposals that may also come forward (e.g the recently permitted hotel development at 329 Fleet Road). Secondly, whatever the case A1 should be added to correct an apparent error in the Policy (A1 is allowed – see para 2.47). It is also not clear as to why A2 uses are excluded from the criteria. A2 uses are a main town center use which are allowed in Primary Shopping areas and therefore to exclude them on a peripheral area requires more explanation. The wording of this policy would allow residential on the ground floor. This would conflict with draft Policy ED5 of HLPSS, which looks to retain/promote the retail character of the area.</p>	<p>Proposed amendment acceptable subject to the substitution of the word supported for permitted.</p>

2.46	<p>This zone adjoins the Civic Quarter and should, therefore, be considered alongside the development of that area. Opportunities to provide “shared space” or “raised table” on Fleet Road within this area will be supported <b><u>subject to appropriate traffic studies, equalities impact assessment, and acceptance by the Local Highways Authority</u></b>, to provide pedestrian friendly entry to the Civic Quarter with gateway treatment at key locations.</p>	<p>The NPPF emphasizes the importance of prioritising walking and cycling and addressing the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. In response to concerns raised about shared space and navigability, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport in a letter to all Councils dated 18th September 2018 calling for a halt to all further shared space schemes that feature a level surface. The focus of the halt is on level-surface schemes in areas with relatively large amounts of pedestrian and vehicular movement, such as high streets and town centres. The reason for this is that experience has shown that blind, deaf-blind and partially-sighted people are excluded from such street layouts – such schemes are no inclusive or accessible for all.</p>	Proposed amendment accepted.
Policy 6 (page 27)	<p>Proposals for new or extended retail development in the <b><u>Core primary</u></b> shopping zone will be supported provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. They are <b><u>in conformity</u></b> aligned with other statutory, Local and Neighbourhood Plan policies</li> <li>ii. <b><u>Development proposals for a change of use from retail (A1)</u></b></li> <li>iii. <b><u>They do not harm the retail character of the zone; are for a main town centre use, which retains or provides an active frontage: have no significant adverse impact on surrounding amenity (noise, odour, waste collection, highways and parking); and enhance the character of the street scene.</u></b></li> <li>iv. There is no loss of an existing shop front of Heritage and Townscape Value identified in Policy 12,</li> <li>v. the design of the shop front or signage is in keeping with the character of the building and its surrounding shop frontages; and vi. access to upper floors is preserved where this already exists</li> </ul>	<p>To ensure consistency with the Policy title. The Policy as a whole is not consistent with its supporting text (para 2.51-2.55 Criterion i - the term “aligned” is both ambiguous and vague. Policies should be in “conformity...”</p> <p>Criterion ii – It would be better if this criterion were to more closely reflect HLPSS Policy ED5</p>	Suggested amendments accepted

	Development of the vacant land to the South East of Church Road carpark that contributes to the growth of this zone will be supported, so long as it respects the setting of the Grade II* listed Church. Proposals for uses outside A1-5 or C1, D1 and D2, will not be supported unless they provide sufficient on-site parking to meet Hart District Council's Parking Guidance		
2.53	Reposition 2.53 after 2.55	To improve flow of paragraphs and aid understanding.	Accept the amendment.
Policy 9 – Fleet Road Public realm policy (Zone 6)	Development and redevelopment of the public realm within Fleet Town Centre will be supported provided that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. improves the movement of pedestrians and cyclists around the town centre;</li> <li>ii. promotes sustainable travel to the railway station;</li> <li>iii. improves pavements, signage and street furniture;</li> <li>iv. 'Greens' Fleet Road by the addition of street trees and soft landscaping as well as <b>Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS)</b> where appropriate; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. fosters active frontages such as shop or office windows and doors at ground level. <del>and,</del> Proposals for the creation of "shared space" or a "raised table" on Fleet Road to enhance the setting of Gurkha Square will be supported, subject to appropriate traffic studies, <b>equalities impact assessment</b>, and acceptance by the Local Highways Authority.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The NPPF emphasizes the importance of prioritising walking and cycling and addressing the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility. In response to concerns raised about shared space and navigability, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport in a letter to all Councils dated 18th September 2018 calling for a halt to all further shared space schemes that feature a level surface. The focus of the halt is on level- surface schemes in areas with relatively large amounts of pedestrian and vehicular movement, such as high streets and town centres. The reason for this is that experience has shown that blind, deaf-blind and partially- sighted people are excluded from such street layouts – such schemes are no inclusive or accessible for all.	Accept the amendment.
2.60	The Hampshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2031) produced by Hampshire County Council provides the long term framework for transport policies within the District. The Plan seeks to improve accessibility	To provide greater clarity regarding the role of SUDS.	Accept the amendment.

	<p>through the three initiatives to reduce, manage and invest. Hampshire Manual for Streets Guidance, and the movement hierarchy therein, should be used to guide the design of the streetscape and public realm in Fleet Town Centre. <b>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)</b> can be an effective means of adding greenery, biodiversity and amenity into cramped urban areas and should be considered where possible. <b><u>SUDS also help manage surface water runoff sustainably.</u></b></p>		
Policy 10 General Design	<p>V. Development shall seek to retain existing mature hedging and established trees and to enhance landscaping including providing SUDS where appropriate to provide for biodiversity <b><u>and also to help manage surface water runoff sustainably.</u></b> Where loss of significant amenity trees <del>or hedging</del> is justified, compensation planting must be provided to mitigate their loss.</p> <p>XII. In relation to flooding, development shall create a safe environment for all uses and not increase off-site flood risk. In areas where surface water flooding is a problem “Finished Floor Levels” may need to be raised and/or Passive Property Level Protection “measures installed to minimise the risk of internal flooding. <b><u>The use of SUDS as a form of flood risk management may also be acceptable.</u></b></p>	<p>Criterion V. should be reviewed having regard to its effectiveness in terms of the loss of hedges.</p> <p>To provide greater clarity regarding the role of SUDS.</p>	Accept the amendment.
Policy 10 a-f	<p>We commend the detailed character assessment set out in this Policy and sub policies. At the pre submission stage these were included as an Appendix but called Policies so we sought clarification as to whether they were supporting design principles or if they were to be policies then they should be included in the Plan itself. We note that these have now been lifted</p>		As stated, on the advice of the District Council the Design Management Policies were moved from an Appendix into the main text of the document. The advice of the District now appears to be the relegation

	<p>into the Plan.</p> <p>These policies set out a description of the type of development that already exists within each character area but as written they do not all read as development management policies. The Council would suggest that they are either repositioned within a Design appendix and renamed as Design Principles, or the wording of each part of the Policy needs to be reviewed so that it is clear to a decision maker as to how they should be used.</p> <p>Policy 10a Area G – first bullet is not clear whether 3 – 5 <b>units</b> per Ha refers to residential uses. There is inconsistency between this, the eighth bullet point referring to one, two and three bed units and the last sentence in para 3.11 referring to the introduction of larger family units.</p> <p>The 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point refers to residential development within the business Park. Ancells Farm is designated as a Locally Important Employment Area in the Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites and this bullet is therefore contrary to Policy ED2 which sets out the circumstances under which a change of use may be acceptable.</p> <p>Generally there is a mix between the use of ‘units’ and ‘dwellings’ per hectare.</p> <p>Area E – delete ‘high’ in first bullet Area F is just a description of an undeveloped amenity area and does not describe how any development proposals should be dealt with.</p> <p>Generally the Council would not favour the prescriptive use of</p>		<p>of the Policies to an Appendix or separate Design Document.</p> <p>Our preference would be to retain the Policies within the main Plan Document.</p> <p>Although a designated important employment area, many of the office/commercial units have converted to residential use under Permitted Development Rights. The direction of the policy is to introduce a mix of apartment sizes to produce a mixed community.</p> <p>The 3-5 units per hectare is stated to be for the well-spaced commercial units. Each unit converts to approximately 30 apartments equating to a residential density of 100-150 units/Ha which is high for the area, but not inappropriate for apartment developments. A significant purpose of the statement is to prevent any infill development, thus changing the character of the area.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>densities as acceptable development may be able to be accommodated at dph outside of these ranges.</p> <p>Through these Polies the LPA is concerned at the generic phraseology relating to trees and the retention/loss of trees and hedges (see earlier comments)</p>		
<p>Policy 11 Safeguarding building stock for People of limited mobility including people with disabilities and older residents</p>	<p>i. Proposals for the conversion of bungalows <del>(predominantly single storey dwellings – a bungalow is a house which has only one level, and no stairs) to a house comprising two or more storeys or two and half storey family houses or to a scale that requires planning permission and</del> that will results in the loss of local homes especially suited to occupation by older people will not be supported.</p> <p>ii. Modification of bungalows to adaptable standards to support independent living will be supported <del>whereas proposals for the demolition of bungalows for replacement with higher rise development will be resisted.</del></p> <p>iii. Proposals that result in the loss of homes especially suited to occupation by older people will not be supported.</p> <p>iv. <b>Subject to compliance with Policy 10 the</b> development of new bungalows <del>through the amalgamation of plots to increase the built density in low density single storey development areas to make more efficient use of the land and create local sustainable communities</del> will be supported.</p>	<p>Whilst the LPA commends the need to ensure appropriate accommodation for those with limited mobility and older residents there does not appear to be any locally specific evidence supporting this Policy. If there is a needs to retain accommodation for the elderly and</p> <p>people with limited mobility there should be an assessment of need which should include all forms of homes such as the high quality retirement development that have taken place within Fleet.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct correlation between bungalows and those with limited mobility or older residents. Bungalows were not designed with any specific intention to aid mobility or to provide accommodation for the elderly. For access one must look further at accessibility and movement around a property (steep gardens or gardens at level etc) and internally to see if it is suitable for use by persons with mobility issues. Two storey dwellings can just as readily be adapted to meet the needs of people with mobility including allowing access to upper floors through such measures such as the installation of a simple stairlift at a very modest cost. Policy also has to clearly written</p>	<p>subject to the words “older people” being replaced by “people of limited mobility” the proposed amendments can be accepted.</p>

		<p>with no ambiguity, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals (NPPF 2012 para 42, or NPPF 2018 para 16). It would be helpful to provide a clear definition of bungalows for the purposes of this Policy.</p> <p>Criterion 1 – It is not understood what is meant by “predominantly single storey dwellings and how this aids the decision-making process?</p> <p>The reference to “two and half storey family houses or to a scale that requires planning permission” also serves no particular purpose. The proposed development either needs planning permission or it doesn’t. The challenge for this criterion is how should the decision maker react when an application is received where only a front facing dormer requires permission, but all the rest of the work proposed to convert the upper floor is either granted planning permission by the GDPO or are internal works that do not require planning permission in the first place.</p> <p>Criterion II – the construction of the criterion is not understood. The first element relating to supporting the adaption or modification of bungalows to support independent living is clear. However, what is meant by ‘adaptable standards’ and does it include proposals that involve the conversion of upper floors if that is an adaptation that helps make space for a groundfloor adaptation?</p> <p>The second part of Criterion 2 however, is not clear – it seems in the same sentence to move onto</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>something very different - “proposals for the demolition of bungalows for replacement with higher rise development will be resisted”? If the latter criterion is necessary, that it should be placed in its own separate criterion.</p> <p>The last criterion is too complicated. It simply needs to cross refer to Policy 10 – General Design Management Policy.</p>	
Policy 12 Buildings of heritage and Townscape value	1. Proposals conserve <del>or and</del> enhance the heritage asset or townscape value and must be of a design that <b>complements</b> <del>contributes positively</del> to the character of the building.	To ensure consistency with NPPF.	The Town Council will accept the proposed wording submitted by Historic England
3.85-3.88		This section would benefit from reordering paragraphs 3.85 to 3.88 to help aid flow/ understanding.	Amendment is possible
3.95	<p>The Council is landowner for Bramshot Farm, identified in the Plan as a Local Green Space. As a SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) required in perpetuity to mitigate the impact of residential development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area we would question the need for this additional level of protection.</p> <p>The purchase and setting up of Bramshot Farm SANG was funded by a loan from the Enterprise M3 LEP with the business case for the loan including potential future built facilities on the site such as a vehicle store and/or visitor centre.</p> <p>The Policy as written allows for uses that would meet the above proposals. However as written it would seem to be more flexible than the requirements of NPPF paragraph 76 which rules out development other than in very special circumstances. If this Policy should</p>		The issue of Bramshot Farm has been separately dealt with. There is no need for any additional protection over that provided by designation as a SANG



	<p>be amended such that it is more restrictive than the Council would object to the inclusion of Bramshot Farm as it would fetter the delivery of longer-term management proposals.</p> <p>If Bramshot Farm remains a Local Green Space there is an error in the mapping and correct boundaries can be provided if necessary.</p>		
<p>Policy 14 Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area</p>	<p>I. Development which affects the Conservation Area and its setting shall be of a scale and design to reinforce the locally distinctive character of the area and should aim to <b>conserve <del>preserve</del> or enhance the heritage asset <u>or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.</u></b></p> <p>IV. <b>All planting near to the Canal should be regularly maintained to improve its leisure and amenity uses</b></p>	<p>To ensure consistency with NPPF.</p> <p>Policies must have some effect and must relate to land use planning considerations i.e. they have to influence a planning decision. The Council cannot require tree owners to maintain their trees/hedges. There is no legislation which could be used to require proactive tree or hedge maintenance to occur. Criterion IV. should therefore be removed.</p>	<p>The Town Council prefer to adopt the revised wording proffered by Historic England.</p>
<p>Policy 15 Residential Gardens</p>	<p>ii. Conversion to front garden parking retains at least 50% of the original garden area as soft landscape. <b><u>The use of permeable paving, grasscrete, gravel or other forms of permeable parking surface, which do not increase surface water runoff and flood risk will also be supported;</u></b></p>	<p>To encourage the use of permeable surfacing for parking areas.</p>	<p>Proposed amendment accepted</p>
<p>Policy 16 North Fleet Conservation Area</p>	<p>2. The demolition of existing buildings in the Conservation Area which are considered to be of architectural or historic interest, particularly those which provide well detailed examples of late 19th and the early 20th century design styles <b><u>or where the existing building makes a positive contribution to the character</u></b> or appearance of the</p>	<p>To provide clarity.</p>	<p>Proposed amendments are generally acceptable but would like to see the conditions placed on replacement TPO trees so that they are readily publicly available. Residents are generally not aware of their obligations.</p>

	<p>conservation area, will not be supported. The redevelopment of Post-War buildings of the 1950s onwards may be allowed, subject to the replacement building being well designed and similar in terms of height, mass, bulk and footprint.</p> <p>4. Existing open green space, including private gardens, shall be protected from unsympathetic development where this would have an adverse impact on the spacious character <b>and appearance</b> of the existing site and the Conservation Area;</p> <p>5. Boundary treatments shall reflect the semi-rural nature of the Conservation Area and help to preserve the views within, and at the boundaries of, the Conservation Area. The preferred options are hedges, with, if necessary from security considerations, inconspicuous fencing behind, and <b>modest</b> wooden gates to brick walls, and the use of metal gates, shall be resisted. Trees and soft landscaping that frame, punctuate or terminate key views along the principal streets within, and at the boundaries of, the Conservation Area shall be preserved;</p> <p>6. Development that requires the felling of <b>mature trees of significant amenity value and as a result thereby changes degrades</b> the character <b>and appearance</b> of the Conservation Area will not be supported. A number of trees within the Conservation Area are subject to <del>a blanket or individual</del> <b>Tree Protection Preservation</b> Orders (TPOs). Where trees subject to a TPO are removed <del>for safety reasons because of disease or storm damage, or are removed</del></p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p><del>without authorisation</del>, they must <b>usually</b> be replaced with species typical of those in the Conservation Area. Such <b>species should include English oak, beech, Scots pine and sweet chestnut.</b></p> <p><b>Where appropriate, desirable 'specimen' tree species could include Atlas cedar, dawn redwood, giant redwood or small-leaved lime. <del>as beech, silver birch, Atlas cedar, deodar cedar, small-leaved lime, English oak, Scots pine, dawn redwood or Wellingtonia.</del></b> The use of inappropriate' trees such as <b>Leyland cypress leylandii</b> will be actively discouraged. <b>All trees subject to a TPO and removed for the above reasons shall be replaced with a native species tree of greater than 75mm diameter at 1.5m above ground level. The young tree shall be suitably supported with stakes and ties and adequately watered to ensure its long-term sustainable growth. Any young trees lost within the first five years of planting shall be replaced with new stock.</b> The maintenance and replacement of trees that are not covered by TPOs and the enhancement of treed areas will be actively encouraged.</p>		<p>Why only "usually replaced"?</p>
<p>3.109</p>	<p><del>No building in the Conservation Area is to be demolished without planning permission unless it has a total cubic content not exceeding 115 cubic metres (as ascertained by external measurement).</del> <b>Planning permission is required for demolition of a building with a volume of more than 115 cubic metres located within in a conservation area.</b> All Saints Church is a listed building controlled by other legislation.</p>	<p>To align with national guidance.</p>	<p>Proposed amendment accepted</p>
<p>3.110</p>	<p>In 1998, <del>when the</del> <b>an</b> Article 4 Direction was served, <b>which</b></p>	<p>To provide clarity and flow of the paragraph.</p>	<p>Other means of enclosure</p>

	<p><u>removed permitted development rights within the North Fleet Conversation Area to erect, alter or remove a gate, wall or other means of enclosure to the frontage of a dwelling. Any change to the enclosure to the frontage of a dwelling therefore requires planning permission. It was decided not to impose planning constraints on individual owners in relation to minor changes to their houses which are usually considered to be ‘permitted development’. This covers changes such as the installation of plastic windows, a change in roof materials, or the addition of front porches. However, the controls within the Article 4 Direction have not been applied universally and there are examples in the Conservation Area of unsympathetic new gateways, fencing, and walls. There appears to have been some uncertainty about the exact implementation of the Article 4 Direction and there have been issues with local property owners about consistency of decision making and enforcement.</u> This policy seeks to provide greater clarity over boundary treatments within the Conservation Area.</p>		<p>includes hedges and therefore appears to require planning permission, but we are advised by the District Council that hedges are not subject to Planning , only hedgerows in the countryside.</p> <p>Otherwise - Proposed amendment accepted</p>
3.111	<p>The principal feature of the North Fleet Conservation Area, which makes it outstanding, is the ‘green’ landscape, with many mature trees and the areas of copses, woodland, shrubbery and other planting. The majority of these lie within privately owned land. Because of the very large number of trees, and the difficulty of obtaining access onto the private land, a full tree survey was not carried out at the time of the appraisal survey and the trees were not recorded on a map. Some of these trees are already specifically protected by either blanket or individual Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), which require the replacement of the tree</p>	<p>To provide clarity and flow of the paragraph.</p>	<p>Why not state “certain size” here so that residents of the NFCA have a single point of reference for all tree matters within the conservation area?</p> <p>Otherwise - Proposed amendment accepted</p>

	<p>in the event of death or decay. <del>Whilst the same condition does not apply to those trees that still significantly contribute to the sylvan character of the Conservation Area but are not specifically protected by TPOs, In addition to the TPO 's,</del> all trees within the Conservation Area <u>of a certain size</u> are subject to the provisions of Section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. These provisions require owners to notify the Local Planning Authority, using a 'Section 211 notice', six weeks before carrying out certain work on such trees, unless an exception applies. The work may go ahead before the end of the six week period if the LPA gives consent. This notice period gives the Authority an opportunity to consider whether to make a Tree Protection Order on the tree. The inclusion of the element of the policy encouraging the maintenance and replacement of trees and enhancement of the treed areas is to ensure the long-term maintenance, conservation and enhancement of the character of the Conservation Area so that it does not progressively become denuded of mature trees over time.</p>		
3.114/3.115		Are both paragraphs quotes? If so, both should be in italics, with no paragraph numbers.	Proposed amendment accepted
<b>Policy 18 Cycling Network</b>	<p>There should be recognition that contributions from new development can only be sought where they meet the tests in the CIL Regulations and in the NPPF (para 204).</p> <p>Amend third para as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Where appropriate, contributions will be sought from new developments to fully fund the design and delivery of the network.</u></b></p>	Remove repetition.	Proposed amendment accepted
Policy 19 Residential Parking	i. adherence to the <del>adopted</del> Hart DC parking standards or guidelines for the number of spaces to be provided on site and...	Correction of error.	Hart District Council clarified the Parking Guidelines are not adopted

			Policy; only a guideline and therefore the word adopted is not appropriate.
4.4	<b><u>Where appropriate</u></b> Local planning authorities require developers to pay for infrastructure projects that help manage the impact of their developments...	To provide clarity.	Proposed amendment accepted.