

## Hartley Wintney Submission Neighbourhood Plan 2017 - 2032 Summary of comments, March 2019

Summary of representations received by Hart District Council (HDC) as part of Regulation 16 Submission Plan consultation and submitted to the independent Examiner.

Consultation period: 10am 28th January 2019 – 4pm 11<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

The table below is a summary of the comments – a copy of all representations has been provided to the Examiner in electronic and paper formats.

Ref No	Representor	Summary of Comments	Responses
001	Waverley Borough Council	No comments	
002	Gregory Gray (Oakfield Farm)	<p>Object to the exclusion of land at Oakfield Farm, West Green Road for the provision of housing to help meet housing need over the Plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.16 in particular does not accurately reflect Draft Local Plan Policy SC9 or NPPF para 54 to support mixed tenure developments outside of settlements.</p> <p>Objective 1 is inconsistent with the objectives of the Draft Local Plan and the Housing White Paper in that neighbourhood plans should not be used as a tool to restrict or prescribe housing targets.</p> <p>Plans and draft Policy and text provided for development at Oakfield Farm for up to 40 dwellings.</p>	<p>The sites allocated are the ones that meet the vision and Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>There is no housing allocation for Hartley Wintney within the Local Plan, therefore neither the objectives or the policies are against the Local Plan as the Plan allocates 23 houses.</p> <p>The first draft policy did not have the benefit of the emerging local plan policies and had estimated a provision that would be given to Hartley Wintney. The draft Local Plan allowed a better allocation to be made</p>
003	Gregory Gray (Taplins Farm)	Plan and draft Policy and text provided for development for two dwellings at Taplins Farm.	As above

004	Rob McLennan Planning (Land rear of Taplins Cottage North) Representation Form	<p>Promoting Land rear of Taplins Cottage for the allocation of about 9 dwellings in place of at least one of the current allocated sites. Details of the site, access and layout provided.</p> <p>Accepts that development outside settlements would not normally be permitted under current adopted policy but recognises that national guidance requires the consideration of other material considerations which might outweigh the policy restrictions. Notes that this site lies alongside the settlement boundary. Recognise the need to respect the character of the Conservation area. Considers other decisions in Hart have set a precedent for allowing developments outside settlements and in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Considers that the allocated sites show no evidence or prospect of coming forward. Consider Taplins Cottage was mis-represented and mis-scored in the site selection process.</p>	As above – the sites allocated meet the objectives of the Plan
005	Highways England	No comments	
006	Chris Farrance	Supports whole Plan	
007	Tom Lawrence Bright  Bell Cornwell (Lowfields, Hartley Wintney)	<p>Promoting land at Lowfields, Hartley Wintney for allocation for residential development (current application on the site).</p> <p>Site should be reinstated as an allocation – draft Policy wording suggested identifying an allocation for 5 dwellings.</p> <p>Commend the Steering Group on progressing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Consider that the current housing number is insufficient to meet local needs and there is no technical reason why Lowfields was removed from earlier versions of the Plan.</p>	<p>As above, the three sites allocated meet the vision and objectives of the plan</p> <p>As above, allocated sites are the ones that meet the Vision and Objectives of the plan</p> <p>There is no allocation for Hartley Wintney within the emerging Local Plan, therefore 23 is considered to be a reasonable number to meet the identified need for smaller houses given the recent major developments in Hartley</p>

		<p>Whilst the Plan is to be considered under the NPPF 2012 paragraph 66 of the NPPF 2018 regarding the provision of housing figures for a neighbourhood area is a material consideration.</p> <p>Consider that using the Government's standard methodology, Hartley Wintney should be delivering 349 homes over a 15-year period (based on proportion of Hartley Wintney population as a proportion of the District total). The Plan should either be making further firm allocations or including reserve sites to add in necessary flexibility to respond to the Government's new methodology or changes to the Local Plan.</p> <p>Development at Lowfields would be consistent with the Plan's Vision and Objectives and would comply with the criteria in Policy HW4 (Design). The site is in a sustainable location, unconstrained, and would bring enhancements to biodiversity and to the historic asset of Bear's Green.</p> <p>The existing allocations have flooding issues and are not in accordance with the NPPF. The Plan does not meet the Basic Condition relating to having regard to national policies and advice as it fails to identify the housing need for the Parish.</p>	<p>Wintney</p> <p>This is dealt with in the Plan itself and has been answered as part of the examiner's questions</p>
--	--	--	---

08	Tom Lawrence Bright, Bell Cornwell (Wintney Court, Hartley Wintney)	<p>Commend the Steering Group on progressing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Consider that the Plan takes an overly restrictive approach and very limited allocations. Consider that using the Government's standard methodology, Hartley Wintney should be delivering 349 homes over a 15 year period (based on proportion of Hartley Wintney population as a proportion of the District total).</p> <p>Seeks reinstatement of Wintney Court as an allocation to help meet a higher housing requirement as part of a proposal for the wider estate. The site would comprise 40 dwellings on 4.6 hectares. The dwellings would be designed for the elderly and constructed to lifetime homes standards. There would be a 60 bed care homes on 1.15 hectares. Supporting highways, SANG and community infrastructure would be provided.</p> <p>Development at Wintney Court would be consistent with the aims and Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. All criteria in Policy HW4 would be met.</p> <p>Draft Policy wording for the allocation is provided.</p> <p>The existing allocations have flooding issues and are not in accordance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>The Local Plan gives no allocation to Hartley Wintney and this is justified above</p> <p>Wintney Court was considered as part of the draft plan, however with the feedback and further information relating to the Local Plan, the three sites allocated have been considered as being more appropriate to meet the Vision and Objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>This has been answered within the examiner's questions</p>
----	--	--	---

09	Richard Agnew, Gladman	<p>SEA – note that this has not been updated since the Reg 14 Plan, notably to reflect the introduction of HW Policy 5 (Maximum number of dwellings on one site) or to reflect the fact that an Appropriate Assessment was required and undertaken. This therefore conflicts with the Basic Conditions (does not breach and is compatible with EU obligations).</p> <p>Site allocations – not seen evidence of a sequential test with regards to alternative sites with a lower risk of flooding or an assessment of the likely impacts on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Considers that in choosing housing options there is a direct conflict between the approach taken by the Steering Group and the SEA. The number of homes is not informed by an assessment of housing needs. A failure to provide for affordable housing, fails the basic conditions (sustainable development).</p> <p>HW Policy 5 - sets an arbitrary cap on development and is not consistent with the NPPF. The Policy has not been subject to an SEA and should have been subject to another round of consultation.</p> <p>HW Policy 7 Views – consider that some of the viewpoints do not have demonstrable physical attributes that elevate their importance above being a nice view of the countryside.</p>	<p>The SEA is reflective of the whole plan</p> <p>A site assessment process was undertaken, and the results are summarised and included at Appendix 4</p> <p>The Local Plan does not allocate housing to Hartley Wintney</p> <p>This is dealt with as part of the feedback to Examiners questions – the community is clear that they wish to retain their rural identity and remain a village. Therefore, it is felt to be reasonable to deliver any further housing through the allocation of smaller sites rather than one large development.</p>
----	---------------------------	---	---

010	Hart District Council	<p>Commends the Parish Council on their progress. A number of comments of clarity are suggested such as making clear which version of the NPPF is being referred to.</p> <p>A general comment is made about the need to tighten up Policy wordings to make clearer what will and won't be supported when making planning decisions in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>The level of development proposed should be identified as a 'minimum'.</p> <p>A number of comments are made on detailed policy wordings including:</p> <p>Whilst supportive of the Parish Councils ambition to allocate sites, concerns remain over the site selection process and compliance with national flood risk policy.</p> <p>Clarity required over the SANG wording in the site allocations policies.</p> <p>Clarity needed in Policy 9 (Control of Artificial Light) and in Policy 12 (protection of Retail premises) as to how some of the terminology would be interpreted in decision making.</p> <p>Do not consider that there is sufficient justification or evidence for the limit of 50 dwellings in Policy 5.</p>	<p>At the time of writing the Plan, the NPPF of 2012 was the point of reference and it is this against which the NP is being examined</p> <p>Feedback to examiners recommendations has been accepted to tighten policies</p> <p>Noted – policy justification and responses to examiners comments is intended to clarify</p> <p>The wording has been taken directly from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and Mitigation Strategy</p> <p>Responses to examiners questions</p> <p>Responded to as part of examiners questions. The community, during the engagement/ consultation exercises made it clear that given the level of development that had already taken place in Hartley Wintney, some on larger sites of over 150, it would not be in keeping with the rural nature of Hartley Wintney to continue development on sites this large. Therefore, it is not appropriate to deliver any future sites of over 50 which is a reasonable number to enable sustainable development and viable for developers to deliver.</p>
-----	-----------------------	--	---

011	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	<p>Recommends that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a Policy on New Water/wastewater Infrastructure (draft wording provided) and wording related to surface water drainage.</p>	noted
012	Natural England	<p>Natural England are content in principle with the three site allocations, these are approximately 450m from Hazeley Heath SSSI which forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) Special Protection Area (SPA).</p> <p>Provisions have been made to secure sufficient SANG within the Neighbourhood Plan and SAMM constructions have been noted. As long as there are no changes to these contributions, Natural England has no objections.</p> <p>Natural England agree with the outcomes of the HRA submitted.</p>	noted
013	David Murray-Cox, Turley (Forest Care Ltd)	<p>Promoting land at Southwood, Thackhams Lane for a 60 bed nursing home (Class C2). Representation is supported by an updated Care Needs Assessment which sets out the extent to which accommodation such as that proposed at Southwood is required in Hartley Wintney.</p> <p>Whilst the emerging neighbourhood plan recognises the need for care provision (as does the emerging Local Plan) it does nothing to provide for these needs. The Parish Council did not object to the current planning application/appeal on this site. In the November 2016 site assessments Southwood was the highest scoring site and yet was not selected for allocation or assessed as a location for a care home.</p> <p>Consider that the Plan does not meet the Basic Conditions and should be revised to include a policy and supporting text which identifies and then proactively responds to the needs of the area through site allocation, namely of the Southwood Site. Request a hearing session on this issue.</p>	<p>Noted – the Parish Council does not object to this development for a nursing home the decision for which lies with Hart District Council.</p> <p>It is pleasing to note that this development has now been successful on appeal</p> <p>Noted</p>

014	Kieron Gregson, Carter Jonas (Wates Developments)	<p><b>Policy 5:</b> - is unduly restrictive by hampering the planning of large-scale developments which can deliver the supply of new homes and associated infrastructure needed. Elvetham Chase is sustainably located to a range of facilities available in neighbouring Elvetham Heath.</p> <p>A 50 dwelling cap seems arbitrary and would be contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Large-scale developments assist with the provision of delivering infrastructure improvements which will not be delivered through the development of the three sites that have been draft allocated.</p> <p>The number of dwellings which acts as a cap should be deleted as it is inappropriate to put an arbitrary cap on the number of dwellings that can be delivered on a site that is able to deliver more in a sustainable manner and help contribute to the need for housing.</p> <p>Objective 1 – introduces a cap which is contrary to national guidance which suggests housing targets in Development Plan Documents are minimum targets. Objective should be reworded to refer to a <b>minimum</b> of 23 dwellings.</p> <p>Objective 2 - unduly restrictive by hampering the planning of large-scale developments. It does not accord with paragraph 72 of the NPPF. Objective 2 should be deleted.</p> <p>Appendix 4 – Site Selection Criteria – Object to the stated comments with regards to impacts on the doctors surgery, parking and traffic. S106 Heads of Terms in relation to the planning appeal included agreement of contributions with the CCG, and there was no objection to the proposal for the Highways Authority.</p> <p>Para 4.4/Objective 12 – support the general presumption of improving traffic management through the village to improve overall safety and environmental impact, but it is often only through financial contributions associated with large scale</p>	<p>Justification for this policy has been addressed within the Examiners Questions.</p> <p>The community, during the engagement/ consultation exercises made it clear that given the level of development that had already taken place in Hartley Wintney, some on larger sites of over 150, it would not be in keeping with the rural nature of Hartley Wintney to continue development on sites this large. Therefore, it is not appropriate to deliver any future sites of over 50 which is a reasonable number to enable sustainable development and viable for developers to deliver. It is therefore proposed in the Policy that any future development is delivered through smaller sites no greater than 50 on any one site.</p> <p>Noted – the Local Plan gives no allocation to Hartley Wintney, therefore 23 over and above this is considered to be reasonable</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
-----	---	---	---

		<p>development that these are delivered. Development of the Elvetham Chase will deliver highway improvements which have been approved by Hampshire County Council. These improvements will not be delivered from the allocated sites.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should include wording to recognise the potential for developer contributions from large scale developments in delivering local infrastructure improvements.</p>	Noted
015	Janice Anne Noble	<p>Paragraph 4.2.20—this type of development will give employment to local tradesmen. Example of empowered action by a neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.16—Plan shows a positive determination to protect the surrounding countryside. The appearance of the rural environment is being threatened by urban features.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.18—supportive of the limited amount of housing proposed to meet local needs which offers positive economic benefits.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
016	Taylor Cherrett, Turley (Cove Construction Ltd)	<p>Considers there is clear evidence to show that additional housing is needed in Hartley Wintney (representation includes a Hartley Wintney needs assessment). Failing to provide for this will continue to worsen the affordability of housing.</p> <p>Objective 2/Policy H5—do not consider that there is clear and robust evidence to support this and therefore no justification to the cap on the number of dwellings. Objective 2 should be removed.</p> <p>There are no policies to meet the aspiration to provide for extra care housing. Sets out justification for a significant need for this type of accommodation.</p> <p>Policy 11—Cycleways and Footways—express concerns that</p>	<p>Justification for this policy has been addressed within the Examiners Questions.</p> <p>– the Local Plan gives no allocation to Hartley Wintney, therefore 23 over and above this is considered to be reasonable</p> <p>The community, during the engagement/ consultation exercises made it clear that given the level of development that had already taken place in Hartley Wintney, some on larger sites of over 150, it would not be in keeping with the rural nature of Hartley Wintney to continue development on sites this large. Therefore, it is not appropriate to deliver any future sites of over 50 which is a reasonable number to enable sustainable development and viable for developers to deliver. It is therefore proposed in the Policy that any future</p>

		<p>the objective in para 7.7.4 cannot be achieved until CIL is adopted and is further constrained by the limited number of dwellings currently proposed. To deliver community aspirations additional land with suitable viability will need to be identified.</p> <p>Land at Grange Farm could support the Neighbourhood Plan in meeting its objectives.</p> <p>Consider that the Local Plan does not currently meet its housing requirement and that large sites, particularly Hartland Village will not deliver along the trajectory identified.</p> <p>The current approach in the Local and Neighbourhood Plan will not deliver any additional affordable housing in Hartley Wintney.</p> <p>Express concerns about the SEA which remains unchanged since the Reg14 Plan and does not test specific quantum of growth over 25 dwellings. A larger site would bring a number of mitigation packages and benefits including open space and SANG.</p> <p>Should a Local Plan review apportion growth to Hartley Wintney there is currently no review mechanism to achieve this.</p> <p>The Parish Council should await the adoption of the Local Plan before proceeding further.</p> <p>Details provided of proposed development of land at Grange Farm for housing and SANG which it is proposed should be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>development is delivered through smaller sites no greater than 50 on any one site.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – the neighbourhood Plan will also undergo a five year review in line with the Local Plan</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – justification for allocation as above</p>
017	Historic England (late representation)	No comments to make.	