

Section ref	Examiner Comments	NP wording	Plan-ET Comment
Section 5.2	On what basis has the Parish Council reached its conclusion in paragraph 5.2.11? How does the conclusion relate to the suggested relationship of the neighbourhood plan to the emerging Local Plan in paragraph 5.2.8?	<p>5.2.11 The site allocation total 23 dwellings is considered to represent an appropriate balance between the need to provide for a growing and changing population whilst also recognising the aim of maintaining Hartley Wintney as a sustainable, rural village over the plan period.</p> <p>5.2.8 The selected sites in this Neighbourhood Plan now provides for 23 dwellings. This figure is in addition to any site currently under construction. These sites are being put forward as a reasonable allowance should the emerging Hart Local Plan fail to achieve its requirement of housing or alter significantly through consultation or examination.</p>	<p>There were a number of contributing factors to the Parish Council’s decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The history of recent developments in the Parish viz Dilly Lane 158 dwellings 2012 Monachus House 14 dwellings 2013 St Marys Park 170 dwellings 2014 Hartley Row-100 dwellings 2015 Lamb Hotel 11 dwellings 2015</li> <li>2. The strength of feedback from the many consultations</li> <li>3. The absence of an allocation from Hart.</li> </ol>
Policy HWS1	I note the information in paragraph 5.4.7. However, has any equivalent and specific information been received from the Environment Agency in respect of the Nero Brewery site on flood risk issues? As included in the submitted Plan paragraph 5.4.5 there does not appears to be any definitive information on this matter.	<p>5.4.7 The results indicate that the site is in fact not within Flood Zone 3 and can be re-classified as Flood Zone 2 where development can be undertaken where appropriate, having undergone sequential testing.</p> <p>5.4.5 The EA has confirmed that they do not hold suitable flood levels for the area to inform a Flood Risk Assessment for the site and that the current classification is untested.</p>	<p>No site specific conversations has taken place with the EA, though there is considerable anecdotal local knowledge which indicates this site does not flood and should a developer approach the EA for re-classification of this site, it is felt that the same change of status would be afforded to this site as has been given to the adjacent site, Pools Yard.</p> <p><b>Local knowledge:</b> All the sites were developed in the 18th/19th century when buildings weren’t constructed in areas that flooded. The flooding issue at the two sites in the village was caused by the failure of the Thames water sewer/surface water pipe. This pipe was replaced nearly 10 years ago (2009) and there hasn’t been a repeat incident since then even when there has been a period of heavy rain that would have caused flooding before. All of Pools Yard remained dry during these events and the flooding at Nero Brewery was limited to the car park and a small, part of the older buildings. Logically therefore, it would need all the Victorian cottages</p>

			<p>along the cricket green road along with parts of the cricket green to be flooded before it reached Pools Yard or the major part of the brewery buildings. There is no historical record of this ever happening.</p> <p>There is also no record of surface water flooding at James Farm. In addition, HDC allowed a nursery to be built on the adjacent part of the site. The flooding issue was along the road and that was due to a culvert under the road collapsing and had to be replaced. This was what was causing the flooding since when it has been fine.</p> <p>On the subject of sequential testing, two sites put forward by Hart are not considered suitable. The office building on the High Street would simply become one large dwelling which wouldn't fit the need for smaller dwellings. The site on Church Lane currently has one dwelling on it. There was an application nearly ten years ago for a development of three houses, all 4 or 5 bed so not smaller dwellings as required by the Plan, which was rejected by both Hart and at appeal. The existing property has recently had a complete modernisation which included substantial extensions. This demonstrates that the sites allocated through the Plan are the best.</p>
--	--	--	--

For the Parish Council's information I have prepared a separate note for the Environment Agency on both Policy HWS1 and HWS3.

<i>Policy HWS2</i>	I can see the approach taken in paragraphs 5.5.6/5.5.7/5.5.8. To what extent does the Parish Council consider this site to represent sustainable development?	5.5.6 Although this site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) <sup>1</sup> Fig 7, it is felt that it is still within close proximity to the SPB and would be a good use of brownfield development as there are already several small areas in the Hartley Wintney Parish which fall	Hart Local Plan policy NBE1 states: “. development proposals within the countryside will only be supported where they are: converting previously used permanent buildings or redundant agricultural buildings for appropriate use.”
--------------------	---	--	---

<sup>1</sup> Local Development Framework Background Paper – Settlement Hierarchy for Hart Jan 2010

		<p>outside the key SPB. In addition, it meets all the criteria identified in the Vision and Objectives for Hartley Wintney.</p> <p>5.5.7 This site, therefore, is to be considered the exception rather than the norm in terms of development outside the SPB</p> <p>5.5.8 The NPPF identifies that “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. It is considered that this site will enable this to be maintained by providing homes for people who wish to enjoy the rural nature of a development whilst not being too far from the facilities offered by the local village. This site is within a ten-minute walk of village facilities</p>	<p>Sustainable development is defined as: “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”<sup>2</sup></p> <p>This is a small development of land adjacent to other dwellings, which will provide new homes within very close proximity to the SPB. Hart District is a predominantly rural district with approx. 23% of the population living in areas classified as “rural”<sup>3</sup> (including Hartley Wintney). This policy seeks to provide development of affordable market housing in an area where new development would not usually be permitted. This approach is supported in national guidance which highlights how important it is to meet the current and future needs of rural communities.</p>
<p><i>Policy HWS3</i></p>	<p>I understand the approach in the first bullet point. However, given the location of the site within the village is it necessary? In any event might it have the potential to frustrate innovative design solutions?</p>	<p>HW Policy 3 - HWS3 Pools Yard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site, as shown in fig 14, shall provide around eight dwellings.</li> <li>• “The current maximum building height of existing buildings must not be exceeded”</li> </ul>	<p>An indicative number of dwellings is shown to reinforce the parish need for 1 &amp; 2 bedroom accommodation.</p> <p>One of the principal concerns of the community is the quality of the design of the built environment. This is a strong view from those consulted on the neighbourhood plan. Hartley Wintney has no single coherent style, and although there are some interesting individual buildings and features, including good examples of modern development, other development in recent years has often been bland and lacking distinctive features. There are also prominent examples of poor design. It was in response to these concerns that the Design guide</p>

<sup>2</sup> UN world commission on Environment and Development 1987

<sup>3</sup> Hart District Council: District Profile Summary key findings Mar 2011

			<p>was developed which describes the character of Hartley Wintney and sets out proposals for improving the design of new development.</p> <p>The context of this site in relation to the typography and landscape character, setting, character and local distinctiveness, and context of the site in relation to its scale, landscape, and building types is really important in a site which is in the centre of the village.</p> <p>It's therefore important that the layout considers how the new buildings relate to the buildings and spaces around it to creates a coherent and legible structure</p> <p>Enabling the creation of a sense of place through massing and built form helps to give this, and therefore sensitivity in respect of wall and building heights is an important aspect of this creation of "belonging" of any new dwellings.</p> <p>Any new build will take place in the centre of the village where the surrounding buildings set a 'sight line'. in the interests of a cohesive and integral development, it is felt that newly introduced buildings should blend into this scenario rather than stand out from it.</p> <p>The height restriction is related to the views into the site from the cricket green and high street conservation areas and a need to prevent any future development becoming to dominant. The height of the current building was assessed on that basis back in the 80's and it would be desirable to avoid a repetition of the height increase at Dairy Walk which has resulted in the upper storey being dominant on the skyline the high street is approached on the Fleet Road.</p>
--	--	--	---

			The intention, therefore, is not to frustrate innovative design, in fact, innovative design would be welcomed, however it is intended to set innovative design within a framework which respects the current character of the village centre.
<i>Policy HW4</i>	This policy is well-considered. However, would the first bullet point be better placed as the third bullet point given that good design is the ultimate outcome (and which is captured in the Design Guide)?		No objection
<i>Policy HW5 – first bullet point</i>	I have read the supporting text. However, is there any specific evidence to the effect that developments need to be size-restricted and that the 50 dwellings identified is the appropriate number?	Any future housing developments within the Parish, will be required to have no more than 50 dwellings on any one site	In recent years Hartley Wintney has undergone considerable development totalling 471 dwellings in total since 2012. Three of these developments have been large (170, 158 and 100). Hartley Wintney is a rural parish with a village feel and larger developments can detract from this Hartley Wintney does not have a housing allocation within the emerging Hart Local Plan, however, engagement with the community recognised that there is a need for some smaller homes to meet demonstrated local housing needs, and the Plan has allocated sites for 23 new homes. It is also recognised that there may be a future demonstrable need for further development in Hartley Wintney. Large scale development is not acceptable to the community and there was a strong consensus that if new housing can be demonstrated, with clear evidence, that it is required, it should be delivered through smaller sites and not one large one. This policy and the requirement for no more than 50 homes on any one site, allows for further sensitive, appropriate, well designed development whilst recognising that

			<p>sites for new homes must be viable for developers.</p> <p>Recent major developments:  Dilly Lane 158 dwellings 2012  Monachus House 14 dwellings 2013  St Marys Park 170 dwellings 2014  Hartley Row-100 dwellings 2015  Lamb Hotel 11 dwellings 2015</p>
<i>Policy HW6</i>	The policy and Table 3 are well-considered. I can see that the second bullet point of the policy reflects paragraphs 76 and 78 of the NPPF (2012).		
	The third bullet point then seeks to identify special circumstances in which development would be supported. This runs contrary to the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. I am proposing to recommend that the third bullet point becomes supporting text.	The only exception shall be development for essential utilities infrastructure which, should the need arise, will be supported in special circumstances where the benefit outweighs any harm and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.	Agreed
	Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?		Agreed
<i>Policy HW7</i>	I looked at the various views. I can appreciate why they were selected.		
	However as submitted the policy does not define 'harm' and/or the extent of any impact which may be acceptable. I am minded to recommend a modification that would provide some clarity for the District Council in its decision-making process.	Development should not harm the Neighbourhood Area's most distinctive views as defined by the shaded areas on Fig 16.	Any development must maintain the local character of the landscape and, in particular, not cause any loss or diminution of the distinctive views, create any intrusion upon these views and minimise light pollution.
	Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?		Modification agreed
<i>Policy HW8</i>	As submitted this policy largely repeats national policy. Given the	Development within the Conservation Area or its setting should demonstrate that it will conserve or enhance the	

	importance of this matter to the neighbourhood area I am proposing to recommend a modification along the lines suggested by the District Council.	heritage asset in accordance with its significance	
	Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?		Agreed
	In addition is the policy intended to apply to all the conservation areas as shown in figure 24?		Modify the policy to include: ..... within the Conservation Area - <b>as shown in Fig 24</b> ..... or its setting....
<i>Policy HW10</i>	Having visited the neighbourhood area, I can see the need for a policy of this type		
<i>Policy HW12</i>	Similar comments to HW10.		
	The fourth bullet point of the policy reads in a rather vague way. Plainly planning applications would not be needed simply to retain existing residential accommodation on upper floors. Is the policy offering support to wider development proposals which would retain existing residential accommodation and/or provide access to create new residential accommodation on upper floors where it does not currently exist?	Development proposals to retain residential accommodation above existing business premises will be supported.	It is recognised that retail premises are under pressure with the number of retail outlets shrinking at a rapid rate. It is important to Hartley Wintney that the retail offering remains and expands. However, it is also recognised that businesses may struggle to have a viable business model alone. Therefore, for two reasons, the community would like to see the “residential” accommodation” over shops and businesses encouraged and retained, it serves to provide a secondary income for the businesses, and in addition, it provides accommodation at a reasonable cost in the village centre. Therefore, whilst not wishing to see current retail premises become purely residential, this bullet point seeks to encourage any new business to provide accommodation as part of their business model.
<i>Policy Numbering</i>	Different policies have differing formats. The initial section uses HWS (1-3), the middle section uses HW (4-5) and the final section uses just numbers (6-13).		The HWS 1 – 3 refers to site references identifying sites which have been allocated within the plan.  I.e.

	<p>Does the Parish Council have a preference for consistency purposes? For clarity in the development management process and given the number of active neighbourhood plans in the District I would suggest that either the HWS or the HW prefix should be used.</p>		<p>HWS1 Nero Brewery (Hartley Wintney Site 1, etc)  HWS2 James Farm  HWS3 Pools Yard  (see references on page 25)</p> <p>Therefore, the first three policies are numbered:</p> <p>HW Policy 1 – HWS1 Nero Brewery  HW Policy 2 – HWS2 James Farm  HW Policy 3 – HWS3 Pools Yard</p> <p>Regrettably, Policies 6 – 13 were missed in the proof read, and should read</p> <p>HW Policy 6 etc</p>
--	--	--	---

**Representations made to the Plan**

Does the Parish Council wish to make observations on any of the representations made to the Plan?

We appreciate the constructive comments and feedback and the momentum they provide as we progress to a ‘made’ Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish.