

Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan

Examiner's Note to Hart District Council requesting clarification on specific policies

Context

These issues and points for clarification arise from:

- my initial reading of the submitted Plan and its associated documents; and
- my unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 24 October 2016; and
- my reading of the representations received.

I may seek further clarification once responses have been received and I have married them up with my own observations and the various representations.

Spatial Plan

Please can I have a plan showing the site of land at Archery Fields that now has planning permission for up to 35 dwellings

Is there any reason why the settlement boundary should not be redrawn to include this site as a factual update?

Housing Development Sites

2.1/ 2.2

What is the scale of the financial contribution sought to the public open space?

What is SAMM and what is its scale?

2.3

As the first point of 2.1/2.2

How have potential flooding issues been considered? Is criterion f) satisfactory to address this matter?

2.4

Is 'generous' needed or defined in c)?

How have potential flooding issues been considered? Is criterion g) satisfactory to address this matter?

2.5

As 2.1/2.2

2.6

As 2.4

2.7

Is there any reason why the nursing home is restricted to two storeys in height?

What is meant by criterion e)? Is something on the site being improved or will land be safeguarded for a future facility? If it is the latter what has driven the specific requirement for 0.25 hectares?

Local Gaps

The policy identifies a new Local Gap. I have read the justification in paragraph 3.24.

Is there any published evidence that underpins this new designation either in general terms or in Appendix 1 in particular?

Has the Parish Council relied on any elements of national planning policy to support this designation?

Housing Mix

Does this policy apply generally within the Plan area or solely to the housing development sites identified in Policy 2? If it is the latter are the policy mix requirements on sites 2/5 and 2/7 consistent with this policy?

In the table at 3.26 am I correct in assuming that the Hart stock and Odiham stock rows are included merely as comparisons to the policy requirement itself (top row)?

Is the policy potentially too restrictive given the context of the 2014 SHMA?

Has any assessment been made of the policy's potential to restrict the supply of new housing in the Plan area?

General Design Principles

This policy reads very well

I have no questions

Odiham Conservation Area

This policy reads very well

I have no questions.

North Warnborough Conservation Area

This policy reads very well

I have no questions.

Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area

This policy reads very well

I have no questions.

Odiham High Street

As I read the policy it has three separate components as set out in its three paragraphs. I assume that each element would be applied to relevant proposals. Please can you advise

In the second part is there any detailed justification for the 'one third' tipping point? How and by whom will this be monitored? How will a potential investor or the decision-maker be aware of any monitoring information and its availability?

Educational Facilities

This policy reads well in general terms.

Would its first sentence be clearer if it specified safeguarding 'for educational use'? Is this the intended purpose of the policy?

Local Green Spaces

I looked at each of the six proposed sites on my recent visit to the Plan area. I have also read the Locally Derived Evidence.

I raise some general points and then some site-specific points:

General:

Has any assessment been undertaken on the overlapping designations issue as set out in Planning Practice Guidance ID 37-011- 20140306?

<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/>

And in particular, the relationships to:

The existing Local Gap – Sites 11/2, 11/3 & 11/6

The Odiham Conservation Area – Sites 11/1, 11/4, 11/5 & 11/6

Both – 11/6

Has any assessment been undertaken of the scale of 11/3 and 11/6 against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance ID 37 – 016 – 20140306? (this is also included in the link above)

Specific:

11/1

No comments

11/2

I saw on my recent visit that the proposed local greenspace is in arable use. This reinforces the detailed in the Local Evidence.

I can see from the combination of policies 2 and 11 that the intention is to develop the land at Dunleys Hill for open space as part of a package with housing sites at 2/1, 2/2 and 2/3 and 2/5. This is precisely the type of imaginative proposal that is appropriate to be included within submitted neighbourhood plans.

As I read the Plan and assess the evidence it appears that the site as shown on p58 and at 11/2 is not currently local green space. However, it will become open space (and potentially local green space) once the wider package has been developed. If this is correct it would be more appropriate to address the site in this fashion and identify it as a separate part of the policy. That element of the policy would support its use as an open space. Does this potential modification achieve the same objectives?

11/3

No further comments beyond the general point on the scale of the site.

11/4

Is there further information on the Chamberlain connection?

Has there historically been any public access into the land? At the time of my visit there was a locked gate adjacent to the footpath to the north.

11/5

Please can I have a copy of the February 2016 Planning Inspector's decision letter.

11/6

No further comments beyond the general point on the scale of the site.

Timescale for responses

I acknowledge that this clarification note is extensive in its nature. Nevertheless, the responses to the points raised will have a bearing on the preparation of my examination report.

I would be grateful for comments from either the District Council or the Parish Council (or both) by Wednesday 9 November 2016. Please let me know as soon as possible if this timetable is unrealistic.

In the event that certain parts of the response are available before others I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it all come to me from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy concerned, and in the case of policies 2 and 11 make reference to the specific sites.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

27 October 2016