

## 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 March 11<sup>th</sup> 2019.

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

Ref No	Representor	Summary of Comments
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>
003	Gregory Gray (Taplins Farm)	Plan and draft Policy and text provided for development for two dwellings at Taplins Farm.
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.</p> <p>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>
005	Highways England	No comments
006	Chris Farrance	Supports whole Plan
007	Tom Lawrence Bright	Promoting land at Lowfields, Hartley Wintney for allocation for residential development (current application on the site). Site

	<p>Bell Cornwell (Lowfields, Hartley Wintney)</p>	<p>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>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. 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 Governments 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>08</p>	<p>Tom Lawrence Bright, Bell Cornwell (Wintney Court, Hartley Wintney)</p>	<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>

		The existing allocations have flooding issues and are not in accordance with the NPPF.
09	Richard Agnew, Gladman	<p>SEA – note that this has not been updated since the Reg14 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 view points do not have demonstrable physical attributes that elevate their importance above being a nice view of the countryside.</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 comments 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>

011	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Recommends that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a Policy on New Water/wastewater Infrastructure (draft wording provided) and wording related to surface water drainage.
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 SAMP 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>
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>

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 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>
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>

		Paragraph 5.1.18 – supportive of the limited amount of housing proposed to meet local needs which offers positive economic benefits.
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 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>
017	Historic England (late representation)	No comments to make.