

Yateley, Darby Green and Frogmore Neighbourhood Development Plan - Examiner's Clarification Note

Response from Yateley Town Council

Question	YTC's Response
Policy YDFNP7 – Important Views	
<p>I looked at the various views identified in the policy during my visit. Plainly the importance and significance of views can be subjective. However how does the Town Council anticipate that the 'adverse impact on the characteristics of the important views' would be interpreted by the decision-maker?</p>	<p>The Council would define adverse impact as anything that is out of keeping with the rural setting of Yateley parish or that would result in further reduction in biodiversity or detrimentally impact the benefit residents have on seeing the view.</p>
<p>Are the views identified in the policy the most important of the views listed in the Views Supplement?</p>	<p>The Council confirms that the included views are the most important, as the land to which they belong is not protected by any designations, such as being village green, common land or in the conservation area. These views were also selected to enable biodiversity to be restored and to maintain the character of the land.</p>
<p>In any event, to what extent were the views informed by an assessment of the wider landscape of the neighbourhood area and the significance of the identified views to that landscape?</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Steering Group considered a long list of Views and having regard to avoiding areas which are already protected (such as the Green and Yateley Common), considered the Views in the policy to be the ones which most clearly define Yateley's semi-rural character. This is in keeping with much of the District and the View policy reflects the Local Plan's objective of maintaining the semi-rural nature of the District.</p> <p>Consideration of wider aspect of the neighbourhood, i.e., its position in the overall landscape is important because so much of the settlement area is built up to the edges of river boundary, common or village green, in fact much of the eastern boundary is an indistinct and confusing coalescence with the neighbouring parish of Blackwater and Hawley solely due to past inconsistencies and poor planning policies in the historically recent past. The parish boundary in Yateley's east was established by Deed of Assignment for Hawley in 1838. Then in 1844 there the ceding of areas of both Yateley and Hawley parishes when the parish of Cove & South Hawley St John's took those two named areas plus Minley, with Hawley compensated by being handed Yorktown up as far as the lodge the Military College. When St Michael's church was built in 1851 the area</p>

	<p>of Yorktown up to the river was restored to the county of Surrey. Minor adjustments to the boundaries were made over the years, the construction of St Andrew's Minley gave that hamlet its own parish (the Consolidated Chapelry of Minley) in 1874 until 1924 when it was reabsorbed into Hawley; on 1 April 1932 67 acres of unoccupied land to the west of Yateley was transferred to Hartley Wintney and 351 acres around Hawley common (including 101 people living there) was transferred to Hawley; finally in 1858 a further 77 acres were transferred to Hawley, but no population figures given (the source for this information is "Visions of Britain"). By these erosions, Yateley parish shrank from 10210 acres in 1831 to 3222 acres in 1881 and to its present borders containing 2727 acres (1100 ha) by 1961.</p>
<p>To what extent did the work undertaken on the views restrict the individual assessments to land within the neighbourhood area?</p>	<p>The assessment of the views was considered from within the parish boundary. The views in the supplement are subjective and were decided by a group of volunteers which included The Yateley Society (the local history and conservation group). The Council was also told that we shouldn't include views that were already protected by being Grade Listed, common land or village green as they already had sufficient protection. Thus, we were unable to put in views which locals might consider iconic to the area, such as Frogmore Green, various views of the Blackwater River, Wyndham's Pool, Cricket Hill Green, the Church, the extremely rare feature of a wooden War Memorial, Shute's Pond, the schools, the sports clubs, the Covid Snake.</p> <p>Since the final list was determined by volunteers, the supplement views did go outside those parameters, such as the Green, the cottages around the Green, the open spaces in private hands which we wanted to preserve; we kept them as a supplement because so much work had gone into debating and choosing those we included. The few in the actual report reflect the few views that fell outside of the common land and village green that didn't have the same degree of protection. They are important views, but not what I would call "usual" views of Yateley that a resident might say give a flavour of what Yateley looks like to live in, those views, we were told, had to be excluded.</p>

Policy YDFNP10 – Community Facilities	
<p>I saw the importance of the various community buildings during the visit. The policy sets out a very robust approach to this matter. For my clarity, does the first part of the policy apply to the list of community facilities set out in Appendix 6?</p>	<p>The Council confirms that the first part of the policy relates to the list in Appendix 6.</p>
<p>I can see that the policy provides a link (23) to the schedule of Hart District Assets of Community Value.</p> <p>In relation to both of the points above, the policy is only fully appreciated by referring to other documents. Would it be practical to list the facilities in the respective parts of the policy (or make a clearer reference to the details of Appendix 6 in the policy) and/or show the various facilities on an additional map?</p>	<p>The Council would like to keep the list of community facilities in an appendix, rather than to list them within the main body of the Plan, but are happy to reword the policy so that it is clarified.</p>
Policy YDFNP13 – Blackbushe Airport	
<p>This is a very well-considered policy which takes account of the scale and significance of the Airport in the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>As I read the third paragraph of the policy, it is supporting text rather than policy. As such I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text.</p> <p>Does the Town Council have any comments on this proposition?</p>	<p>The suggestion to reposition the third paragraph of the policy into the main body of the text is acceptable to the Council.</p>
<p>I can see the community feedback as set out in paragraph 155 of the Plan. Nevertheless, is the final paragraph of the policy either realistic or practicable?</p>	<p>The Council recognises that other factors will come into play with regards to requiring the land to revert back to public open space, in the event that the airport closes. However, the Council felt that it was important to record the wider view of the public, as referenced in the Residents' Survey, and to acknowledge that the decision on decommissioning of land on the site is still subject to a court decision.</p>

Policy YDFNP14 – Home Working	
I am minded to recommend that it is modified to acknowledge that not all proposals for home working will represent a material change of use and therefore will not need planning permission. Does the Town Council have any comments on this proposition?	The Council agrees with the Examiner's stance and can reword the policy accordingly.
Representations Does the Town Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?	
Obsidian Strategic (003)	The Council has already considered the points made by Obsidian from the previous consultation and no new points have been made in the Reg. 16 consultation, therefore, no changes are required.
Landhold Capital/Claremont Planning Consultancy (013)	The Council has already considered the points made by Landhold Capital/Claremont from the previous consultation and no new points have been made in the Reg. 16 consultation, therefore, no changes are required.
Belgrave Homes (016)	The Council has already considered the points made by Woolf Bond on behalf of Belgrave Homes from the previous consultation and no new points have been made in the Reg. 16 consultation, therefore, no changes are required. This application from Belgrave Homes was the subject of an appeal which was rejected by the Inspector as the land is within a flood zone and is subjected to repeated flooding.
Gladman Developments Limited (017)	The Council has already considered the points made by Gladman from the previous consultation and no new points have been made in the Reg. 16 consultation, therefore, no changes are required.
Hart District Council (020)	The Council has noted the comments made by Hart District Council. None of the comments require a change to the policy wording, other than some clarifying references and wording. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will review Hart District Council's comments in more detail at their next meeting on 15 th February and respond to their suggestions.

The District Council specifically proposes a series of refinements to Policies YDFNP 2/4/5/6/8/9/12/13 and 15. Does the Town Council have any comments on the suggested refinements?	
Policy YDFNP2	As above.
Policy YDFNP4	As above.
Policy YDFNP5	As above.
Policy YDFNP6	As above.
Policy YDFNP8	As above.
Policy YDFNP9	As above.
Policy YDFNP12	As above.
Policy YDFNP13	As above.
Policy YDFNP15	As above.