

COUNCIL

Date and Time: Thursday, 24 September 2015 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS –

Oliver - (Chairman)

Ambler	Crookes	Neighbour
Bailey	Dickens	Parker
Blewett	Forster S	Radley JE
Burchfield	Gray	Radley JR
Butler	Gorys	Renshaw
Clarke	Kennett	Southern
Cockarill	Leeson	Wheale
Crampton	Makepeace-Browne	Woods
Crisp	Morris	

Officers Present:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Gill Chapman	Committee Services

35 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2015 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Axam, Billings, Collett, Kinnell and Lewis.

37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

38 PRESENTATION - THE ARK CANCER CHARITY

Mark Jones, Director of Fundraising and Communications of the Ark Cancer Charity, gave a presentation on the fundraising project of £5m for a new cancer treatment centre. The Ark Cancer Charity would be based in Basingstoke on a new site and serve patients from all over the North Hampshire area. The aim was to provide a treatment centre for patients and loved ones in a restful and stress free environment, with easy travel and parking and support services and therapies all on site. Stress

free treatment had been shown to improve outcomes for patients and awareness was being raised and fundraising gaining momentum.

Mr Jones received questions concerning improved outcomes from treatment at such centres. All types of cancer treatment given but not child cancers, that this would be an NHS facility for NHS patients, patient choice, and the 'catchment' area.

Members thanked Mr Jones for his presentation and wished him well in the fundraising for this much needed facility.

39 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Questions were received from Mr Meyrick Williams, details of which are set out in Appendix I attached to these Minutes.

40 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

None received.

41 CHAIRMANS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council.

16 August	Havant Borough Council service of thanksgiving and commemoration for the 70 th anniversary of VJ Day – St Faiths Church, Havant
4 September	Mayor of Havant Civic Day, Havant
9 September	Mayor Fareham Civic Day
9 September	RAF Odiham Annual Reception in the Officers' Mess
10 September	Singing for the Brain (Alzheimers Society) at Methodist Church, Hartley Wintney
14 September	Farnham Sea Cadets Royal Naval Parade at TS Swiftsure, Farnham

The Chairman added the following announcements:

Firstly, in support of my nominated Charity Hart Foodbank I will be holding a fund raising meal on Monday the 30th November at WE The Restaurant. Further details to follow but I would invite all councillors to support, particularly those that don't do the weekly shop and so are not able to provide food donations directly.

I am also pleased to say that Councillor Crisp and Councillor Morris have agreed to help me in setting up similar events in Yateley and Hook in the new year so that the local community and groups can show support for their local Hart Foodbanks working in these locations.

I would also like to announce how I intend to celebrate the tremendous Voluntary sector we have in Hart and the way we as a council can recognise this through the Chairman's Awards. I intend to hold a single evening event this year on Tuesday, 22nd March in the Harlington Centre. As well as being a celebration and recognition of our Community Volunteers, it will also allow for networking opportunities for the

sector. HVA have offered to manage the selection process and will be writing to groups, Parish Councils and Councillors for nominations.

I hope that this very advanced notice will allow all Councillors to reserve the date in their diaries and help me to recognise the work of their local ward community volunteers and those who work across Hart. Without their support services HDC and other statutory bodies deliver would be under even more strain than they already are.

42 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council, **Councillor Parker**, announced:

Devolution - There have been lots of meetings between Hampshire leaders and chief executives, and members have seen the prospectus which have been shared with all members. The indications from the South East England Councils meeting which I attended today are that Government is looking favourably on the Hampshire prospectus, not least because we have ticked the important boxes of involvement of districts, Park Authorities and LEPs. Greg Clark has asked the Leader of Hampshire to meet him on stage at the Conservative Party Conference, and we think it unlikely that it is to tell us that it is a rubbish bid. However, if we do get through this stage, the scary bit starts.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, **Councillor Burchfield**, reported

I am pleased to announce that as a result of the Council's innovative approach to using 'the Cloud' and software as a service, we have negotiated a reduction in the IT portion of the Capita contract. The reason for the saving is a reduction in the need to manage servers on site. This savings equates to £165,000 over the next two years.

Secondly, the Joint Procurement project continues to go from strength to strength. I am hosting a meeting with the other Leaders or Portfolio Holders from the other four Councils next week, 30th September to meet the four bidding vendors - Capita and Arvato for Lot 1 (which includes Revenue and benefits, Finance, HR and IT); and Bouygues and Vinci for Lot 2 (which includes car parking, Facilities Management and Property Management).

Members will note from the Cabinet Work Programme that the final report seeking a decision on outsourcing will be in January 2016.

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, **Councillor Crampton**, announced:

Last Friday I met Gethin Hughes who is the Director of Integrated Services at Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust, to discuss physiotherapy at Fleet Community Hospital. The musculoskeletal service was under threat because of long waiting times and the availability locally of other providers with shorter waiting times.

Southern Health proposes to revive the Fleet physio service by offering to GPs an acute assessment clinic. Patients who ring in to the surgery with acute musculoskeletal symptoms will be given an on the day appointment to see a physio

where they will be seen, assessed and treated. This model has proved popular elsewhere and will be trialled before Christmas. This new service will boost the numbers of patients seen and bring in more income.

The services provided by Fleet hospital will be expanded and Southern Health are keen to involve the community more closely and provide facilities for the locality such as the dementia café, and they can open at the weekends if needed. The hospital will be a hub for the integrated care teams with multi-specialist teams being co located on site. Gethin Hughes assured me that Fleet hospital will continue to be a vital part of local NHS resources and that involvement with the Local Authority will be ongoing. I will be having further meetings with Southern Health next week. “

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, **Councillor Crookes**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, **Councillor Forster**, reported:

1. Buses - Since 1st September the Fleet and Church Crookham area has had new bus services from Stagecoach, recognising county support and local campaigners. Though having the service is good there are three issues: timing, overcrowding and Frimley Park Hospital. I am working to address these with colleagues and officers.
2. Flooding - The deluge, when we had 2/3rds of a month of rain in one day, has now been cleaned up. There is a survey out, and we have had 22 responses from Church Crookham residents and 43 responses from Fleet residents. I urge the public, and ask Councillors to encourage them, to respond.
3. Waste Service - The missed collection and complaints are the lowest for a long time. Bin purchase costs have been lowered, the 240L blue bins especially, to encourage recycling. 76 properties were under Duty of Care where Veolia had identified risk to employees. These residents have been informed and half have responded. The Joint Waste Team is working towards resolving this.
4. Street Parking - Hampshire Blue Badge Enforcement Team spent a day looking at misuse. 14 offences (which potentially are a criminal offence) were identified and further action is being taken where appropriate.”

The Cabinet Member for Housing, **Councillor Gorys**, reported:

1. A successful Private Rented Sector Landlord's Forum was held on 17th September - well organised and (reasonably) well attended with positive feedback from the landlords who came along to enjoy some wine and cheese and receive important updates along with information about our "new" landlord offer (moving to a cashless Bond guarantee instead of cash deposits and with 2 named dedicated officers to support landlords and tenants, plus a "Landlord Hotline" direct in to the service!). Well done to Niamh Stewart and Claire Boxall in the Housing Options team for their work in organising the event.
2. The Housing Service has been given the "Silver Award" in the national Gold Standard Challenge for front line housing options services. The challenge

represents a continuous improvement journey and the Housing team have been working hard to achieve this level of recognition. Hart are one of just six Council's in the whole country to have achieved this level in the challenge and 1 of just 2 in Hampshire.

3. Finally, well done to Kate Layzell and Dan Fullbrook who, as the newest recruits to the Housing Options team, have been dealing with some of our most challenging customers and delivering a really high standard of customer service to residents and partner agencies alike.

The Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services, **Councillor Kennett**, reported:

I went recently to a meeting of the Joint Management Group for the Shared Licensing Service. Everything is proceeding well but we have had more than our forecast share of management time. This was mainly to do with the Highwayman and is not expected to be an ongoing problem and so Basingstoke will not try to charge us extra. We expect that there will be savings as we see the benefits of Basingstoke's automatic generation of renewal forms.

The Dog Warden service have been awarded the RSPCA Golden Paw award for high standards in all aspects of the service. I am sure members will join me in congratulating Lynn Byfield and her team. This the fourth year in succession that they have gained the award and, if they can achieve it next year, they will receive a platinum award.

The Cabinet Member for Town and Village Regeneration, **Councillor Morris**, reported:

Myself and Blackwater and Hawley Town Council are actively engaged in activities to regenerate and revitalise Blackwater Shopping area along the A30. This includes the initiation of a retailer association, a thorough clean up of that area assisted by the Technical Services portfolio holder Cllr Steve Forster and landscaping a very untidy focal point in Blackwater. The Landscaping will be designed by Harts Countryside manager Adam Green, the groundwork managed by the highways authority. Within this reclaimed area a mature tree will be planted to allow for lights and decoration for future Christmas's.

I have also engaged with senior managers of large retailers, close by to Blackwater, to seek financial assistance for community projects and will report back to Council on this progress as it unfolds.

This week I met with Elvetham Heath Parish Council and agreed to help process two regeneration projects they had been considering, namely turning a field into a wild flower meadow and the planting of a community orchard. Tomorrow, Hart's Countryside manager Adam Green has once again been of great help and has agreed to accompany me to potential planting sites in Elvetham Heath to assist in bring forward these projects.

It is also my intention to help Officers design a web page as part of Hart's website so that regeneration action plans and their progress can be viewed by all at council and the public at large.

Finally, Walking With The Wounded, a Charity helping ex military wounded veterans to find employment are walking through Hart in Hook on 12th October at 0900hrs. Many Hook residents, retailers and both Hook schools will line Station Road in Hook to applaud the efforts of such brave people who are walking from Scotland to Buckingham Palace in 72 days. Those of you who can find time to also attend will be whole heartedly welcomed. I will be emailing all councillors with the details of this occasion.

43 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT

The Joint Chief Executives reported on savings, as mentioned from the Capita contract, and others from the mapping system now coming out of East Hants as a shared service, which is a good system well used by residents. There are also savings from the planning public access system, since it is now being hosted there has been no downtime in the last 6 months. The shared service for building control with Rushmoor is working well and will be reviewed in November. We are not aware of any problems in this shared service and indeed there has been an increase in income.

44 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

Meeting

Date

Standards

20 August 2015

Minute 6 - Constitution - Recommendation to ADOPT

The resolution was proposed by Councillor Ambler and seconded by Councillor Crookes.

A member was concerned that the substitution process (Proposed Practice Note Appendix 1) could be impractical and asked that the guidance show more clarity on this issue. The Joint Chief Executive agreed to circulate some slightly adjusted wording to Group Leaders for their approval, and after a vote the resolution was CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the following be adopted:

- 1 Proposed Practice Note For Appointment of Substitute Members of Committees and Sub-Committees (Appendix 1 as attached to the minutes)
- 2 Proposed Council's Scheme for Public Questions (Appendix 2 as attached to the minutes)
- 3 Proposed Petitions Scheme (Appendix 3 as attached to the minutes)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Constitution be changed to reflect that questions be asked and answered in rotation, as attached at Appendix 4.

Para 25.1 of the Constitution states that 'Any motion to change the Constitution will, when proposed and seconded, be referred without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.' This item will therefore be considered at the next Council meeting on 29 October 2015.

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

20 August 2015

No questions asked.

Cabinet

6 August 2015

No questions asked.

Cabinet

3 September 2015

Minute 44 - Approach to Encourage Brownfield Development in Advance of the Adoption of a new Hart District Local Plan

The resolution was moved by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Morris and Councillor Parker then introduced the item.

In discussion Members generally supported the aims of the Council to encourage the development of brownfield sites, and acknowledged that in losing brownfield sites to development there should no loss of local employment, and any excessive density on these sites should not cause other issues such as parking and other such burdens on the infrastructure.

After a vote the resolution was CARRIED by many with one abstention.

RESOLVED

- A. The Portfolio Holder for Planning be delegated authority, in consultation with respective local Ward Councillors, and informed by any discussions with Parish Councils and interested stakeholders, to identify suitable “zones of residential opportunity areas” on sites or areas where BI office uses are experiencing high levels of, or long term, vacancy rates. This includes land where planning permission has been granted for commercial development but where the market shows little appetite to bring such development forward.
- B. Once identified as “zones of residential opportunity” planning applications for residential use/redevelopment should be seen as being compliance with Policy URB7 by virtue of the enhancement of residential availability.
- C. Saved Local Plan Policy RUR5 (Re-Use of Rural Buildings – Residential) is no longer applied when determining planning applications because it is contrary to the NPPF. If a planning application is deemed to be contrary to Policy RUR5 then that on its own will not render the proposal as being contrary to the development plan.
- D. The Planning Application Checklist – local requirements be amended for office to residential conversion to reduce the administrative burden on applicants to submit supporting information to accompany any planning application and that the main material considerations in assessing the merits of such applications

should concentrate on issues such as flooding, land contamination, car parking and transport.

- E. Where only conversion to residential use is proposed the Council should take a flexible approach to the issue of developer contributions. Within the SPA 5km zone of influence SANG mitigation and SAMP is however obligatory. Affordable housing will be required or proportionately reduced where necessary unless it has been demonstrated by independent assessment that it would make such conversions unviable.
- F. Where redevelopment is proposed full planning application details will be required. Applicants will also need to demonstrate that adequate infrastructure (transport, leisure/open space, community, education) is in place to meet the needs of the development but that development viability remains a material consideration. SANG mitigation and SAMP will however remain obligatory within the SPA 5km zone of influence. Affordable housing should be required unless it has been demonstrated by independent assessment that it would make such developments unviable.

Planning Committee

29 July 2015

No questions asked.

Planning Committee

12 August 2015

No questions asked.

Planning Committee

9 September 2015

No questions asked.

Staffing Committee

14 September 2015

Minute 6 - Joint Chief Executive Posts – Longer Term Arrangements

The resolution was moved by Councillor Burchfield and seconded by Councillor Neighbour. Councillor Burchfield, as Chairman of the Staffing Committee, introduced the item, explaining that in November 2014 that Howard Davis, the Local Government Association's Principal Adviser for the West Midlands had reported on the longer terms arrangements for role of the Chief Executive. The key message from Mr Davis's review was very positive. There was recognition that the current arrangements are sound; that the joint Chief Executives are providing continuity to the organisation; and that the key priorities for the Council were on-track. In the Committee's view the current arrangements work and the Committee was confident that these arrangements will continue to work for Hart into the future.

Members debated the resolution, considering the seeking of expert advice from HR professionals, particularly regarding unintended consequences, new contracts and terms of conditions, what would constitute a breakdown in relations and the Leader's role in dealing with such an issue.

After a vote the resolution was unanimously CARRIED.

RESOLVED

- 1 That the current Joint Chief Executive arrangements be confirmed and the Council's staffing structure be adjusted accordingly to reflect the deletion of the existing Corporate Director posts.
- 2 That the posts of Joint Chief Executives are confirmed upon Ms Patricia Hughes and Mr Daryl Phillips and that:
 - a. The following additional duties lie with Ms Hughes - to carry out the statutory function of the Head of Paid Service;
 - b. The following additional duties lie with Mr Phillips – to perform the statutory duties of the Council's Monitoring Officer, Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer.
- 3 That when the arrangement ceases, due to one of the Joint Chief Executives leaving the Council's employ, then the current staffing structure would be reviewed, and a post of Chief Executive will be advertised. In that event any remaining incumbent will be encouraged to apply.

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Questions received from Mr Meyrick Williams with responses from Councillor Stephen Parker, Leader of the Council:

Question 1

What are the timescales for the Revised Options Paper, the Draft Local Plan and the Revised Plan, pre submission to the Inspector, as declared by the Joint CEO at the Standards Committee on 20 Aug, and what statistical process will be used to analyse the public response?

Response:

Current timescales are shown below. These are set out in a new Local Development Scheme being considered by Cabinet on 1st October, the papers for which are available at <http://www.hart.gov.uk/October-Meetings>

- * Revised Options Paper – Winter 2015
- * Draft Local Plan 'Preferred Approach' Summer 2016
- * Publication (Pre-Submission Draft) Autumn 2016
- * Submission Winter 2016

We have yet to agree any statistical processes for analysing the public responses.

Supplementary Question

Would you agree that in advance of a Public Consultation on Housing Options, Hart Council should take care not to influence public opinion by showing a preference for any of the Options, but since the article in Hart News clearly states that Winchfield New Town is Hart's preferred option, will the Council agree to fund a leaflet drop apologising for its error and making it clear that it has no preference for any particular Option or funding other groups to circulate their leaflets to ensure a level playing field? Would you agree that in advance of a consultation council should not show a preference for options? Hart News clearly shows Winchfield so will Hart apologise?

Response

In November 2014 the Council had indicated that subject to testing the development of a new settlement centred on Winchfield was its preferred option for growth. The Hart News article is consistent with that position but we will make sure that any further consultation is as even handed as we can make it.

Question 2

Could the Council confirm who are the members of the core strategy team in HDC, both elected and officers, who are formulating the Local Plan and their respective responsibilities?

Response

Local Plan Steering comprises:

Cabinet Member for Planning (Chairman)	Stephen Parker
The Leader of Council	As above
Cabinet Member for Housing	Stephen Gorys
Chairman of Planning Committee	Simon Ambler
Political Group Leaders	David Neighbour James Radley

Officers:

- Joint Chief Executive – Daryl Phillips - Project Sponsor
- Planning Policy Manager – Daniel Hawes, (supported by a Principal Planning Policy Officer and a Planning Technician) – responsible for delivery of local plan

We are looking to recruit new staff to the team, and the Policy manager has access to private planning consultancies to help support local plan preparation.

Supplementary Question

Given that 3 of the 7 appointments in that key group are filled by the same person, should the Council consider a more representative membership to avoid the concentration of power in too few hands?

Response

No I don't believe so. This is an advisory group not a decision making body. As a child of Cabinet the views are sent to Cabinet and Cabinet acts with a view to their advice. All Members of Council are invited to attend the Local Plan Steering Group and many do. I don't feel that any member of Council is disenfranchised, many turn up and all are welcome

Question 3

Would the Council agree with the President of the Royal Town Planning Institute, in the report dated 14 August, that there is a fundamental flaw in the reasoning that there is a quick fix and a sustainable solution to the housing crisis by putting large numbers of new homes close to railway stations, because in towns with railway stations with direct connections to London only 7.4% of commuters actually travel to London by train, 72% of commuters instead travel by private vehicle, to jobs within their local area or to other places not in London?

Response

In my view there are no quick fixes to the housing crisis, and we should all beware of those who suggest they are. I will certainly look at the RTPI report in case there are any pertinent lessons for Hart. We will also consider and consult on alternative strategies before making a decision on a new settlement.

However, we must also prepare the local plan in line with the NPPF which has as a core principle that planning should “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable (paragraph 17, penultimate bullet point)”.

Supplementary

Given that the centuries old road system in and around Winchfield will need a massive upgrade, destroying the Heart of Hart, if a new settlement goes ahead, how will the infrastructure costs be funded?

Response

That is part of the appraisal for all the options that we will be considering. We are well aware that there would be costs for infrastructure wherever there is development. For instance if we were to consider expansion in Fleet we would have to consider infrastructure costs in Fleet, and similar issues with similar costs in any location.

Question 4

Given that the Hop Garden Road development was turned down by the Government Inspector on appeal since, amongst other considerations, it would "conflict with Local Plan Policies RUR1, RUR2, and RUR3 which seek, among other things, to restrict development in the open countryside beyond settlement boundaries", what justification has the Council for pursuing a Local Plan strategy of building a new town in open countryside, which is diametrically opposed to long-standing policies formally approved by Hart residents?

Response

The Hop Garden decision was determined against current local plan policies, and was successful at least in part because Hart currently has a five year supply of housing land. However the Council cannot forever rely on the current saved plan because it does not address the housing needs that we face over a longer time frame. The NPPF requires an up to date plan that looks at least 15 years ahead. Unfortunately there are not enough brownfield sites to meet housing needs over that period, so we must review the current plan. That means identifying new sites for development that are not in the current saved plan. We can either continue to expand the existing settlements into the countryside, or we can choose a new settlement, or we may need to do both.

Supplementary

Why would Winchfield be a preferred option to all the others that have been rejected given that the environmental constraints in Winchfield are far greater than those at Hop Garden Road?

Response

There are always pros and cons with any site. We will be doing another consultation later this year and looking at the evidence to come to a better educated informed decision,

Question 5

Does Hart's acceptance of the obligation to take on Rushmoor and Surrey Heath's unmet housing capacity during this plan period lead to the logical conclusion that it will be impossible for Rushmoor or Surrey Heath to accommodate any new housing at all in the following plan period and that in this event, does Hart accept the principle that it will have to accept the totality of the housing need for all three councils next time and have to build probably in excess of 25000 homes or the equivalent of 5 new towns in that period?

Response

The Duty to Cooperate under the Localism Act 2011 obliges us to work with Rushmoor and Surrey Heath (and in theory others) to meet housing needs as defined by the NPPF and NPPG. The Council will only accept any unmet housing needs from Rushmoor and Surrey Heath reluctantly.

I do not accept the principle that Hart will have to accept the totality of the housing need for all three Councils next time around:

- Firstly I am not going to speculate on what housing needs might be in 15 years time;
- Second, I am not going to speculate on what the housing capacity of Rushmoor and Surrey Heath will be in 15 years time, bearing in mind new brownfield sites are likely to become available, and Green Belt policy may well have changed by then freeing up land in Surrey Heath;
- Thirdly I am not going to speculate on what national planning policy will require of us next time around. National planning policy has a habit of changing over time. The NPPF and the legal duty to cooperate may well be replaced with an entirely different approach by that time. All we can do is try and prepare a new plan in line with the rules as they are written today.

Supplementary

If, as mentioned in Hart's News, 3,500 houses are needed and 1,800 brownfield sites have been identified, this leaves a further 1,700 houses required - no more than a 5% increase in the current housing stock of 38,000 over the next 17 years, so why can these not be provided from a fair sharing amongst existing communities or is Hart trying to justify building in Winchfield for a requirement post 2032, which is not relevant to this plan period

Response

There are many options that could be considered to ensure that Housing Market Area needs are addressed. All of them have pros and cons and all of which depend upon what priority one wishes to place on delivering that need. At this stage one has to plan for the future taking into account the likelihood of having to meet unmet needs and the scale of the growth required is a determining factor as to what may be the best strategy to follow. This will be tested through the Local Plan process.

Question 6

Given that the last LP failed due to a lack of cooperation with Rushmoor and Surrey Heath, but the vision of maintaining the rural nature of Hart was not challenged, is Hart not inviting a further failure through abandoning the main strategy put forward in the last failed LP since that was implicitly approved by the Inspector?

Response

The last plan was rejected due to Rushmoor and Surrey Heath failing to cooperate. The Inspector looked at housing numbers and indicated that he had a problem with them, but did not look beyond that. Specifically, he did not consider the vision. It is thus incorrect to assert that the main vision and strategy put forward in the last core strategy was implicitly approved by the Inspector. It would be unwise for the Council to blindly follow the same vision and strategy in the context of much higher housing growth requirements.

Question 7

Given that London, with presumably much higher growth rates, has agreed to meet its own needs will HDC continue to convince both Rushmoor and Surrey Heath that they need to meet their own housing needs, if necessary accepting that their housing requirements that close to London call for higher housing densities?

Response

We are already pressing Rushmoor and Surrey Heath to meet their needs as far as possible, including through increasing densities. Last summer we responded to the Rushmoor Draft Plan to that effect. However as a local planning authority, under a legal duty to cooperate, we need to be realistic and reasonable in our actions. What's right for London does not necessarily make for sound planning in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath which are different areas with different characteristics, opportunities and constraints.

Supplementary

If London does meet its own housing needs, doesn't this call into question the inward migration assumptions in the SHMA and therefore Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath housing allocation should be reduced?

Response

This does not necessarily mean that people are migrating to London or elsewhere, and I'm not sure if it lets us off the hook.

Question 8

How many units have been applied for or granted or identified, and their locations and categories, as possible conversions or developments on brownfield sites since October 2014?

Response

With regards solely to conversions allowed through permitted development rights: At 14th September 2015, there were 258 dwellings approved through the permitted development/prior approval notice procedure the bulk of which are conversions from offices to residential. 5 units were completed in the year 1st April 2014 to 31st March 2015. This information is published on Hart's website.

These figures exclude brownfield sites that require planning permission, because those are not currently split between greenfield and brownfield developments. We do need to be mindful that as yet the PDR regime closes next May, and it is now way too late for a developer complete any such conversion if not already started. You will however note the brownfield provisions on today's council agenda, which we will be discussion later this evening.

Supplementary

Should the number of Brownfield site houses declared in Hart News of 1800 actually be at least 2438 and possibly as many as 3600 if the density is increased, even possibly more as the number includes only 6 of the 27 buildings at Ancells and only 1 site in Hook and does not including Pyestock?

Response

We can only include sites which are available for development. If the site owner is unwilling to develop his site, we cannot take it into account. An example is Pyestock, we have informed the developers that we would like residential development, but the developers have not agreed. If they wish to say yes tomorrow we will be happy.

Question 9

Of the 7534 housing target set out in the SHMA, what is the residual requirement left that need to be granted planning permission?

Response

At 14th September 2015 the residual requirement to 2032 was approximately 2,900 dwellings needed to meet Hart's housing needs as identified in the December 2014 SHMA. This figure will be updated prior to selecting development sites for inclusion in the local plan. However I should point out that this figure does not allow for any unmet need arising in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath. Rushmoor currently say they have a 1,600 dwelling shortfall although as I have said previously, Hart has challenged that figure.

Question 10

In the 'Conclusion' (secs.13 & 14) of 'The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' document, Hart gives guidance to Members regarding saved policies, five year land supply but the Interim Housing Delivery Strategy (IHDS) is not mentioned at all; has Hart abolished the IHDS? If it has it should say so, if it has not, it should be referenced in in 'The Hart Local Plan' section, because inter alia IHDS (Principle 2) gives specific guidance, unobtainable elsewhere, regarding development outside settlement boundaries.

Response

The IHDS has not been withdrawn although it has in some regards become out of date. In any event, this will be superseded by the provisions of the new local plan.