



# Annual Monitoring Report

## Planning and Development

April 2014 – March 2015

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
1. Progress on Plan preparation	3
2. Neighbourhood Planning	3
3. Housing development	4
4. SANG capacity	4
5. Community Infrastructure Levy	5
6. Duty to Cooperate	6
Appendices	8-24

## 1. Progress on Plan preparation

- 1.1 At the start of the monitoring year 2014/15 the local plan timetable was set out in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) Third Revision (April 2014) set out at Appendix A. A Fourth Revision to the LDS, set out at Appendix B, took effect in February 2015, towards the end of the monitoring year. The Fourth Revision was superseded in October 2015, outside the period that this AMR is reporting on. The latest LDS can be found at <http://www.hart.gov.uk/Emerging-planning-policy-guidance>. However, it should be noted that this is again under review.
- 1.2 By the end of March 2015 consultation on a Housing Development Options Paper had taken place (between 14<sup>th</sup> August 2014 and 10<sup>th</sup> October 2014) to inform the Local Plan Strategy and Sites DPD Regulation 18 stage. The Development Management DPD had not started. The LDS Fourth Revision saw the removal of a *Developer Contributions to Leisure & Open Space Facilities* DPD. It was decided to include a new policy on this issue in the new Local Plan Strategy and Sites DPD based on a fresh evidence base rather than progress a separate single issue DPD.
- 1.2 The changes to the timetable for the Local Plan Strategy and Sites DPD are in response to resourcing issues which are being addressed, various outsourced evidence studies unavoidably taking longer than anticipated, and a decision to undertake an additional consultation in the form of a 'Refined Housing Options Consultation' to give the community a greater say on which strategic housing options and sites the Council should select in a draft local plan.

## 2. Neighbourhood Planning

- 2.1 During 2014/15 the following Neighbourhood Plan areas were designated within Hart:
- Church Crookham Parish (August 2014)
  - Odiham Parish (August 2014)
  - Hartley Wintney Parish October 2014
  - Hook Parish (October 2014)
  - Rotherwick Parish (October 2014)
- 2.2 Further information on the designation of Neighbourhood Plan areas within Hart, and links to parish websites showing Neighbourhood Plans, can be found at <http://www.hart.gov.uk/towns-parishes>

### 3. Housing development

3.1 Between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2015, 338 **new dwellings** were completed, of which 70 were defined as **affordable**.

3.2 The Table below sets out housing completions in Hart back to 1996:

Year	New houses
1996/97	308
1997/98	364
1998/99	163
1999/00	211
2000/01	294
2001/02	341
2002/03	443
2003/04	567
2004/05	642
2005/06	527
2006/07	396
2007/08	229
2008/09	52
2009/10	-17
2010/11	70
2011/12	326
2012/13	197
2013/14	264
2014/15	338

### 4. SANG capacity

4.1 To facilitate residential development within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area<sup>1</sup> (TBHSPA) zone of influence the Council has adopted an **Interim Avoidance Strategy (IAS)**<sup>2</sup>. This enables developers to mitigate development via financial contributions towards off-site SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) and SAMM (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring). SANG is intended to direct people away from causing habitat disturbance on the SPA.

4.2 The IAS contains two SANG sites: one at Hitches Lane, Fleet; and one at Hawley Meadows, Hawley. The latter is shared with Rushmoor and

<sup>1</sup><http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2050-theme=default>

<sup>2</sup> Available at <http://www.hart.gov.uk/Current-planning-policy-guidance>

Surrey Heath. There is other SANG which the Council does not own or manage but which can be used to mitigate housing development, subject to the agreement of the SANG owner and compliance with the IAS principles.

- 4.3 The Table below sets out the remaining capacity for SPA mitigation at SANG sites in Hart as at the end of the monitoring year (31 March 2015):

Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)	Total SANG Capacity (persons)	Persons allocated to date	Remaining unallocated capacity (persons)	Approximate remaining capacity (dwellings)
Hitches Lane, Fleet	2240	1569	812 <sup>3</sup>	338
Hawley Meadows and Blackwater Park	1139	152	215 <sup>4</sup>	90
Bassetts Mead (Hook Parish Council)	1113	304	809	337
Queen Elizabeth Barracks / Crookham Park (private)	2050 <sup>5</sup>	331	1719	716
Clarks Farm (Swan Lakes) Yateley	305	188	0	0 <sup>6</sup>
Dilly Lane / QE II Fields, Hartley Wintney (private)	341	341	0	0
				<b>428 public 1053 private 1481 total</b>

- 4.4 Updates to SANG availability are published at:  
<http://www.hart.gov.uk/Current-planning-policy-guidance>

## 5. Community Infrastructure Levy

- 5.1 The Council consulted on a **Preliminary Charging Schedule** during May-June 2014. Thereafter it consulted on a **Draft Charging Schedule** during October-December 2014. The CIL timetable is being reviewed, linked to progress on a draft local plan.

<sup>3</sup> Application 13/02513/MAJOR adds 4.84ha of Hitches Lane SANG (605 persons, approx. 252 dwellings), and uses up 3.17ha (464 persons, approx. 193 dwellings)

<sup>4</sup> Release of share of Hawley Meadows and Blackwater Park SANG to Rushmoor BC and Surrey Heath BC – 386 persons each. Agreed at Cabinet – 17<sup>th</sup> July 2014

<sup>5</sup> Utilises 12ha / 1000 population

<sup>6</sup> Yateley Town Council SANG - Remaining capacity given to Surrey Heath

## 6. Duty to Cooperate

- 6.1 The Council is required to work under the 'Duty to Cooperate' (DtC) in respect of strategic and/or cross-boundary planning matters. Cooperation partners can be neighbouring local planning authorities, county councils, and other relevant bodies (or persons)<sup>7</sup>.
- 6.2 The previous monitoring report (2014) reported how the Council had carried out a **scoping exercise** in order to identify cross-boundary and strategic matters that might need to be planned collaboratively. This document is attached for further reference at Appendix C. At Appendix D meanwhile there is a **summary of responses** from DtC bodies to the scoping exercise. This also includes DtC responses to the Housing Options Consultation 2014.
- 6.3 Collaboration with Duty to Cooperate bodies continued on a reciprocal basis during the monitoring year 2014-15. Emerging substantive issues for cooperation into 2015 and beyond appeared to be the following:
- Discussing how to accommodate the housing market area's assessed need with Rushmoor and Surrey Heath
  - Issues around the highway network and capacities with Hampshire County Council and Highways England
  - Issues around schools provision with Hampshire County Council
  - Issues around healthcare provision with the two Clinical Commissioning Groups (North-East Hampshire and North Hampshire)
  - Issues around water quality and foul water capacity with the Environment Agency
- 6.4 There is a schedule of DtC meetings and consultations, with key issues identified, at Appendix E.

### Cooperation on housing and economic development

- 6.5 Early in 2014/15, a Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath **Member Liaison Group** agreed its terms of reference and prepared a SHMA, published in December 2014.
- 6.6 The SHMA (December 2014) provides a figure for objectively assessed housing need of 24,413 homes across the three-authority housing market area between 2011 and 2032. In Hart the SHMA identifies a need of 7,534 homes over the period, which equates to 359 dwellings per annum. Latest information about the SHMA is available here <http://www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base>

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/section/110/enacted>

- 6.7 Discussions also started on the housing capacities within the three authorities.
- 6.8 In late summer/autumn 2014 both Rushmoor and Surrey Heath separately responded to Hart's Housing Development Options consultation, available along with all other consultation at <http://www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation-responses>.
- 6.9 Housing delivery is affected by the Thames Basin Heaths area of environmental protection. The Council is one of a group of authorities that cooperate continuously on the work of the **Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Joint Strategic Partnership Board**. Its objective is to facilitate new housing within the SPA zone of influence under the Saved South East Plan Policy NRM6 and the JSPB Housing Delivery Framework.
- 6.10 In this context, the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Member Liaison Group also started to explore how they could work together to overcome SANG capacity as a constraint. Surrey Heath used SANG capacity at the Swan Lakes SANG in Yateley.
- 6.11 With regards to economic development, the three authorities Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath published a [study](#) that identifies the combined area as a 'functional economic area'. This led to the decision to work jointly on economic development matters as appropriate, and the terms of reference for the group were updated accordingly (see Appendix F). Work began on a Joint Employment Land Review (ELR), a study that amongst other things analyses the performance of the area's business parks and industrial estates.
- 6.12 Hart and Rushmoor also began work on a joint Retail & Town Centre Study to establish the needs for retail and other town centre uses in each authority area. For latest information on this and the ELR please refer to the Council website <http://www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base>

## APPENDIX A

### Local Development Scheme: Third Revision

With effect from 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014



This Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out Hart District Council's programme for preparing its Local Plan (2011-2032). It supersedes the LDS 2<sup>nd</sup> Revision that was published in October 2012. The new Hart Local Plan will comprise more than one Development Plan Document (DPD). The timetable and key milestones are set out overleaf.

#### Timelines for Hart Local Plan Development Plan Documents

	<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>Developer Contributions to Leisure and Open Space Facilities</b>	<b>Development Management Polices</b>
<b>Subject matter</b>	Sets out the strategy and key policies and sites or broad locations for delivering housing, economic growth, infrastructure, and environmental protection.	A policy on developer contributions to open space, sport and recreation facilities	Policies and proposals that assist the development management process, either by adding detail to the core strategy, or covering issues not covered in the core strategy.
<b>Geographical area to which document relates</b>	The whole district	The whole district	The whole district
<b>Consulting on scope of the Sustainability Appraisal</b> The SA scoping report sets out the sustainability objectives used to appraise the effects of the DPD.	April 2014	Conducted in April 2011	September 2016
<b>Regulation 18: Preparation of a Local Plan</b> Opportunity for interested parties and statutory consultees to be involved at an early stage.	<b>July/August 2014</b> Consultation on Strategic Growth Options  <b>March 2015</b> Consultation on a Draft Plan	Consultation on a draft policy took place between 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2012 and 10 <sup>th</sup> September 2012	September 2016
<b>Regulation 19: Publication of a Local Plan</b>	October 2015	November – December 2014	February 2017

<p>The Council publishes the plan. There follows a period of at least 6 weeks when representations may be received.</p>			
<p><b>Regulation 22 - Submission</b> The Council submits the Local Plan to the Secretary of State with the representations received and a summary of those representations. There will follow an 'examination' by an Independent Planning Inspector – dates to be determined.</p>	<p>December 2015/January 2016</p>	<p>February 2015</p>	<p>April 2017</p>
<p><b>Adoption</b> Subject to the outcome of the examination, the Council formally adopt the plan. These estimated dates are subject to the length of the process after submission, including the examination and receipt of the inspector's report.</p>	<p>July 2016</p>	<p>September 2015</p>	<p>August 2017</p>

## APPENDIX B

### Local Development Scheme: Fourth Revision

**With effect from 16 February 2015**



This Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out Hart District Council's timetable for preparing its Local Plan (2011-2032). It supersedes the LDS 3<sup>rd</sup> Revision that was published in April 2014. The new Hart Local Plan will comprise two Development Plan Documents (DPDs).

### Timelines for Hart Local Plan Development Plan Documents

	Local Plan: Strategy and Sites DPD	Development Management Policies
<b>Subject matter</b>	Sets out the strategy and key policies and sites or broad locations for delivering housing, economic growth, infrastructure, and environmental protection. It relates to the whole district.	Policies and proposals that assist the development management process, either by adding detail to the Strategy and Sites DPD, or covering issues not covered in that document. It relates to the whole district.
<b>Consulting on scope of the Sustainability Appraisal</b> The SA scoping report sets out the sustainability objectives used to appraise the effects of the DPD.	April 2014	Autumn 2016
<b>Regulation 18: Preparation of a Local Plan</b> Opportunity for interested parties and statutory consultees to be involved at an early stage.	Consultation on Housing Development Options Paper took place between 14 <sup>th</sup> August 2014 and 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	Winter 2016
<b>Regulation 19: Publication of a Local Plan</b> The Council publishes the draft plan. There follows a period of at least 6 weeks consultation.	Autumn 2015	Spring 2017
<b>Regulation 22: Submission</b>	Winter 2015/16	Summer 2017

<p>The Council submits the Local Plan to the Secretary of State with the representations received and a summary of those representations.</p>		
<p><b>Examination</b> Following submission there will be an 'examination' by an independent Planning Inspector who will consider representation made at Regulation 22 stage.</p>	<p>Estimate: Spring 2016</p>	<p>Estimate: Autumn 2017</p>
<p><b>Adoption</b> Subject to the outcome of the examination, the Council formally adopt the plan.</p>	<p>Estimate: Summer 2016</p>	<p>Estimate: Winter 2017</p>

## APPENDIX C

### Duty to Cooperate issues and partners – scoping table for consultation with DtC bodies (August 2014)

Issue	Suggested Partners involved
1. Mitigating the effects of new housing in the vicinity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart District Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>• Waverley Borough Council</li> <li>• Guildford Borough Council</li> <li>• Bracknell Forest Borough Council</li> <li>• Woking Borough Council</li> <li>• Wokingham Borough Council</li> <li>• Elmbridge Borough Council</li> <li>• Runnymede Borough Council</li> <li>• Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</li> <li>• Hampshire County Council</li> <li>• Surrey County Council</li> <li>• Natural England</li> <li>• Enterprise M3 LEP</li> </ul>
2. Meeting the objectively assessed need for housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart District Council</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council</li> <li>• Homes &amp; Community Agency</li> </ul> <p>In the event that housing needs cannot be met within this Housing Market Area (HMA), local authorities in HMAs that adjoin the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey HMA will need to be approached.</p>
3. Meeting the needs of Travellers for Transit Sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart District Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council</li> <li>• Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</li> <li>• Hampshire County Council</li> </ul> <p>We anticipate that permanent pitch provision will be dealt with by individual authorities meeting their own needs, with the possible exception of Rushmoor where under the withdrawn Core Strategy, Hart agreed to take their single pitch need.</p>
4. Meeting the need for employment land across the functional economic area	<p>Core partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart District Council</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council</li> <li>• Enterprise M3 LEP</li> </ul> <p>Other partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</li> <li>• Bracknell Forest</li> </ul>

Issue	Suggested Partners involved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wokingham</li> <li>• Waverley</li> <li>• Guildford</li> <li>• East Hampshire</li> <li>• Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</li> </ul>
5. Meeting the need for Retail & Leisure across the functional economic area	<p>Core partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hart District Council</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council</li> <li>• Enterprise M3 LEP</li> </ul> <p>Other partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</li> <li>• Bracknell Forest</li> <li>• East Hampshire</li> <li>• Guildford</li> <li>• Reading Borough Council</li> <li>• Wokingham</li> <li>• Waverley</li> </ul>
6. Infrastructure: Mitigating the impacts of development on the strategic and local highway network and on public transport networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> <li>• Hampshire County Council (Highways Authority)</li> <li>• Office of Rail Regulation</li> </ul> <p>Potentially other local authorities depending on results of transport assessment work, most likely to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrey County Council,</li> <li>• Wokingham Borough Council,</li> <li>• Bracknell Forest Council,</li> <li>• Basingstoke &amp; Deane Borough Council</li> <li>• Waverley Borough Council</li> <li>• Surrey Heath Borough Council</li> <li>• Rushmoor Borough Council,</li> <li>• Waverley Borough Council</li> <li>• East Hampshire District Council</li> </ul>
7. Infrastructure: Meeting Education needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hampshire County Council (Education Authority)</li> </ul>
8. Infrastructure: Meeting Health needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group</li> <li>• North East Hampshire &amp; Farnham CCG</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX D

## Housing Options Paper 2014: Responses from Duty to Co-operate Bodies

Duty to Co-operate Body	Summary of Response
Basingstoke & Deane District Council	<p>Comments on the Duty to Co-operate Scoping Exercise:</p> <p>Issue 1 - B&amp;D should be listed as a partner in relation to 'Mitigating the effects of new housing in the vicinity of the TBHSPA'.</p> <p>Issue 2 – Meeting objectively assessed need for housing – this is wider than just meeting OAN but also identifying the OAN in the first instance - B&amp; D should be listed as a relevant body.</p> <p>Issue 4 – Employment - Do not consider B&amp;D to be a partner involved in this issue.</p> <p>Issue 5 – Retail and Leisure – this has not been raised previously as a strategic issue between the two authorities.</p> <p>May also be helpful to include in the table all the relevant DTC prescribed bodies as set out in the relevant Regulations.</p>
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	No response received
Civil Aviation Authority	No response received
Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	<p>Welcomes the consideration given in the consultation paper to the Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan. Committed to working with Hart to help address issues of joint interest.</p> <p>Para 2.25 and 2.26 – endorse the use of up to date economic evidence.</p> <p>Para 2.35 – Consider that the review of employment land requirements should be carried out as soon as possible.</p> <p>Para 2.48 – Encourage Hart to work jointly with the LEP on possible future projects for the Local Growth Fund.</p> <p>Para 2.54 – recognise the challenges of affordability across the area and encourages Hart to fully consider this strategic issue when developing the Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 3.23 – In relation to housing acceleration, it may be more accurate to say subject to Government 'funding' as well as 'support'.</p> <p>Para 3.24 – in contrast to the statement in para 3.24, the LEP has made it clear that this applies across the area and is not broken down to individual authorities.</p> <p>Para 3.52 – support the objective relating to economic development. Would urge that the Plan is based on up to date market intelligence and insight and they are happy to help.</p> <p>Para 3.55 – There are five step up towns, not seven.</p> <p>Para 3.62 – Welcomes and supports the joint working taking place with Rushmoor and Surrey Heath.</p> <p>Comments on Duty to Co-operate issues:</p> <p>TBHSPA – endorses the key partners identified</p> <p>Housing need – would be helpful to set out how Hart will engage on a wider network of partners including Enterprise M3, on relevant issues to housing.</p> <p>Employment needs across the functional economic area – endorse the list identified. May be appropriate to include the Thames Valley LEP and Reading Borough Council in this list, and also Woking, Runnymede and West Berkshire Councils.</p> <p>Retail and leisure needs – comments as for employment above.</p> <p>Transport issues – with the introduction of the Local Growth Fund in 2015/16 it will be important that Enterprise M3 is engaged in discussions on this issue, particularly where infrastructure funding is required to unlock growth. Might</p>

	<p>also consider whether to involve Network Rail and the Train Operating companies in discussions.</p>
English Heritage	<p>Response to Question 1 - Options There is insufficient information available at this stage in terms of the potential effect on the historic environment of any of these five options, as recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal, for English Heritage to express preferences between all the options.</p> <p>Welcome the recognition of the historic environment of Hart as a potential influence on the level and nature of housing development in some area although would prefer positive characteristics to be highlighted rather than as a negative constraint.</p> <p>In Option 1, Conservation Area designations are recognition of the special architectural or historic interest of such areas. It is the potential effect on this special interest, informed by a Character Appraisal identifying the contribution of open spaces to that special interest, that should determine whether development on such open spaces is appropriate, rather than the designation itself.</p> <p>In determining eventual locations to be allocated for new housing (and other development), English Heritage will look for a robust evidence base underpinning the selection in which the historic environment is given proper weight in accordance with statutory provisions and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>We would comment that Appendix A contains no specific reference to any specific historic environment evidence for the district (except perhaps the Urban Characterisation and Density Study).</p> <p>Response to Question 2: Smallest villages and hamlets Make the general comment that where the village or hamlet is historically important, its small size is likely to mean that its capacity to absorb new development without degrading that importance or character is reduced.</p> <p>Response to Question 3: Location for new settlement Would expect such a location, if this option was pursued, to be informed by historic environment considerations.</p> <p>Response to Question 4: Any other options: Would expect any such options to be informed by historic environment considerations, including designated and undesignated heritage assets and historic landscape character and sensitivity, as part of the range of necessary considerations.</p> <p>Response to Question 5: Any other comments: English Heritage previously commented on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and we are pleased to see the Council's responses to our comments. We note that the Report identifies an uncertain impact against SA Objective SA7 for all of the five potential options, on the basis that site specific or broad locations would be required in order to fully establish a likely significant positive or negative effect. We generally agree with this position, although we would suggest that Option 5 should be recognised as being likely to have the greatest potential impact on designated heritage assets.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Comments on the Housing Options Consultation Document: Welcome involvement at this early stage. Para 1.24 and Appendix A: Evidence Base Review – consider that a water cycle study will be required to assess infrastructure capacity and the impact on both water resources and water quality (this was acknowledged in the 2011 Water Cycle Scoping Study). Support the SFRA update. The HCC</p>

	<p>Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2013, and the HCC Surface Water Management Plan (in preparation) should also be part of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Section 2: Issues</b>  Environmental – welcome acknowledgement of many of the environmental issues within the EA remit. Para 2.16 should also acknowledge the need for mitigation and adaptation to climate change in terms of flood risk, biodiversity, water resources and water quality.  Infrastructure – Water resources and foul drainage must be identified as infrastructure issues.</p> <p><b>Section 3: Assessing growth and development needed.</b>  Biodiversity - The ecological value of river sites should be taken into consideration.  Flooding constraints – there is no mention of the sequential test for any future site allocations. The updated SFRA should form the evidence base on which this is tested. Evidence that the sequential test will be required if there are sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Any strategic sequential test should inform the Sustainability Appraisal.  Infrastructure Capacity – The growth proposed will place a significant increase in loading on the water supply and foul drainage infrastructure. The plan and supporting evidence must show that the proposed allocations are deliverable. EA require evidence to show how much of the planned growth is accounted for within the Thames Water Asset Management Plan 2015 – 2020. Sewage treatment works may also need to be upgraded but as yet there is no assessment of the impact on the SWTs.  A review of the infrastructure delivery plan will need to be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Section 4: Options</b> – no specific comments. Reiterate that the constraints of flood risk, water supply and foul drainage infrastructure must be taken into account.</p> <p><b>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal:</b>  No comments on the methodology, but some points as follows:  Appendix 3, SA Framework:  SA10 – no appraisal of the foul drainage infrastructure has been undertaken to ensure that future development does not lead to a deterioration of water quality and non compliance with the Water Framework Directive.  SA13 – For clarity would be helpful for the framework to state there will be no development in Flood Zone 3. A sequential test will be needed for future sites allocated in flood zone 2 and the results will form the Sustainability Appraisal.  Appendix 6, Appraisal Tables – the EA do not understand the appraisal of the options against this objective, particularly that greater levels of growth will result in a more likely significant positive effect on water quality. Clarity on this would be welcome.  There has been no assessment of the impacts on water quality and the Water Framework Directive requirements from the increased loading on the foul drainage infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Comments on Duty to Co-operate issues:</b>  The scoping tables do not identify the impacts that may occur by meeting development needs and therefore the mitigation required. The impact on the environment in terms of water supply, wastewater, flood risk and biodiversity may require assessment and improvement in the infrastructure.</p>
Hampshire County Council	<p>Para 1.9, Page 3  Reference should be made to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and a web link added.</p>

Para 2.16, page 14

Welcomes role in reducing carbon emissions, the need to reduce the use of coal and oil and to see identification of renewable energy technologies with potential in the area. HCC would encourage more attention to adapting to the effects of climate change.

Para 2.56, page 20

When sustainability of housing is considered in the Development Plan, the mix of building types has been the main focus and not the sustainability of the natural and built environment. HCC would encourage consideration of longer term sustainability of both the built and the natural environment.

Para 3.47 – there is a discrepancy between the SA and the Options Paper – para 3.47 of the Options Paper does not reference Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments. They should all be mentioned to be consistent with Section 7 of the SA. The document should also reference the Historic Environment Record as part of the evidence base.

HCC would need to see the associated transport modelling for each option to fully understand the potential impacts of each on Hampshire and the strategic road network. The transport evidence to support these potential development options should assess the impacts of proposed options on the local and strategic transport network. Any transport modelling and background evidence paper should also link in with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Options 3 and 4 – Education Authority Comments

The location and number of dwellings to be provided in the new Local Plan period need to be clarified in order to be able to assess the implications on school place planning and propose specific solutions should additional school places be required. Until detailed information is available the comments made here relate to principles of school place planning.

Detailed comments made regarding pupil generation and class/school size. Options 3 and 4 provide the best opportunity to provide new primary schools providing the quantum of housing in one area is a minimum of 1,400 dwellings to allow the provision of a new 2 FE primary school, as highlighted in Option 3.

Option 4 provides the best opportunity to provide additional primary schools and to consider the provision of a new secondary school.

The provision of expansions to existing schools or the provision of new schools will depend on the factors affecting school organisation and school place planning at the time the housing development is proposed.

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

Welcomes inclusion of Objective SA12 - To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, manage the impacts of climate change and improve air quality.

Suggest that the preliminary SA decision making criteria should include:

Will the objective reduce vulnerability of people, the built and natural environment to warmer wetter winters, hotter dryer summers and more frequent extreme weather events?

SHLAA – new site proposal

	<p>Requests the inclusion of Thurlston House, Victoria Hill Road, Fleet (former Adult Services site) for housing.</p> <p><b>Comments on Duty to Co-operate Issues:</b> Agree with the identification of joint issues between HCC and HDC with the addition of 'Minerals Safeguarding'.</p>
Highways Agency	The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. It is noted that much of the evidence is to be updated and have no further comments at this time.
Homes and Community Agency	No response received
The Mayor of London	No response received.
Natural England (NE)	<p>NE note that Option 5 is relevant to para. 2 of NRM6 on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) which states that: 'Priority should be given to directing development to those areas where effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures'.</p> <p>Scale of development, cumulative impact, and any in-combination effects will need to be considered, and we note that these elements are indeed acknowledged on pages 54-55 of the Housing Development Options Paper (Hart DC, August 2014)</p>
North East Hampshire & Farnham CCG	<p>The CCG would welcome the opportunity to welcome a range of issues such as the required health infrastructure to meet any housing/population demand as this impacts on local GP practice and the additional demand this puts on doctors and staff to deliver health care services to the local population. Would also like to see practices and patients engaged to develop a common understanding of the implications on the health infrastructure.</p> <p>The CCG is also developing a Primary Care Strategy and it will be important that the Hart Local Plan and the PCS dovetail.</p> <p>Details are provided of the providers of health care within the CCG area.</p>
North Hampshire CCG	No response received
Office of Rail Regulation	No response received
Runnymede Borough Council	No comments on the Development Options Paper or the Sustainability Appraisal.
Rushmoor Borough Council	<p><b>Comments on Development Options Paper:</b> Welcomes the opportunity to respond. Notes that the Options paper takes forward the recommendations of the joint SHMA and recognises that the needs of the HMA as a whole must be met.</p> <p>Welcomes consideration of a range of options to maximise housing delivery potential. Identifies that initial capacity work at Rushmoor suggests there is likely to be a shortfall of about 1,800 dwellings (initial figure subject to further work) in meeting the housing needs identified in the SHMA up to 2032. Requests that HDC notes this and considers whether any of this shortfall could be met within Hart District. Rushmoor will also write to Surrey Heath Borough Council to advise them of a likely shortfall and to ask Surrey Heath if they can consider if they will be able to accommodate any of this shortfall.</p> <p><b>Comments on Duty to Co-operate Issues:</b></p>

	Agreed that the issues identified by Hart are the relevant cross boundary issues that affect Hart and Rushmoor.
Spelthorne Borough Council <sup>8</sup>	<p>Currently undertaking a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) with Runnymede BC which lies adjacent to the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Housing Market Area (HMA). Initial findings consider that links between the two areas are very limited and confined to Runnymede/Surrey Heath only.</p> <p>As the Options document considers broad locations and not the actual housing number, at this moment in time it cannot be determined what effect (if any) Hart's housing needs will have on the Spelthorne/Runnymede area. Spelthorne Borough Council has no comment to make regarding which distribution option Hart should pursue.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to meet Hart's housing need either within Hart or within the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath HMA in the first instance. Any shortfall of needs within the HMA as a whole could have implications for areas outside of the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath HMA which may include the Spelthorne/Runnymede area.</p>
Surrey County Council	No response received
Surrey Heath Borough Council	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Welcomes the recognition that there may be a requirement for Hart to meet the needs of neighbouring authorities, particularly those in the HMA.</p> <p>Support consideration of a range of options which indicates land available for circa 9,580 – 9,875 dwellings (2014 – 2032), above Hart's OAN.</p> <p>Despite best endeavours, Surrey Heath may not be able to meet its OAHN due to environmental constraints.</p> <p>Whilst recognising there is further work to be done, this indicates that Hart could be in a position to help deliver the HMA requirement if other authorities are unable to.</p> <p>Surrey Heath will also write to Rushmoor to request that if Surrey Heath has a shortfall, whether Rushmoor could accommodate any of this.</p> <p>Makes some specific corrections in relation to Surrey Heath completions figures.</p> <p>Notes and welcomes recognition of the joint working already underway within the HMA.</p>
Waverley Borough Council	<p>Waverley BC would ask that whichever option is chosen that the implications for infrastructure and services both within Hart District and in neighbouring areas like Waverley are identified and addressed.</p> <p>If the Local Plan were to proceed with a housing target that does not meet the needs then this needs to be fully justified, given that undersupply in one area may result in pressure to increase delivery in another where similar constraints apply.</p> <p>Note that one option relates to the part of the district outside the zone of influence of the TBH SPA. Trusts that the need to adopt a consistent approach to the SPA will be considered in taking the Plan forward.</p>
Woking Borough Council	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>The only strategic issue is that of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Woking would therefore advise that the preferred option should reflect the TBH Delivery Framework which both authorities are signed up to.</p>
Wokingham Borough Council	<p>Of particular concern to Wokingham Borough are options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Option 1, Settlement Focus would involve concentrating new housing development within the existing boundaries of the main settlements and</p>

<sup>8</sup> Spelthorne Borough Council are not strictly speaking a duty to co-operate body.

	<p>larger villages within Hart. Of particular interest to Wokingham Borough are the settlements of Yateley and Eversley, which are near the Wokingham Borough boundary. Wokingham Borough Council would request that Hart District Council consider the impacts on Wokingham Borough infrastructure of growth along this boundary, particularly with regards to transportation, education, flood risk, etc.</p> <p>Option 2, Dispersal Strategy would involve allocating new housing development adjacent to the main settlements and larger villages in Hart District which would include Yateley and Eversley. Wokingham Borough Council would request here too that Hart District Council consider the impacts of growth in these areas on Wokingham Borough.</p> <p>Options 3, 4 and 5 do not propose additional growth along the Hart boundary with Wokingham Borough and so are not of particular concern to the Council.</p> <p>The development options for Yateley and Eversley would be likely to generate education, transport and flood risk impacts on Wokingham Borough. WBC would welcome the opportunity to discuss any issues associated with development at Yateley and Eversley so that deliverable solutions can be identified.</p>
--	--

## APPENDIX E

### Duty to Co-operate Meetings & Consultations (April 2014-March 2015)

Date	Duty to Cooperate body/ies	Cooperation issue(s) identified
21 April 2014	Basingstoke & Deane BC	Concern that expressed Basingstoke housing need was lower than the true objective assessment
14 May 2014	HRSH <sup>9</sup> Member Liaison Group	Proposal for the group's Terms of Reference, and finalisation of the joint strategic housing market assessment (SHMA)
22 July 2014	HRSH Member Liaison Group	Agreement on the group's Terms of Reference, and emergence of potential housing shortfalls versus need in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath
1 Oct 2014	Hampshire County Council - highways	Commitment to cooperate on highways capacity in Hart Local Plan
28 Oct 2014	HRSH Member Liaison Group	Highlighting of potential housing shortfall via Hart Housing Options Consultation by Rushmoor and Surrey Heath. SHMA finalisation. Potential for SANG in Hart to serve needs in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath
30 Oct 2014	Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership <sup>10</sup>	Emphasis to be placed on use of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) to offset development impacts upon the special protection area
7 Nov 2014	Hampshire County Council - schools	Commitment to cooperate on school places provision in Hart Local Plan
November 2014	Elmbridge Borough Council	Elmbridge DtC Scoping Statement: no issues for Hart
November 2014	Rushmoor Borough Council	Rushmoor DtC Framework: no issues for Hart in document
9 Jan 2015	Bracknell Forest BC	Commitment to accommodate housing need in respective areas. No other issues identified
14 Jan 2015	Waverley BC	No specific issues identified; commitment to ongoing cooperation
20 Jan 2015	HRSH Member Liaison Group	Ongoing joint work on housing need including SANG, and inclusion of employment land need in group's Terms of Reference
3 Feb 2015	Basingstoke & Deane BC	Objection to Basingstoke housing number withdrawn on grounds of need figure having been raised. Commitment to ongoing working
5 Feb 2015	Wokingham BC	No specific issues identified; commitment to ongoing cooperation
10 Feb	NE and North Hants	First contact in order that healthcare

<sup>9</sup> Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath

<sup>10</sup> Woking BC, Elmbridge BC, RB of Windsor & Maidenhead, Bracknell Forest BC, Wokingham BC, Runnymede BC, Hart DC, Surrey Heath BC, Rushmoor BC, Guildford BC, Waverley BC, Surrey CC, Hampshire CC, Natural England

2015	Clinical Commissioning Groups	provision needs are built into Hart local plan
27 Feb 2015	Environment Agency	Issue identified: risks from development to water quality of rivers in Hart, and potential that sewerage capacity was likely to be limited
11 March 2015	HRSB Member Liaison Group	Ongoing work on housing and employment land need, possible housing shortfalls in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath, and SANG provision
19 March 2015	Wokingham BC, Bracknell Forest BC, RB of Windsor & Maidenhead and Homes & Community Agency	Local authorities to stay in touch as and when gypsies & travellers assessments are carried out

## APPENDIX F

### Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Housing and Employment Joint Member Liaison Group

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE 2014 (updated January 2015)

##### *Background*

1. The National Planning Policy Framework requires local authorities to ensure that their Local Plans meet the full objectively assessed needs for housing (in the housing market area), and employment (in the functional economic area), as far as is consistent with policies in the Framework.
2. In order to identify the objectively assessed housing needs across the housing market area, Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Councils commissioned Wessex Economics to carry out a Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment for the three authorities. A draft was published in May 2014, with the final report completed in December 2014.
3. In order to identify economic development needs, the three Councils have jointly prepared an Employment Land Review. A draft is to be published in February 2015 with the final report to be completed April 2015.

##### *Purpose of the Joint Member Liaison Group*

4. To provide a joint forum under the duty to co-operate for:
  - exploring how the objectively assessed need for housing in the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath Housing Market Area (HMA) could be delivered;
  - exploring how the objectively assessed need for employment in the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath Functional Economic Area (FEA) could be delivered; and
  - recognising the need to balance housing and employment provision across the three authorities.

##### *The nature of the group*

5. The liaison group is not a decision-making body. Any agreement by the Group will be subject to the democratic and local plan processes within each local authority.

##### *Specific objectives*

- i. To reach an informal agreement between the three authorities on what the objectively assessed housing need is across the HMA, and within each authority area, over relevant time periods<sup>11</sup>;
- ii. To informally agree whether each authority is doing all it reasonably can, consistent with policies in the NPPF and other material considerations, to meet the objectively assessed housing needs for its area;
- iii. That in the event of any housing shortfalls arising in one authority area, to explore how cross boundary working can help address those shortfalls;
- iv. To reach an informal agreement between the three authorities on what the likely employment need (jobs target/floorspace requirement) is across the FEA up until 2032 and how this target is apportioned to each local authority area; based on evidence including land availability (supply) and information

---

<sup>11</sup> Different authorities in the HMA are currently working to different local plan periods, so it may be necessary to agree figures for housing need that cover different time periods.

on the commercial property market (demand). It is anticipated that the targets will be ranges to provide flexibility.

#### *Outcomes*

6. Where all three authorities are satisfied that each one is doing all it reasonably can to meet its own housing needs, and that any shortfalls in one area are addressed as far as possible through joint working, so that across the HMA as a whole needs are met as far as possible, consistent with policies in the NPPF. In the event that the objectively assessed housing need within the HMA is adjudged as being impossible to meet, the Group will establish how to approach adjacent HMAs.
7. Where all three authorities are satisfied that each one is doing all it reasonably can to meet its own employment needs, so that across the FEA as a whole needs are met as far as possible, consistent with policies in the NPPF.

#### *Membership*

8. The Joint Member Liaison Group will:
  - Comprise two elected Members from each authority. Substitutes may attend if appropriate.
  - Meet at intervals to be agreed at the first meeting.