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1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Consultation Statement sets out how Hart District Council has undertaken community participation and stakeholder involvement in the production of the emerging Local Plan, and how such efforts have shaped the Plan and the main issues raised by consultations and representations. It is a requirement set out by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and must accompany the Regulation 19 proposed submission consultation plan. This statement must set out:

i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,
ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,
iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;
v) if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and
vi) if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made.

1.2 It is important to note that consultations have been undertaken within the context of Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states:

"Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made."

1.3 Aside from demonstrating compliance with the aforementioned Regulations this statement also highlights how Hart has met the requirements of Paragraph 155 of the NPPF and the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

1.4 A detailed timetable for the production of Development Plan Documents (DPD) can be found in the Local Development Scheme.

---

1 https://www.hart.gov.uk/Current-planning-policy-guidance
2 https://www.hart.gov.uk/Emerging-planning-policy-guidance
2.0 Conformity with the Statement of Community Involvement

2.1 The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)\(^3\) guides the approach to consultation stages throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. It sets out how the community should be engaged in the Local Plan process and at what stages that involvement should take place. The SCI was originally published in September 2006. Subsequently it has been updated to take into account new Regulations and policy guidance with the most up to date version being approved for publication by the Council in July 2014. In April 2017, there were amendments made to Appendix D of the SCI to take account of changes to consultation procedures for planning applications.

2.2 The SCI establishes public participation as a valuable part of the production of Development Plan Documents. Early discussions with statutory consultees as well as continued engagement with the local community has been undertaken by the Council.

2.3 For the preparation of a Local Plan the SCI identifies the following statutory requirements that must happen as part of any public consultation:

- Statutory and general consultation bodies (as appropriate and identified in the SCI) are notified and invited to comment on what the document ought to contain.
- Consider whether to invite comments from local residents or businesses.
- Consider any representations received.

2.4 In addition the SCI identifies the following additional (non-statutory) engagement that is optional and may be undertaken:

- Place details of consultation on Council website.
- Place details of consultation in libraries and parish council offices.
- Consult stakeholders.
- Consider engagement with community forums.
- Consider holding public exhibitions.
- Consider whether to consult on policy options in the document.

2.5 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 prescribe a series of ‘Specific and General Consultation Bodies’ that the Council should consult with during each consultation stage. The list below outlines the specific organisations and other bodies that the Council consider to have an interest in the preparation of planning documents within Hart:

- The Coal Authority
- The Environment Agency
- Historic England
- The Highways Agency
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- Adjoining Local Planning Authorities
- Town and Parish Councils within Hart District as well as those adjoining the district

\(^3\)https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Policies_and_published_documents/Planning_policy/Statement%20of%20Community%20Involvement%20Amended%20July%202017.pdf
2.6 The full list of all statutory bodies contacted can be viewed in Appendix 1. The general consultation bodies are also identified in the Regulations and relate to voluntary organisations representing certain groups within the community. The general consultation bodies are:
- Amenity groups (including the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society and the Twentieth Century Society)
- Civic Societies
- Community groups and residents associations
- Countryside / Conservation groups
- Development and property owning interests
- Disability groups
- Ethnic minority groups (to include the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups)
- Health groups and organisations
- Housing interest groups and Housing Associations
- Local business groups
- Older persons groups
- Educational organisations
- Sport and recreation bodies and organisations
- Other groups / individuals (to include the residents of Hart District)
- Parish Plan groups
- Religious groups
- Surrey and Hampshire Canal Society
- The Theatres Trust
- Youth groups

2.7 The Council maintains a database of these Specific and General Consultation Bodies together with local organisations that have expressed an interest in being consulted on or being kept informed of the development of planning policy. This database is live and continuously updated. There are currently 5,115 individuals on the contact database which includes 33 statutory bodies, 243 general consultation bodies, 173 planning agents and developers, 84 companies and businesses, as well as local residents, landowners and other individuals with an interest in the Local Plan.

2.8 The methods of communication used to notify interested parties on the consultation database is via email and post, depending on the individual/organisation/business preferred contact method. There are also other varied methods of communication to be as inclusive as possible (table 1).
Website www.hart.gov.uk
Where information can be accessed and documents downloaded. The dedicated planning pages are kept up to date and a dedicated consultations page has information above previous consultations.

Emails and letters
Sent to all statutory and non-statutory consultees as well as individuals and businesses that have requested to be kept informed of Local Plan updates.

Hart District Council Offices
Printed copies of consultation documents were available to view at the Council offices.

Local Libraries
Printed copies of consultation documents were available to view at all three libraries across the district. View the Hampshire County Council website for opening times of these libraries.

Town/Parish Council offices
Printed copies of consultation documents were available to view at all Town and Parish Councils which had an office. Opening times of these offices varied between each location.

Press releases / adverts
To ensure the Council communicates as widely as possible.

Hart News
An article informing of forthcoming consultations were published in Hart News, the Council’s half yearly publication and is distributed to households and businesses within the district. The publication is also available online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Methods of communication used for consultations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Duty to Cooperate**

2.9 The ‘Duty to Cooperate’ is set out in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 which states that it applies to all Local Planning Authorities, National Park Authorities and County Councils in England. A list of the Duty to Cooperate bodies consulted can be viewed in Appendix 2. A separate statement has been prepared detailing how the Council has fulfilled this obligation with regards to the preparation of the Local Plan.

**Consultation**

2.10 The Hart Local Plan is currently at Regulation 19 publication stage and will be subject to a final round of consultation on 9 February – 26 March 2017. All representations received will be submitted alongside the Local Plan. A schedule of the consultation stages and the front covers of each consultation document can be viewed in table 2 and figure 1 respectively. Each of the Regulation 18 stages were subject to public consultation in accordance with the SCI and statutory requirements. Such bodies were also duly notified and the documents made available in accordance with the Regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Stage</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Consultation Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development Options Paper</td>
<td>Regulation 18</td>
<td>14 August – 10 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Options for Delivering New Homes</td>
<td>4 February – 18 March 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Hart Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2011-2032</td>
<td>26 April – 9 June 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Hart Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2016-2032</td>
<td>Regulation 19</td>
<td>9 February – 26 March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Schedule of key consultation dates*

---

2.11 In additional to these ‘formal’ stages of consultation, more informal engagement was undertaken throughout the process, particularly with statutory bodies and Duty to Cooperate bodies. These informed the development of the Plan and the evidence base. The outcome of discussions with Duty to Cooperate bodies is set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. Table 3 shows stakeholder involvement in the evidence base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Base</th>
<th>Stakeholder Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report 2014</td>
<td>Consultation on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal took place between 10 April and 16 May 2014 including the three statutory environmental consultees Environment Agency, English Heritage (now Historic England) and Natural England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal of Housing Development Options 2014</td>
<td>Consultation was undertaken alongside the Paper 14 August – 10 October 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report 2017</td>
<td>Consultation was undertaken alongside the draft plan 26 April – 9 June 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014</td>
<td>• Stakeholder consultation on the SHMA methodology was undertaken in March 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder event held on 25 March 2014 included a mix of local authority officers, Councillors, house builders and registered providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft SHMA available for consultation May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2016</td>
<td>A joint methodology was prepared for the local authorities within the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Housing Market Area to ensure consistency when preparing a Strategic Land Availability Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2016</td>
<td>Consultation with Hampshire Gypsy Liaison, adjoining local authorities, interviews with residents of gypsy and traveller sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Review 2015</td>
<td>Stakeholder Event was held at Rushmoor Borough Council’s offices in November 2014 including with commercial agents and M3 Local Enterprise Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Review 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Strategy 2017</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation undertaken in two stages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Base</td>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Open Space Study 2016  
Built Facilities Strategy 2016  
Playing Pitch Strategy 2016 | • Initial e-mail consultation November 2016  
• Stakeholder workshop held at the Harlington, Fleet on 30 November 2016.  
In order to understand the needs and perceptions of the local community regarding levels of provision a programme of consultation was undertaken as part of the Open Space Study. This entailed online surveys, meetings and workshops with stakeholders. Two workshops were hosted by HDC in April 2014 and in March 2015.  
For the Sports Built Facility Strategy an electronic survey was distributed to 47 National Governing Bodies for Sport, sport clubs, Primary/secondary schools and community groups to understand their views on current provision. Responses were received from 35 bodies. |
| Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2018 | Between April 2017 and December 2017 meetings held with the following bodies:  
• Hampshire County Council – Education  
• Hampshire County Council – Strategic Planning Team  
• Hampshire County Council – Highways  
• Natural England  
• Stagecoach  
• North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group  
• North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group  
• South East Water (telephone conversation and email exchange) |
| Retail, Leisure and Town Centres Study 2015 | Household survey undertaken in September 2014. |
| Habitat Regulation assessment 2018 | Natural England invited to comment on the draft HRA. |
| Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Water Cycle Study 2017 | Consultation undertaken with the Environment Agency during study period. |

*Table 3: Stakeholder involvement in the Local Plan evidence base*

2.12 With respect to what are regarded as the Regulation 18 consultations, at each stage responses were recorded, considered and taken into account. Resulting changes were incorporated into the content of the following stage of consultation.

2.13 Consultation has also taken place supporting documentation such as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) during April and June 2017.

2.14 Each stage of consultation is detailed in this document in the context of how it was promoted and what responses were received. Throughout the process there has also been member input and involvement.
3.0 Housing Options Paper: 14 August – 10 October 2014

3.1 The Housing Options Paper\(^5\) was the first stage of consultation and it made the public aware of the Council’s intention to prepare a Local Plan for Hart. It provided an opportunity for interested parties to voice their opinion on what direction strategic growth in Hart would take. The paper was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal of the Options and a range of other evidence which was made available on the Council’s website.

3.2 The paper sought views on different options for delivering future growth, namely:

- Option 1 – Settlement Focus
- Option 2 – Dispersal Strategy
- Option 3 – Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extension)
- Option 4 – Focused Growth (New Settlement)
- Option 5 – Focusing development away from the Thames Basin Heaths Zone of Influence

How the Consultation was undertaken

3.3 The consultation lasted for an eight week period from 14 August to 10 October 2014. The consultation was formally notified in accordance with Regulation 18 and all documents were made available in accordance with Regulation 35. The consultation was also consistent with the procedures set out in the SCI. Table 4 sets out how the Council engaged with the community for this consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council website</td>
<td>Publish and advertise consultation document, summary leaflet and response form (online form available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart District Council offices</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at Hart District Council offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council Offices and Libraries</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at all libraries and parish council offices across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters and Emails</td>
<td>Notification to all persons or businesses on the consultation database (approximately 800 groups and individuals at the time of the consultation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific letters sent to the duty to co-operate bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart News</td>
<td>An article publicising the consultation included in the Council’s half yearly publication which is delivered to every household in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Notification on Facebook and Twitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Information Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Exhibitions (drop-in workshops)</td>
<td>Held at 4 different locations throughout Hart District:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9 September 2014 10:30am-7:30pm – Elizabeth Hall, Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 September 2014 10:30am-7pm – Cross Barn, Odiham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 September 2014 10:30am-7:30pm – Monteagle Community Hall, Yateley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 30 September 2014 10:30am-8pm – Hart District Council Offices, Fleet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4: Methods for promoting the Housing Options consultation |

3.4 There were 684 representations to the consultation received through a mix of online responses, paper questionnaires, letters and emails. The individual responses can be viewed online at [https://www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation-responses](https://www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation-responses)

3.5 Of those who used the online questionnaire to respond, 55 per cent of individuals were male, 36 per cent were female and nine per cent did not specify their gender (figure 2).

![Figure 2: Responses to ‘What is your gender?’](image)

3.6 Responses to the question on age revealed one person was under 18, one per cent were aged 18-24, five per cent were 25-34, 13 per cent were 35-44, 16 per cent were 45-54, 21 per cent were aged 55-64, 31 per cent were over 65, and 13 per cent did not specify an age (figure 3).
Summary of Main Issues Raised

3.7 The response form used for this consultation and the summary leaflet can be found in Appendices 3 and 4 respectively. The individual responses and a full summary of the responses can be found on the Hart District Council website.

Growth Options

3.8 Respondents were asked to rank their preference on the future growth options (as set out in paragraph 3.2). Option 1 (settlement focus) and Option 4 (new settlement) emerged as the two preferred options followed by Option 3 (strategic sites), Option 2 (dispersal) and Option 5 (SPA avoidance) in that order.

3.9 There were a number of comments suggesting that a combination of options would be needed. In particular (but not solely), the following combinations were put forward, although there were also comments against options 3 and 4 as being not viable, and options 1, 2 and 3 as not able to provide sustainable infrastructure:

- A combination of Options 1 and 3
- A combination of Options 1 and 4
- A combination of Options 4 and 5
- A combination of Options 2 and 4

3.10 When asked whether even the smallest villages should see some development, 322 respondents said ‘Yes’, 151 said ‘No’, and 59 answered ‘Don’t Know’.

3.11 There were a number of comments which questioned the need for the number of new homes proposed, but also comments supporting the level of housing, or a higher number, being met. Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Council’s alerted Hart to a potential shortfall in their ability to meet their own respective housing need. There were mixed comments on the need to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, and there were additional comments

---

relating to the need to involve residents; to prepare a plan as soon as possible; to focus on brownfield land and protect greenfield sites, and the need to take account of existing expansion plans. There were also a number of detailed comments setting out concerns about existing infrastructure and the need to ensure that new development must be supported with appropriate infrastructure alongside it.

**Infrastructure**

3.12 Key stakeholders responded to the consultation. Hampshire County Council (HCC) preferred strategic developments to dispersal as it offers more scope for on-site school provision. In particular, HCC stated that the new settlement option provides the best opportunity to provide additional primary schools and to consider the provision of a new secondary school. Thames Water identified several areas with capacity issues in different parts of the district, and on the implications of different options. Large-scale development, particularly a new settlement, offered the best opportunity to deliver infrastructure solutions particularly for waste water.

**Evidence**

3.13 There were a number of representations made challenging the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) methodology and suggestions that the District’s housing need is higher.

3.14 There were sites submitted to the Council for potential development across the District. The sites were later assessed as part of the SHLAA.

**Actions Taken / Key Changes**

3.15 The decision was made after the consultation to follow a combination of growth strategies and to test an option including creating a new settlement. Based on the availability and suitability of potential sites the new settlement would be centred on the Winchfield area. As well as the preference for a new settlement in the consultation results, an important factor in reaching this outcome was HCC’s partiality for larger focused developments in order to help meet the long-term educational needs of Hart. This preferred approach was agreed at a Full Council meeting\(^7\) as a strategy to be tested and not a final decision.

3.16 The Council also continued to work with both Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Borough Council’s to assess their ability to meet their own housing need.

---

\(^7\) 27 November 2014 Full Council:
[https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Council_meetings/M_Archive/14%2011%20Council.pdf](https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Council_meetings/M_Archive/14%2011%20Council.pdf)
4.0 Refined Options for Delivering New Homes: 4 February – 18 March 2016

4.1 The Refined Options for Delivering New Homes consultation\(^8\) was originally run from 23 November 2015 to 15 January 2016. However due to a technical issue the consultation was stopped on 14 January 2016 and re-run in February – March 2016 for a six week period. This consultation built on the previous responses to the Housing Options consultation.

4.2 After establishing the key priority of delivering new homes on brownfield land, it was considered unlikely that there will be enough brownfield land to meet all the district’s housing need. The Refined Options for Delivering New Homes paper set out some alternative approaches for building on greenfield land and also asked for comments on individual sites.

4.3 Respondents were asked to rank the following approaches in order of preference:

- Approach 1 – Disperse development throughout towns and villages
- Approach 2 – Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements (Namely: West of Hook; Pale Lane, Fleet; and West of Fleet)
- Approach 3 – A new settlement at Winchfield

4.4 The paper also sought comments on an early draft of the vision and key issues for the emerging Local Plan, and the need for different types of housing: affordable and starter homes; custom and self build; homes for older people; and travelling communities. There was also a call for sites conducted during this consultation period.

How the Consultation was undertaken

4.5 The consultation ran from 4 February to 18 March 2016 and was formally notified in accordance with Regulation 18. All documents were made available in accordance with Regulation 35 and were consistent with the procedures set out in the SCI. Table 5 sets out how the Council engaged with the community for this consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council website</td>
<td>Publish and advertise consultation document, summary leaflet and response form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart District Council offices</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at Hart District Council offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council offices and Libraries</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at all libraries and parish council offices across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters and Emails</td>
<td>Notification to all persons or businesses on the consultation database Specific letters sent to the duty to co-operate bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>A Refined Options consultation summary newsletter was delivered to all households in the district (Appendix 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\)https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Consultations/Local_Plan_Feb_2016/Refined%20Options%20for%20Delivering%20New%20Homes%202016%20v2.6.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hart News</td>
<td>An article publicising the consultation included in the Council’s half yearly publication which is delivered to every household in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Notification on Facebook and Twitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Methods for promoting the Refined Housing Options consultation

4.6 There were 4,481 responses to the consultation received through a mix of online responses, paper questionnaires, letters and emails. This was an 85 per cent increase in the number of respondents to the previous Housing Options consultation in 2014.

Summary of the Main Issues Raised

4.7 The response form, leaflet and a full summary of the main comments for this consultation can be viewed in Appendices 5, 6 and 7 respectively. The comments are available to view online.

Alternative Approaches for Growth

4.8 Respondents were asked to rank which approach would be preferable to deliver new homes in Hart (as set out in paragraph 4.3). An overwhelming majority voted for a new settlement at Winchfield (59 per cent), followed by the urban centres of Fleet and Hook (47 per cent), in locations close to public transport and services and facilities and, infill development in existing villages and edge of settlement sites.

4.9 Respondents were then asked to rank Approaches 4 to 7 in order of preference.
   - Approach 4: combined approaches 1 and 2
   - Approach 5: combined approaches 2 and 3
   - Approach 6: combined approaches 3 and 1
   - Approach 7: combine all three approaches

4.10 The preferred combination of responses were for Approach 6 (40 per cent) followed by Approach 4 (35 per cent), Approach 5 (21 per cent) and Approach 7 (4 per cent).

4.11 Many communities were concerned about the level of development in the villages on the basis of limited infrastructure to support additional homes, impact on the countryside, SANGS and on the historic environment, traffic generation and pollution and flooding.

4.12 Whilst there was general support for the new settlement, there were concerns regarding coalescence of settlements, impact of the character and identity of nearby villages and limited infrastructure.

Housing Need

4.13 Many objected to housing numbers and meeting the unmet need from other local authorities in the Housing Market Area (HMA) arguing that the SHMA, population projections and methodology were out of date.

4.14 The main comments on meeting the housing needs of specialist groups was that sheltered housing should be near shops and facilities and Hart had already exceeded its quota for this

---

9 Comments available at [https://www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-housing-options-results-2016](https://www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-housing-options-results-2016) and a formal summary of these responses is available at [https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Policies_and_published_documents/Planning_policy/Local_Plan/Refined%20Options%20for%20Housing%20Full%20Summary%20of%20Responses.pdf](https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Policies_and_published_documents/Planning_policy/Local_Plan/Refined%20Options%20for%20Housing%20Full%20Summary%20of%20Responses.pdf)
type of housing. The majority of comments were in agreement that there were sufficient sites in Hart to cater for travellers.

**Actions Taken / Key Changes**

4.15 Further technical studies and site assessment work were undertaken and specific policies were prepared in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2011-2032 to target issues raised in the consultation. Specific policies were developed for affordable housing (SC8), specialist housing for older persons (SC10), Custom and self-build (SC7) and a policy on Gypsy and traveller sites (SC11). The Spatial Strategy policy (SSI) proposed the allocation of four key strategic sites at Hartland Village, Murrell Green, Cross Farm and Sun Park. The advantage of focusing growth on strategic sites could mean the development can support higher levels of service provision and greater infrastructure improvements. In addition a limited amount of development was proposed within the more sustainable villages (SC5) within the District. Draft policies required all large development schemes to include the full range of housing to meet all housing needs.

4.16 Following concerns of insufficient infrastructure and risks of flooding, technical studies were commissioned to assess potential impacts on the natural environment and capacity of existing infrastructure. This informed policies in the Draft Local Plan such as Policy I1 Infrastructure, Policy I3 Transport, Policy I8 Strategic SANG, Policy NE4 Managing Flood Risk, Policy BE1 Historic Environment, and Policy BE4 Pollution.

4.17 Following concerns regarding coalescence of towns and villages, especially if a new settlement was proposed, a policy was included in the Draft Local Plan on Gaps between Settlements (MG6). This policy aimed to ensure a sense of place is maintained for individual communities.

4.18 The Council updated the SHMA to inform the Draft Local Plan which included up to date population projections.

4.19 New sites were submitted following the call for sites exercise. Sites were assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which informed the Draft Local Plan.
5.0 Draft Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2011-2032: 26 April – 9 June 2017

5.1 This consultation was the first draft of the local plan document showing all the proposed policies and allocations. The Draft Local Plan\textsuperscript{10} set out the vision and strategy for the district. It was informed by previous consultations and a robust evidence base. The Draft Plan was supported by an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and a range of other evidence which was made available on the Council’s website.

5.2 The consultation sought views on the chapters and policies contained within the Draft Local Plan.

How the Consultation was undertaken

5.3 The consultation was undertaken between 26 April and 9 June (six weeks). The consultation was formally notified in accordance with Regulation 18 and all documents were made available in accordance with Regulation 35. The consultation was also consistent with the procedures set out in the SCI. Table 6 sets out how the Council engaged with the community for this consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council website</td>
<td>Publish and advertise consultation document, summary leaflet and response form (online form available)</td>
<td>6,689 page views on the draft local plan. 2,028 page views on the consultation response form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart District Council offices</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at Hart District Council offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council Offices and Libraries</td>
<td>Printed copies of the consultation material were available to view at all libraries and parish council offices across the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters and Emails</td>
<td>Notification to all persons or businesses on the consultation database</td>
<td>Email sent to: 40 statutory bodies, 243 non-statutory consultees, 215 planning consultants &amp; agents, 87 companies and businesses, 1,541 individuals and landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster and leaflets</td>
<td>Leaflet sent to all properties on the Council Tax/ Business Rates address list, in addition to a selection of residents in Riseley and Rushmoor (Appendix 8)</td>
<td>36,000 leaflets sent directly to all households. In addition, they were sent to properties outside of the borough at Riseley (70 properties) and Farnborough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Facebook: Publish promoted to target residents, specifically targeting hard to reach groups (young people)</td>
<td>Facebook: The total reach for the campaign was 8,272 people. In total, there were 151 clicks, 37 likes and 12 people shared the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twitter: Publish key messages throughout the consultation. Aimed at residents and business</td>
<td>Twitter: The total reach for the campaign was 79,005. There was a total of 150 clicks. In total 44 people retweeted messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LinkedIn: Publish key messages throughout the consultation</td>
<td>LinkedIn: 1,443 impressions with 11 clicks to the website for more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>Press release published announcing the launch of the consultation</td>
<td>2,835 visits to news article on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business eNews Updates</td>
<td>Provide information for businesses on where they can respond to the consultation</td>
<td>May 2017 of HDC publication ‘Hart for Business’ update – sent to 1,569 businesses – 371 read email and 28 clicks onto the draft LP consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Exhibitions (drop-in workshops)</td>
<td>Held at 6 different locations throughout Hart District: • Tuesday 2 May 2-8pm – Hook Community Centre • Wednesday 3 May 2-8pm – The Harlington, Fleet • Monday 8 May 2-8pm – Victoria Hall, Hartley Wintney • Wednesday 10 May 2-8pm – The Tythings, Yateley • Thursday 11 May 2-8pm – Ridley Hall, South Warnborough • Monday 15 May 4:30-8pm – Hawley Leisure Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6:** Methods for promoting the Draft Hart Local Plan consultation

5.4 There were 1,226 responses to the consultation generating 2,313 representations. The majority of responses were made using the online form with the remainder being submitted via post or email. The responses can be viewed online at [https://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-responses-2017](https://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-responses-2017) and all the consultation material including the exhibition display boards are available at [https://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan](https://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan).

5.5 Of the 613 who responded to the gender equalities question 323 (52.7 per cent) were male and 245 (40 per cent) were female. 45 individuals (7.3 per cent) preferred not to answer (figure 4).
There were 624 responses to the age related category question. 149 were in the 65-74 age group followed by 137 in the 55-64 age group, 111 in the 45-55, 11 in the 18-24, 28 in the 25-34 and 67 preferred not to say. Overall 338 (54.1 per cent) were aged over 55 (figure 5).

Of those who responded to the ethnic group monitoring question, 558 identified as white, 402 of whom identified as White British. Five identified as being of mixed ethnic groups, two Asian, one Gypsy and 72 preferred not to reveal their ethnic group (figure 6).
5.8 22 (3.8 per cent) of the 579 respondents to the ‘do you consider yourself to have a disability?’ question considered themselves as having a disability, 48 preferred not to answer (figure 7).

**Figure 6: Responses to ‘How would you describe your ethnic group?’**

**Figure 7: Responses to ‘Do you consider yourself to have a disability?’**

**Summary of Main Issues Raised**

5.9 The response form, consultation leaflet and a summary of the main comments raised can be found in Appendices 8, 9 and 10 respectively. The individual responses made can be viewed on the Council’s website.

5.10 There were concerns that there was an over-provision of housing numbers beyond the SHMA figure and the affordable housing uplift was not needed. Conversely, other comments

---

considered there was a lack of sufficiently deliverable allocations to meet the full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the District within the plan period, and that the OAHN should be higher.

**Proposed Sites and New Settlement**

5.11 Various comments were made regarding the 11 proposed allocations in the Draft Plan, especially three of the strategic sites: Hartland Park; Murrell Green; and Land at Cross Farm. The main objections to Hartland Park was the failure of the site to deliver 40 per cent affordable housing, and the over-reliance on the site to deliver 1,500 dwellings over the plan period. Objections to Murrell Green related to the need for a new settlement in principle as well as other detailed concerns. There were also concerns regarding developing Murrell Green instead of Winchfield, in line with the outcome of the 2016 Refined Options for Delivering New Homes Consultation. Comments on the proposed site at Cross Farm questioned the need for additional specialist accommodation for older persons as there are many care homes and elderly facilities already in the area. Other comments on the sites related to inappropriate scale and the impact on the historic and natural environment.

5.12 Representations were made promoting sites for inclusion in the Local Plan. There were seven new sites submitted for consideration which the Council assessed as part of a SHLAA update.

**Comments on Policies**

5.13 Concerns were raised about the appropriate infrastructure needed to support the new settlement and strategic sites. A need to improve public transport, roads and cycle paths was emphasised to allow for increased capacity being brought about as a result of new development.

5.14 There was support for the principle of settlement gaps and for particular gap designations. There were also objections to a number of gaps which included a lack of supporting evidence.

5.15 The Safeguarding Employment Land policy was criticised for safeguarding employment sites in areas with an over-supply of low grade office space such as Fleet. Many supported the redevelopment of brownfield sites for residential uses.

**Evidence**

5.16 Objections to the evidence base included a lack of a robust SA, Transport Assessment (TA), Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and HRA.

**Actions Taken / Key Changes**

**Housing Numbers and Sites**

5.17 Following the close of consultation the Government consulted on a new standard methodology for calculating local housing need\(^{12}\). In preparing the proposed Submission version of the Local Plan the Council has taken this methodology as a starting point but with an uplift taking account of factors such as removal of the 'cap', the need for flexibility and the

---

delivery of affordable housing. Further detail is set out in Appendix 2 to the proposed Submission Local Plan.

5.18 The plan period was brought forward from 2011 to 2016 in order to be consistent with the Government’s new methodology. These changes had a consequential effect on the number of new homes required over the plan period, and having regard to this and technical evidence the plan was amended such that a number of draft housing allocations were deleted including the proposal for a new settlement at Murrell Green. Instead, having regard to the representations made, the change in housing numbers and other technical evidence, the Plan was amended to include an area of search for a new settlement to meet longer term needs in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area. Work on the proposed new settlement DPD is proposed to commence after the adoption of the Local Plan. Hartland Park has been retained as a Strategic allocation, making the best use of previously developed land (Policy SS2). Some amendments have been made to this Policy and to the supporting text.

Evidence

5.19 A complete evidence base including the SA, TA, HRA and IDP have been prepared to support the proposed Submission version of the Local Plan as well as various topic papers.

Other Changes

5.20 A number of policies were amended following the outcome of consultation and completion of the evidence base.
6.0 What Happens Next?

6.1 Over the three consultations undertaken so far the Council has consulted for a total of 20 weeks and given the community significant opportunities to provide input and comment on the emerging Local Plan. Over 6,300 responses from individuals / companies / organisations have been inputted over all three rounds of consultation.

6.2 The views and information submitted throughout each stage of consultations have been used alongside evidence studies to prepare a Regulation 19 Local Plan Proposed Submission Document. The final consultation period will allow formal representations to be made in response to the Proposed Submission Document by any interested individual or group.

6.3 This Consultation Statement will be updated to reflect the latest representations following the Regulation 19 Consultation on the Local Plan.
Appendix 1: Statutory bodies consulted

The Coal Authority
The Environment Agency
Historic England
The Highways Agency
Homes and Communities Agency
Natural England
Rushmoor Borough Council
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Wokingham Borough Council
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
East Hants District Council
Waverley District Council
Hampshire County Council
Surrey County Council
Blackwater & Hawley Town Council
Bramshill Parish Council
Church Crookham Parish Council
Crondall Parish Council
Crookham Village Parish Council
Dogmersfield Parish Council
Elvetham Heath Parish Council
Eversley Parish Council
Ewshot Parish Council
Fleet Town Council
Greywell Parish Council
Hartley Wintney Parish Council
Heckfield Parish Council
Hook Parish Council
Long Sutton & Well Parish Council
Mattingley Parish Council
Odiham Parish Council
Rotherwick Parish Council
South Warnborough Parish Council
Winchfield Parish Council
Yateley Town Council
Beech Hill Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Bentley Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Farnham Town Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Finchampstead Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Froyle Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Greywell Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Hartley Wespall Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Mapledurwell and Up Nately Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Newnham Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Old Basing Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Sandhurst Town Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Shalden Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Stratfield Saye Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Stratfield Turgis Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Swallowfield Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Upton Grey Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Weston Corbett and Weston Patrick Parish Council (Parish/Town Council in adjoining authority)
Hampshire Police Authority
NHS Hampshire and Hampshire Community Health Care
Network Rail
NHS South Central Strategic Health Authority
British Gas
British Telecom
BT Group plc
EE
Hutchison 3G UK Limited
National Grid UK
SSE Power
SSE Power Distribution Limited
Telefonica UK Limited (O2)
Three
T-Mobile/Orange (UK) Ltd (Now EE)
Virgin Media
Vodaphone and O2
South East Water
South East Water
Southern Electric
Southern Gas Network (Scotia Gas Networks)
Thames Water
The British Wind Energy Association
Appendix 2: Duty to Cooperate bodies consulted

Rushmoor Borough Council
Surrey Heath Borough Council
Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Wokingham Borough Council
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
East Hants District Council
Waverley District Council
Hampshire County Council
Surrey County Council
Environment Agency
English Heritage
Natural England
The Mayor of London
Civil Aviation Authority
Homes and Communities Agency
NHS North East Hampshire & Farnham CCG
NHS North Hampshire CCG
Office of Rail Regulation
Highways Authority
Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership
Appendix 3: Response Form for the Housing Development Options Consultation

Hart District Council
Housing Development Options Consultation

RESPONSE FORM

| Date of consultation: | 14th August 2014 – 10th October 2014 |

Please use this response form to give us your views on future housing options.

Information on the housing options is set out in a Housing Development Options Paper, and in a Summary Leaflet. There is also a Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanies the Options Paper. These are all available on the Council’s website at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan.

Please respond electronically if possible either using the online form at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-options-survey or by emailing a completed a WORD document to planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk.

All responses (electronic and paper) must be received by 5pm on Friday 10 October 2014.

Responses will be published online and will be attributed to source (this may include your name and a reference number). Personal details other than name will not be published.

Contact information will be kept so that you can be notified of future stages of this and other planning policy documents, unless you tell us that you do not want us to contact you further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR DETAILS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Dr / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents: (Please give the name of the person/organisation you represent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hart District Council
Housing Development Options Consultation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Please circle one rank for each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 – Settlement Focus</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 – Dispersal Strategy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 – Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extensions)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 – Focused Growth (New Settlement)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 – Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any comments that support your response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>None of the options suggest housing in Hart’s smallest villages and hamlets. Do you think even the smallest settlements should see some new housing?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please add any comments that support your response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q3 | If Option 4 (Focused Growth - New Settlement) were selected, where in Hart do you think the new settlement should be located and how large should it be? Please give reasons for your views. |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|-----------|
|    | Comments:                                                                                                                       |     |    |           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Are there any other possible housing development options?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you have said ‘yes’ please outline what other option or options there might be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5  Please use this space to make any other comments on the Housing Development Options Paper or the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. (Please attach separate sheets as necessary)

Comments:

About You

The following information is for our records, and aims to ensure that we listen to the views of all sectors of our community. It will help us understand responses in greater detail by seeing 'who thinks what'. Like the rest of the survey, all the questions are optional and any responses received will be treated in confidence.

Q6  Gender (please tick □ one box only)
    Male
    Female
    Prefer not to say

Q7  Age (please tick □ one box only)
    Under 18
    25 - 34
    45 - 54
    65 +
    18 - 24
    35 - 44
    55 - 64
    Prefer not to say

Hart District Council
Housing Development Options Consultation
Appendix 4: Housing Development Options Summary Leaflet

How can I find out more?

We are holding a series of drop-in sessions for Hart residents. If you have any questions about the new Local Plan and would like to speak to council officers, please come to a drop-in session; no appointment needed. Drop-in sessions will be held at the following locations:

- Hook - 9 September 2014, 10:30am - 7:30pm, Elizabeth Hall, Raven Road, Hook, RG27 9HH
- Yateley - 10 September 2014, 10:30am - 7:30pm, Cross Barn, Prince Gate Farm, Yateley, RG21 9JX
- Fleet - 30 September 2014, 10:30am - 7:30pm, Civic Offices, Hartley Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE

We want to know your views!

This leaflet summarises only the main housing growth options for the new Local Plan. The Housing Development Options Paper also looks at other important planning issues, including:

- Why we need more homes
- The need for other types of development
- Environmental concerns
- Infrastructure issues

Please send us your comments by 10 October 2014. You can download a questionnaire together with this leaflet, a Housing Options Summary Paper and the full version of the Options Paper from our website at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan.

The consultation papers can be viewed in paper copy at the Hart District Council Civic Offices, Hartley Way, Fleet. They can also be viewed in paper copy at Parish Council Offices and in local libraries during normal opening hours.

Where do we go from here?

We need to decide which option, or options, to take forward. Your comments, and other relevant evidence, will be taken into account in making that decision.

We aim to publish a ‘preferred strategy’ for consultation early in 2015. That document will explain why we have selected the preferred approach, and will add more detail on what it could mean for different parts of the district.

The next steps...

- End Housing Development Options Consultation - October 2014
- Preferred Strategy for Growth - January to February 2015
- Draft Plan Consultation - Summer/ Autumn 2015
- Final Plan Consultation - Autumn 2015
- Published, then submit the Local Plan for Examination - Autumn 2016
- Examination (including public hearing sessions) - Spring 2016
- Adoption - Summer 2016

Documents published August 2014 by Hart District Council.

If you require this leaflet in a different format please call the Planning Policy department on 01252 714188.

Local Plan to 2032

SHAPING THE FUTURE OF HART

A new local plan for Hart District

Recent changes to the planning system mean that we must consider future local needs and identify new areas for growth and development. The Local Plan will give the Council more control over new development. However, this means making choices about where development should go.

We need your help shaping the future of Hart

As a first step we have written a Housing Development Options Paper for you to comment on and this leaflet sums up the key questions. It sets out how much growth there should be and where it should take place up to 2032.

Making Hart a great place to live
How am I affected?

The plan may affect you in a variety of ways; there may be new housing, business premises, new shops, schools or open spaces near to where you live. New roads or cycle ways could be built. The Local Plan may affect many aspects of our lives and we want to get the balance right. If you want to have your say at an early stage, then this is a good time to get involved.

How much growth should there be?

Many factors need to be taken into account when deciding how many new homes and jobs need to be provided in Hart District between now and 2032. Taking account of the houses already planned for, initial analysis suggests that we will need to find sites for around 4,000 new homes.

Where should the growth be located?

We are proposing five options for how growth might be distributed up to 2032 – we want to know which one you prefer. If you think there is another option which we should consider please let us know. More detail can be found in the Full Housing Development Options Paper available on our website www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan.

What should the new approach be as we look forward to 2032?

The Options paper looks at five different approaches that could be taken across the District to deliver the 4,000 homes needed. Not all of the options deliver the total amount needed, so some may need to be combined.

Option 1 - Settlement Focus:
Growth takes place within the existing towns and villages. This could deliver up to 875 homes meaning it will need to be combined with another option.

Pro: Avoids greenfield development.

Con: Does not meet housing needs in full, so would need to be combined with another option.

Deliver up to 875 homes

---

Option 2 - Dispersal Strategy:
This would spread the growth around the edges of the main towns and villages within Hart. This could deliver as many as 4,000 homes.

Pro: Everywhere takes a share of growth.

Con: Difficult to deliver big infrastructure items.

Deliver as many as 4,000 homes

---

Option 3 - Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extensions):
This would focus the growth on the edges of one or two of the existing towns in Hart. This could deliver around 3,500 homes meaning it will need to be combined with another option.

Pro: Can properly plan a new neighbourhood with facilities.

Con: Could place strain on the host settlement’s infrastructure and character.

Deliver up to 3,500 homes

---

Option 4 - Focused Growth (New Settlement):
This option would create a new town or village in Hart. However as it could take up to 10 years before any homes are built, it would need to be combined with another option.

Pro: Can properly plan a new settlement with homes, employment and major infrastructure.

Con: Could take several years before homes are built so would need to be combined with another option.

Deliver 4,000 homes or more

---

Option 5 - Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy:
This pushes the growth away from the environmentally sensitive Special Protection Area (SPA), which covers the north and east of the district. This could deliver 1,500 homes so would need to be combined with another option.

Pro: Best protection for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Con: Rural area with limited infrastructure and high landscape quality and historic environments.

Deliver up to 1,500 homes

Which option do you prefer? Is there another option the Council should consider?

Possible implications of new development

In growth locations new development may lead to a boost in the local economy, new jobs, homes and services such as GP surgeries, schools, shops and community facilities. New infrastructure, such as new roads and other community assets may also be developed. However, nearby open and undeveloped land may come under pressure for development and traffic levels may be affected.

In locations with little or no growth, whilst the open countryside may be preserved, shops and other services may struggle to remain viable.

More information about these options and their implications are set out in the full consultation documents at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan.

For information on Hart’s settlements and their facilities see ‘A Settlement Hierarchy for Hart District (Updated August 2010)’ available at www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base. You can also see information on each parish at www.hart.gov.uk/parish-profiles.

A call for sites

We want as much choice as possible over where development could go. If you know of land that you think could be developed then we want to hear from you. Now is the best time to submit site details via a New Site Form available at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan.
Appendix 5: Response Form for the Refined Options for Delivering New Homes Consultation

Hart District Local Plan 2011-2032

Refined Options for Delivering New Homes
Draft Vision & Strategic Priorities

Consultation closes 4pm Friday 18 March 2016

Response Form

This new consultation replaces the earlier consultation which started in November 2015 and was stopped on 14 January 2016 because it became apparent, following feedback from local residents, that not all the settlements that were anticipated to be included within one of the key questions had been correctly captured.

If you have read the new consultation material and would like to re-submit your original response please visit www.hart.gov.uk/confirmation-of-local-plan-response or email planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk.
**Name:**
You must give us your name otherwise it will invalidate your response to this consultation.

**Postcode:**
You must give us your full postcode. Invalid postcodes will invalidate your response to this consultation.

If you would like to be sent a copy of the results of this consultation and to hear about future local plan consultations please enter your email address below:
Consultation questions regarding the Refined Options for Delivering New Homes

You need not answer every question or make comments but you must answer Questions 4 and 5 and you must complete those two questions in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

Q1. Do you have any comments on how to meet the needs of specialist groups such as affordable and Starter Homes, Custom or self-build homes, specialist homes for older people, and sites for the Travelling Community?

Q2. Where are the sites within Hart District that you think may be appropriate for:
   a) Affordable and Starter Homes?
   b) Custom and Self Build?
   c) Homes for older people?
   d) Travelling communities?
Q3. Do you agree with the current Settlement Hierarchy? (Please tick)

The Council has an existing Settlement Hierarchy (2010) which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Main Urban Area</td>
<td>Fleet, including Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Primary Local Service Centres</td>
<td>Blackwater &amp; Hawley, Hook, Yateley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Secondary Local Service Centres</td>
<td>Hartley Wintney, Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>Main Villages</td>
<td>RAF Odiham, Crondall, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Ewhot, Eversley, Long Sutton, Rotherwick, South Warnborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 5</td>
<td>All remaining villages and hamlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yes**

**No**

If not, how should it be changed?
Our priority will be to deliver new homes on brownfield land (land that has previously been developed). However we do not think there will be enough brownfield land available to meet our needs. Any development that cannot be built on ‘brownfield land’ will have to be delivered elsewhere. This will essentially be on ‘greenfield’ sites outside our towns and villages. The possible ‘greenfield’ approaches are set out in Questions 4 and 5.

Q4. Of the three possible approaches that could deliver new homes in Hart, which one should we prioritise to deliver the majority of our housing needs?

You must complete this question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

Please note that this question only seeks your views on what should be our primary approach to delivering Hart’s housing needs. It does not mean it would be our only approach. We will need to ensure that we deliver a constant supply of new homes throughout the Local Plan period. Some elements of lesser preferred approaches may need to be included in the plan.

Please rank your choice in order of preference (1 = most preferred to 3 = least preferred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach 1: Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes: Blackwater &amp; Hawley, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Elvetham Heath, Eversley, Ewshot, Fleet, Hartley Wintney, Heckfield, Hook, Rotherwick and Yateley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 2: Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements (West of Hook, Pale Lane Farm adjacent to Elvetham Heath and land west of Fleet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 3: A new settlement at Winchfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any further comments on this below

---
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Q5. If we need to combine approaches, which combinations do you prefer? Please rank your choice in order of preference (1 = most preferred to 4 = least preferred).

You must complete this question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach 4</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Combine Approaches 1 and 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Disperse development throughout the towns and villages &lt;br&gt;and&lt;br&gt;• Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Combine Approaches 2 and 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements &lt;br&gt;and&lt;br&gt;• A new settlement at Winchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 6</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Combine Approaches 3 and 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;• A new settlement at Winchfield &lt;br&gt;and&lt;br&gt;• Disperse development throughout the towns and villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 7</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Combine all three approaches</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Disperse development throughout the towns and villages &lt;br&gt;and&lt;br&gt;• Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements &lt;br&gt;and&lt;br&gt;• A new settlement at Winchfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any further comments on this below


37
Q6. The New Homes Sites Booklet shows, by Parish, sites that are available for the development of new homes.

Do you have any comments on any of these sites?

For parishes where there is a choice of two or more shortlisted sites (in red and listed on the tables on each map), please rank the sites in order of preference (1 = most preferred, then 2, 3, 4 etc. to least preferred). Please add any comments to support your ranking.

You may also comment on any ‘rejected sites’ (in blue and listed on the tables on each map).

You may complete the ranking for as many parishes as you like. Particular regard will be paid to how close you live to the sites being ranked. Please read the New Homes Site Booklet for more detail.

Please note that Question 6 and the New Homes Sites booklet relate only to ‘non-strategic’ sites. Very large ‘strategic’ site options covered under Approaches 2 and 3 (Strategic Urban Extensions and New Settlement) are not included in this ranking exercise. If you wish to make comments on those sites please do so under Questions 4 and 5 of the response form.

**Blackwater & Hawley**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 2=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sun Park, Guillemont Park North (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Brook House (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

**Bramshill – no shortlisted sites**

Comments
### Church Crookham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Stillers Farm (shared with Ewshot parish) (106)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

### Crondall

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 2=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Land west of Crondall (184)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Land north west of Crondall (66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
**Crookham Village**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Cross Farm (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

*Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.*

**Dogmersfield**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM001</td>
<td>Land at Dogmersfield (141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

**Elvetham Heath**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Land at Elvetham Heath (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

*Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.*
# Eversley

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 9=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Land west of Marsh Lane (134)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Land north of Reading Road (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Land adjoining Crosby Gardens (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112a</td>
<td>CEMEX site A (105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112b</td>
<td>CEMEX site B (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Land west of the Fielders (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Area B land at Eversley Cross (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Land north of Hollybush Lane (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road (88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
**Ewshot**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Stillers Farm (shared with Church Crookham parish) (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM005</td>
<td>Land south of Church Crookham (158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM006</td>
<td>Land east of Redfields Lane (89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fleet**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 4=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Town Centre, zone 2 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Town Centre, zone 4 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Land at Great Bramshot Farm (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Land at Sankey Lane (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** To comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

**Greywell – no shortlisted or rejected sites**

| Comments |
**Hartley Wintney**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm A (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm B (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM002</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Causeway Green and Farm (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heckfield**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Land south of Riseley (69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
**Hook**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Land at Owen’s Farm (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>West of Varndell Road (44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM003</td>
<td>Hook Garden Centre, Reading Road (117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

*Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension option at West Hook please see questions 4 and 5.*
**Long Sutton**
You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 4=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Land at Hyde Road (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Land east of Copse Lane (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Granary Fields (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Land south of Chaffers Close (46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mattingley – no shortlisted sites**

**Comments**
Odiham
You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Land south of Hamilton House (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Land to the south of Crownfields (west) (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM004</td>
<td>Land to the north of Deptford Lane (174)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Rotherwick
You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Land north west of Rotherwick Village (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Land at Green Lane (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Land at Rosemary Cottage (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
**South Warnborough**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 3=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Plough Meadow (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Nash Meadows / Ridley’s Piece (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Granary Court (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

---

**Winchfield – no shortlisted non-strategic sites**

**Comments**

---

*Note: To comment on the Winchfield New Settlement option please see questions 4 and 5*
**Yateley**

You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Please rank (1=most preferred, 2=least preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Land at Moulsham Lane (180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Land at Reading Road (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
Q7 Do you have any other comments on the refined housing options paper?
Consultation questions regarding the Draft Vision and Strategic Priorities for Hart

The following questions relate to a document called ‘Draft Vision and Strategic Priorities for Hart’ which is available alongside the ‘Refined Options for Delivering New Homes’ and the ‘New Homes Sites Booklet’

Q1. We have identified a set of Key Issues for the Local Plan in Table 1 on page 5. Do you agree with them? (Please tick)

| Yes | No |

Do you have any comments on the key issues?

Q2. We have drafted a vision setting out how the district might look by 2032 on page 6. To what extent do you agree with it? (Please tick)

| Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Disagree |

Do you have any comments on the Vision?
Q3. We have identified some draft Strategic Priorities for the Local Plan in Table 2 on page 7 & 8. Do you agree with them? (Please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any comments on the strategic priorities?


Please send this response to:
Planning Policy
Hart District Council
Harlington Way
Fleet
Hampshire
GU51 4AE

Or email it to: planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk
Appendix 6: Refined Options for Delivering New Homes Leaflet

Hart District Local Plan
2011-2032

Refined Options for delivering new Homes

We want your views

Public consultation until 4pm on Friday 18 March 2016

www.hart.gov.uk
What is this consultation about?
We are preparing a Local Plan for Hart. It will set out where new homes should be built in the district up to 2032.

The Government requires us to conduct an assessment of housing need over the next 15 years using methodology set out by the Government. The assessment is that we need to deliver a further 2,500 new homes by 2032 just to meet Hart’s own needs but under Government rules we may also have to plan for up to 3,000 additional new homes to cover shortfalls in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath.

Our priority will be to deliver new homes on brownfield land (land that has previously been developed). However we do not think there will be enough brownfield land available to meet our needs. Any development that cannot be built on ‘brownfield land’ will have to be delivered elsewhere. This will essentially be on ‘greenfield’ sites outside our towns and villages. The possible ‘greenfield’ approaches are set out in Questions 4 and 5.

This is a summary leaflet of the full Consultation Document. We urge you to read the full consultation document before answering the questions. It sets out alternative approaches which we could use to deliver the additional homes that we need. Each approach has its own advantages and disadvantages and it is important that you let us know what you think. This consultation also asks for your comments on individual sites which could possibly be developed.

This consultation is not on a draft Local Plan (that will come later); it is a consultation asking questions to gather your ideas for shaping the Local Plan. The results from this consultation will feed into the preparation of the draft Local Plan which we want to consult on in summer 2016.

We would also welcome your views on our draft Vision and Strategic Priorities which is included at the end of this consultation.

How to get involved
We are seeking your views on this document. It replaces the document that we consulted on in November 2015 because we have clarified that within Approach 1 it includes the Parishes of Dogmersfield, Crookham Village and Heckfield.

We want to learn your views via our response form which is available at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation-2016 by 4pm on Friday 18 March 2016.

For more information you can view the full consultation documents, including our background evidence, online at www.hart.gov.uk/planning-policy.

Paper copies of the full document can be viewed at the Council offices in Fleet, at Town and Parish Council Offices and at local libraries. All responses we receive will be available to the public to view, although personal contact details will not be shown.

What happens next?
Your comments, along with further background evidence, will help us draft the next stage of our plan. There will be public consultation on a Draft Local Plan in summer 2016.

Contacts
If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy Team by:
- Emailing - planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk
- Writing to - Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE
How do we know what land is available?
We have published a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which gathers together information provided by landowners and agents on potential housing sites. If there is evidence that a site is ‘deliverable’, ‘free of constraint’, and ‘capable of development’ it is published in the SHLAA. Many individual sites are shown on the New Homes Site Options Booklet, which has also been published as part of this consultation.

Where can we build?
Hart does not have any Green Belt or special national landscape designations (such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or National Parks) which would otherwise prevent Hart from growing. However, the choices about where that growth can take place are restricted by certain internationally and nationally important constraints (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Flood Risk, and Historic Gardens and Parks).

How should we plan for the additional new homes?
Any development that cannot be built on ‘brownfield land’ will have to be delivered elsewhere. This will essentially be on ‘greenfield’ sites outside of our towns and villages.

We think that there are three different approaches available to us to meet this remaining housing need. It is our aim to ensure that the advantages and disadvantages of each approach are clear, so that everyone can make an informed choice. Some approaches may have to be combined if we are to meet all our needs.

1. Approach 1 - Disperse development throughout the parishes in Hart (Blackwater & Hawley, Church Crookham, Crondall, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Elvetham Heath, Eversley, Ewshot, Fleet, Hartley Wintney, Heckfield, Hook, Rotherwick and Yateley)

2. Approach 2 - Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements (West of Hook, Pale Lane Farm adjacent to Elvetham Heath and land west of Fleet)

3. Approach 3 - Focus growth on a new settlement at Winchfield

3 Available at http://www.hart.gov.uk
4 The site must be deliverable now or in the near future and where we have evidence that the owner would be willing to make the land available for new homes
5 Available at www.hart.gov.uk/consultations

enquiries@hart.gov.uk
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Approach 1: Development throughout the district’s towns and villages

This approach would mean that new housing would be spread across a number of existing towns and villages and would see development taking place within the following parishes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages include</th>
<th>Disadvantages include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretically this could meet all of Hart’s immediate new home needs and partially contribute to any unmet needs from Rushmoor or Surrey Heath</td>
<td>It is unlikely to be sufficient to deal in full with any unmet housing needs arising from Rushmoor and potentially Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairer distribution of growth with all or most settlements (towns and villages) accepting significant levels of growth but without significant impacts on any one area</td>
<td>Current service and infrastructure provision in towns and villages may be unable to accommodate additional residents without substantial investment and upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May improve access to homes for rural communities with new homes provided in villages and rural areas</td>
<td>Potential to lead to increased car usage to access services in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help sustain local services that may be vulnerable to closure (e.g., local school, post office) due to low population numbers</td>
<td>May harm the character and heritage of towns and villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could help provide a mix of new homes relative to local circumstances</td>
<td>May result in overall delivery of less affordable homes than other approaches depending on site sizes and the thresholds at which the requirements for affordable homes are set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approach does not include the shaded area on the map above. This is because it lies beyond the Thames Basin’s Heath’s Special Protection Area 5km zone of influence and so we must separately assess its capacity to deliver new homes. We think that this area could deliver a further 300 new homes by 2032.

www.harc.gov.uk
Approach 2: Strategic ‘greenfield’ expansion on the edge of one or more of the main settlements

This approach focuses the additional growth on three existing sites: Pale Lane Farm, adjacent to Elvetham Heath (approx. 800 new homes), west of Hook (approx. 730 new homes) and west of Fleet Hitches Lane (approx. 450 new homes). Each development would provide open space on site along with any necessary community facilities. It is likely that this approach will need to be combined with another to meet the need for new homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages include</th>
<th>Disadvantages include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has the potential to just meet the need for new homes in Hart</td>
<td>On its own it could not deal with any unmet needs from Rushmoor and/or Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would provide for infrastructure improvements and new local service centres to be developed which could also serve the wider rural area</td>
<td>Flood risk, environmental designations and infrastructure concerns limit the number of places where this level of growth could take place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some potential to connect to utilities: For example water, gas and electricity and existing services such as shops, education and health care</td>
<td>Much of the existing infrastructure in the main settlements is already operating at full capacity and often the scope for improvement is limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opportunity to connect to existing public transport provision and main transport corridors with potential opportunities for improved transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Limited existing public transport infrastructure and capacity on the existing road network to support additional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to employment provision</td>
<td>Could result in urban sprawl or the coalescence and associated loss of individual identity of existing settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to existing urban areas may allow alternative transport by cycle and walking</td>
<td>Would require significant and complex investment in infrastructure to support new development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enquiries@hart.gov.uk
**Approach 3: Focus growth on a new settlement at Winchfield**

A new settlement could be designed to accommodate up to 5,000 new homes (of which there is the potential to deliver over 2,000 new homes before 2032) as well as supporting new services, shopping and employment opportunities. However, it would have a long lead in time and so would not necessarily meet all of our current need for new homes by 2032. It would probably need to be combined with another approach if a constant supply of new homes is to be secured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages include</th>
<th>Disadvantages include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the longer term it would make a significant contribution to meeting the future need for new homes. It could be designed to ultimately accommodate up to 5,000 new homes with around 2,000 new homes being built by 2032.</td>
<td>On its own, it would not meet Hart's immediate new home needs. This is because new settlements have long lead times which includes planning a new settlement and the infrastructure needed to support it is a long, complex and costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver a significant number of new homes only towards the end of the plan period, which would not be enough to confirm with any certainty a constant supply throughout the Plan period. It would have to be combined with another approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would allow economies of scale to support new service and infrastructure provision (e.g. secondary schools etc.) which would be provided alongside new homes.</td>
<td>Would require significant and complex investment in infrastructure to support new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to really improve access to housing for both urban and rural communities and greater certainty over the delivery of affordable and other specialist homes.</td>
<td>Potential to lead to increased car use to access services and employment in other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to deliver enhanced sustainability due to the potential for designing this in at the outset.</td>
<td>Potential landscape and biodiversity impacts (albeit in non-designated countryside).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to services for surrounding areas through the provision of a new local service centre.</td>
<td>Very limited existing utility and infrastructure provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is flexible and could provide for further development beyond the year 2032.</td>
<td>It would have significant effects on the character and appearance of the area identified. It would fundamentally change the rural characteristics of the Winchfield area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.harc.gov.uk
Main Consultation Questions

The Full Consultation Paper poses six questions but the two main questions set out below.

Our priority will be to deliver new homes on brownfield land (land that has previously been developed). However we do not think there will be enough brownfield land available to meet our needs. Any development that cannot be built on 'brownfield land' will have to be delivered elsewhere. This will essentially be on 'greenfield' sites outside our towns and villages. The possible 'greenfield' approaches are set out in Questions 4 and 5.

Please note that this question only seeks your views on what should be our primary approach to delivering Hart’s housing needs on greenfield sites after we have prioritised the development of brownfield land. It does not mean it would be our only approach. We will need to ensure that we deliver a constant supply of new homes throughout the Local Plan period. Some elements of lesser preferred approaches may need to be included in the plan.

Q4: Of the three possible approaches that could deliver new homes in Hart, which one should we prioritise to deliver the majority of our housing needs? Please rank your choice in order of preference (1 = most preferred to 3 = least preferred).

Approach 1 - Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes: Blackwater & Howley, Crowthorne, Church Crookham, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Elstead Heath, Eversley, Ewhurst, Fleet, Hartley Wintney, Heckfield, Hook, Rotherwick and Yateley.

Approach 2 - Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements (West of Hook, Pale Lane Farm adjacent to Elstead Heath and land west of Fleet).

Approach 3 - A new settlement at Winchfield.

Q5: If we need to combine approaches, which combinations do you prefer? Please rank your choice in order of preference. (1 = most preferred to 4 = least preferred).

Approach 4 - Combine Approaches 1 and 2
Disperse development throughout towns and villages and Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements.

Approach 5 - Combine Approaches 2 and 3
Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements and a new settlement at Winchfield.

Approach 6 - Combine Approaches 3 and 1
A new settlement at Winchfield and disperse development throughout the towns and villages.

Approach 7 - Combine all three approaches
Disperse development throughout the towns and villages and Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements and a new settlement at Winchfield.

6 Available at www.hart.gov.uk/consultations

enquiries@hart.gov.uk
New Home Site Options

The separate New Home Site Booklet identifies potential new home sites by Parish. Each parish section contains a parish map identifying the new home site options for consideration. It also identifies those sites that we have chosen not to take any further forward after the first stage of sifting/testing (‘rejected sites’). Please see the full consultation documents’ glossary for further details.

This is not a list of preferred sites for allocation in the Local Plan. It is only a range of potential sites that may be needed to meet our new home needs. This is an opportunity for you to contribute to the consideration of potential sites before the Council selects its preferred sites. It is also an opportunity for you to comment on those sites that we have discounted at this stage.

Q6. The New Homes Sites Booklet shows, by Parish, sites that are available for the development of new homes.

Do you have any comments on any of these sites?

For parishes where there is a choice of two or more shortlisted sites (in red, and listed in the tables on each map), please rank the sites in order of preference (1 = most preferred, then 2, 3, 4 etc. to least preferred). Please add any comments to support your ranking.

You may also comment on any ‘rejected’ sites (in blue and listed on the tables on each map).

You may complete the ranking for as many parishes as you like. Particular regard will be paid to how close you live to the sites being ranked. Please read the New Homes Site Booklet for more detail.

Please note that Question 6 and the Sites Booklet relate only to ‘non-strategic’ sites. Very large site ‘strategic’ site options covered under Approaches 2 and 3 (Strategic Urban Extensions and New Settlement) are not included in this ranking exercise. If you wish to make comments on those sites please do so under Questions 4 and 5 of the response form.

Contact details

Address: Hart District Council,
Civic Offices, Harlington Way,
Fleet, Hampshire,
GU51 4AE

Tel: 01252 622122
Email: enquiries@hart.gov.uk
Web: www.hart.gov.uk

Facebook: /HartDistrictCouncil
Twitter: @HartCouncil
Instagram: @HartCouncil
## Appendix 7: Summary of Main Comments from Refined Options for Delivering New Homes Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issue</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Do you have comments on how to meet the needs of specialist groups</td>
<td>Affordable and starter homes. There was a consensus that this type of housing should be reserved for young people and those on low incomes and that it should be integrated within larger development schemes and well served by public transport and facilities.</td>
<td>Specific policies have been developed for affordable housing (SC8), specialist housing for older persons (SC10), Custom and self-build (SC7) and a policy on Gypsy and traveller sites (SC11) to be included in the draft local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as affordable and Starter Homes, Custom or self-build homes,</td>
<td>Custom and self-build. The general view was that people with resources for this type of housing should not be explicitly catered for and every new development should have plots for self-build.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialist homes for older people, and sites for the Travelling Community?</td>
<td>Specialist housing for older persons. There was a general consensus that sheltered housing should be near shops and facilities and Hart had already exceeded its quota for this type of housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are these sites?</td>
<td>Sites for the Travelling community. The majority were in agreement that there was sufficient sites in Hart to cater for travellers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Where are the sites within Hart District that you think maybe</td>
<td>A majority voted for a new settlement at Winchfield, followed by the urban centres of Fleet and Hook, in locations close to public transport and services and facilities and, infill development in existing villages and edge of settlement sites.</td>
<td>The Spatial Strategy (SSI) proposes the allocation of 4 key strategic sites at Hartland Village, Murrell Green, Cross Farm and Sun Park. In addition a limited amount of development has been proposed within the more sustainable villages (SC5) within the District. All large development schemes will be required to include the full range of housing to meet all housing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate for:</td>
<td>Sites for travelling communities. The majority view was that there are sufficient sites allocated within Hart and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Affordable and starter homes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Custom and self-build homes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Homes for older persons?</td>
<td>new allocations should either be expansion of existing sites, or locations away from existing communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Travelling communities?</td>
<td>There was general support for the settlement hierarchy (55%) however there were concerns that it was out of date and flawed as it excluded smaller settlements from future growth. In addition, there were comments seeking to redefine settlements within the hierarchy. E.g., Hook as a tier 3 settlement and Dogmersfield as a tier 5 settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Do you agree with the current Settlement Hierarchy – Yes or No? If not, how should it be changed?</td>
<td>No changes have been proposed to the settlement hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Of the three possible approaches that could deliver new homes in Hart, which one should we prioritise to deliver the majority of our housing needs? Please rank your choice in order of preference: Approach 1: Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in parishes Approach 2: Strategic urban extensions at main settlements Approach 3: A new settlement at Winchfield.</td>
<td>59% supported Approach 3- a new settlement, with 47% supporting the urban extension (2) and dispersed approach (1), respectively. Further technical studies and site assessment work has been undertaken and a new spatial policy SSI has set out an alternative location for the new settlement in the Regulation 18 Draft Hart Local Plan- Strategy and Sites, 2011-2032 document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>If you need to combine approaches, which combinations do you prefer?</td>
<td>The preferred combination of responses were for Approach 6 (40%) followed by Approach 7 (49%), Approach 5 (32%) and Approach 4 (52%). New settlements are the next most sustainable location for growth. They have the advantage of focusing growth so that development can support higher levels of service provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issue</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rank you choice in order of preference:</td>
<td></td>
<td>and greater infrastructure improvements. The draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) sets out 4 new key strategic allocations at Hartland Park, Murrell Green, Cross Farm and Sun Park. These are supported by Policy SC5 which identifies site allocations within the more sustainable villages within the district to meet housing need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 4: combined approaches 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 5: combined approaches 2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 6: combined approaches 3 and 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach 7: combine all three approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 The New Homes Sites Booklet shows, by Parish, sites that are available for the development of new homes. Do you have any comments on any of these sites?</td>
<td>115 sites were identified through the SHLAA, by parish, with sites either being shortlisted for allocation or rejected.</td>
<td>New sites that were proposed following the call for sites exercise, and were assessed through the SHLAA. If suitable they were included in new policy SC5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Additional comments</td>
<td>Many communities were concerned about the level of development in the villages on the basis of limited infrastructure to support additional homes, impact on the countryside, SANGS and on the historic environment, traffic generation and pollution and flooding.</td>
<td>Hart District Council has developed a settlement hierarchy, categorising the settlements within the District by the services and facilities they offer taking account of employment opportunities, schools, health services, recreation and leisure opportunities, and population. All our towns and villages are categorised by ‘tiers’. The draft local plan will be directing new development to the most sustainable locations (Policy SC5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. We have identified a set of key issues for the Local Plan in table 1 on page 5. Do you agree with them?</td>
<td>General support for a new settlement but concerns about compatibility of growth on the existing local</td>
<td>Additional technical studies have been commissioned to assess potential impacts on the road network, the natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issue</td>
<td>Summary of comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. We have drafted a vision setting out how the district might look by 2032 on page 6. To what extent do you agree with it?</td>
<td>Whilst there is general support for a new settlement to accommodate Harts future population growth, there is significant resistance to a new settlement at Winchfield for reasons of coalescence, impact on the character and identity of nearby settlements and limited infrastructure.</td>
<td>The location of the new settlement requires further investigation by the council in terms of availability, suitability and deliverability. The draft Local Plan identifies 3 potential locations for a new settlement – Winchfield, Murrell Green and Rye Common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. We have identified some draft strategic priorities for the Local Plan in table 2 on page 7 &amp; 8. Do you agree with them?</td>
<td>Strategic priorities which received the most responses were: Many objected to housing numbers and meeting unmet need from other local authorities in our HMA on the basis of an out of date SHMA Study, population projections and methodology for assessing local housing need. Concerns were expressed over building on green field sites and not planning sustainably for future generations, with many citing other sources of land supply - brownfield sites, vacant employment sites and infill development. Objections to the new settlement at Winchfield centred on infrastructure costs of road improvements, the need for a new school and the need to work with HCC.</td>
<td>In meeting housing needs Hart Council has undertaken relevant technical studies to assess housing need and supply from all sources including previously used land. The new Spatial Strategy (SSI) is informed by these technical studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Response form for the Draft Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites Consultation

Draft Local Plan Consultation

We are preparing a new Local Plan which will guide development in the district up to 2032. The Draft Local Plan contains planning policies and site allocations, including where new housing and employment development will take place.

You can find all supporting information to this consultation online via www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan or hard copies of the consultation documents are available to view at the Hart District Council Offices, Town and parish council offices and public libraries across the district.

All valid comments (electronic or written) and the name(s) of the respondent will be made publicly available. Personal contact details will remain confidential.

We encourage you to respond to our Draft Local Plan consultation using our online form available at www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-consultation. However if you wish, you can use this word version of the response form and email to planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk or post to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.

This form contains two comments sections. If you wish to make more than two comments please copy and paste the boxes as required.

All comments must be submitted no later than 5pm on Friday 9 June.

* Indicates a required field.

Response form

Are you a: *
- Resident
- Business
- Agent
- Other (i.e. Community interest group)

If Resident please complete:
Name* Click here to enter text.
Address* Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.
If Business please complete:
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation* Click here to enter text.
Job title Click here to enter text.
Business address Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.

If Agent please complete:
Agent details
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation* Click here to enter text.
Job title Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.
Client details
Name* Click here to enter text.
Organisation Click here to enter text.
Address* Click here to enter text.

If Other please complete:
Please specify Click here to enter text.
Name* Click here to enter text.
Completing details on behalf of Click here to enter text.
Address* Click here to enter text.
Phone number Click here to enter text.
Email* Click here to enter text.

☐ Please tick this box if you do not want to be contacted about Local Plan documents or updates

Comment 1

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☐ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number(s):* Click here to enter text.

Section/Policy number:* Click here to enter text.

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.
Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *

☐ Support
☐ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Click here to enter text.

Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☐ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please complete the comments section as before.

Comment 2

Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:

☐ Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

Page number/s:* Click here to enter text.

Section/Policy number:* Click here to enter text.

Paragraph: Click here to enter text.

Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document? *

☐ Support
☐ Oppose
☐ Comment

Please provide your comments below: *

Click here to enter text.
Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation? *

☐ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

Equality monitoring questions – Please note that these fields are not mandatory.

The information that you provide below will help us identify which different demographic groups have engaged with this consultation.

How would you describe your ethnic group?

☐ White
☐ Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups
☐ Asian or Asian British
☐ Black or Black British
☐ Other – please specify Click here to enter text.
☐ I would rather not answer

If White please complete:

☐ White British
☐ White Irish
☐ White Traveller (including Gypsy, Roma or Irish traveller)
☐ Other White background

If Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups please complete:

☐ White and Asian
☐ White and Black African
☐ White and Black Caribbean
☐ Other Mixed background

If Asian or Asian British please complete:

☐ Nepalese
☐ Bangladeshi
☐ Indian
☐ Pakistani
☐ Chinese
☐ Other Asian background
If Black or Black British please complete:
☐ African
☐ Caribbean
☐ Other Black background

Do you consider yourself to have a disability as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (2005)?
Definition: A person has a disability for the purposes of this Act if s/he has a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on her/his ability to carry out day-to-day activities.
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know
☐ I would rather not answer

What is your gender?
☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ I would rather not answer

In which age category are you?
☐ Under 18
☐ 18 – 24
☐ 25 – 34
☐ 35 – 44
☐ 45 – 54
☐ 55 – 64
☐ 65 – 74
☐ 75 +
☐ I would rather not answer

Thank you for completing this form.

Please email this response to planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk or send it to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.
THE HART LOCAL PLAN
Shaping our district to 2032

We want your views
Have your say on the future of Hart's towns, villages and countryside

Find out more and have your say at
www.hart.gov.uk
VISIT OUR STAFFED EXHIBITIONS
No booking required, just drop in between the times below:

- **Tuesday 2 May - 2pm to 8pm**
  Hook Community Centre, RG27 9NN

- **Wednesday 3 May - 2pm to 8pm**
  The Harlington Centre, Fleet, GU51 4BY

- **Monday 8 May - 2pm to 8pm**
  Victoria Hall, Hartley Wintney, RG27 8RE

- **Wednesday 10 May - 2pm to 8pm**
  The Tythings, Yateley, GU46 7RP

- **Thursday 11 May - 2pm to 8pm**
  Ridley Hall, South Warnborough, RG29 1RQ

- **Monday 15 May - 4.30pm to 8pm**
  Hawley Leisure Centre, GU17 9BW

The consultation documents and how to respond can be found at [www.hart.gov.uk](http://www.hart.gov.uk). Copies will also be available at the District Council Offices in Fleet, Town and Parish Council Offices and local Hart libraries.

**CLOSING DATE FOR COMMENTS 9 JUNE 4PM**

Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE
planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk
01252 774118
## Appendix 10: Summary of Main Comments from Draft Local Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Comments</th>
<th>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SS1: Spatial Strategy.</strong> General support for the spatial strategy and a new settlement but concerns about the over-reliance on four strategic sites to deliver the majority of the housing requirement for the District, over-provision of housing numbers beyond the SHMA figure and the lack of sufficiently identified allocations to meet the full OAHN for the District within the plan period, including comments that the OAHN should be higher.</td>
<td>The Spatial Strategy proposed the allocation of 4 key strategic sites at Hartland Village, Murrell Green (new settlement), Cross Farm and Sun Park. In addition a limited amount of development was proposed within the more sustainable villages within the District. In September 2017 the Government consulted on “Right homes in the Right places” proposals for a standard methodology for calculating local housing need. This consultation identified a new approach to calculating local housing need, which has resulted in changes to the housing targets meaning that the delivery of a new settlement is not needed in the same timescale as previously anticipated. In addition it is clear from the representations on the Plan that further work needs to be undertaken to properly assess the location and scale of development of a new settlement. New settlements are the next most sustainable locations for growth. They have the advantages of focusing growth so that developments can support provision of appropriate levels of service provision and new infrastructure. In particular they can support the provision of new secondary schools and help support high quality public transport measures that result in a higher proportion of journeys being made by non-car modes than with more dispersed village development. As such, the spatial strategy has now been amended to reflect a revised timescale consistent with the new methodology and a revised housing target. The Plan now includes one strategic allocated site at Hartland Park (Policy SS2), and an area of search for a new settlement to meet long term development needs (new policy SS3). Other allocations in the Draft Local Plan now either have planning permission or have been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments were also made either regarding the need to make further provision to meet housing needs across the Housing Market Area (HMA), or that the Council should not have to make provision for any unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the use of previously developed land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG1: Managing Growth.</strong> Objections relate to housing numbers over the plan period and an unsustainable local plan.</td>
<td>This policy has been renumbered and reworded as SD1. A definition of Sustainable Development has been added into the Glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG2: Previously Developed Land.</strong> Use of previously developed land was supported. Objections related to not allowing for considerations of sustainability, lack of a clear housing distribution policy and the need for greenfield development to meet housing needs.</td>
<td>Reference to the use of previously developed land has been added into Policy SS1 and this Policy deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG3: Housing-led.</strong> A number of detailed points were made on the criteria within the policy and comments of support and objection to the identified strategic sites.</td>
<td>As set out previously changes have been made to the allocation of strategic sites and this Policy has therefore been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG5: Development in the countryside.</strong> Comments sought clarification on the definition of the countryside and acceptable uses in the countryside. A number of comments related to the need to protect specific areas of countryside.</td>
<td>This policy has been renumbered as Policy NBE1. The supporting text sets out the reasons why the countryside should not be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG6: Gaps between settlements.</strong> There was support for the principle of gaps and for particular gap designations. There was also objection to a number of the gaps, including a lack of evidence and the need to ensure delivery of the housing allocation. A number of comments also requested additional gaps be identified.</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan covers the overall strategic policy for gaps rather than detailed gap boundary reviews. Precise settlement gap boundaries will be reviewed and defined in the next full review of the Local Plan and through Neighbourhood Plans, where these are being prepared. The Policy has been amended to delete reference to the gaps between Murrell Green and Hook and Hartley Wintney following deletion of the new settlement allocation at Murrell Green and replacement with an area of search Policy. This policy has been renumbered NBE2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Communities. Policies SC1-SC4.</strong> The strategic allocations were subject to considerable comment and objections made to Murrell Green, Cross Farm and Hartland Park for the following reasons:</td>
<td>As set out under SS1 with the introduction of the new approach to calculating local housing need, this has resulted in changes to the housing targets meaning that the allocation of some of the Draft Plan sites and delivery of a new settlement is not needed in the same timescale as previously anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SC1: Hartland Park. Main objections to the failure of the site to deliver 40% affordable housing; the over-reliance on this site to deliver 1,500 new dwellings over the plan period and other detailed land-use issues.</td>
<td>Hartland Park has been retained as a Strategic allocation, making the best use of previously developed land (Policy SS2). Some amendments have been made to this Policy and to the supporting text. Sun Park has received planning permission and is now in the housing commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SC2: Murrell Green. Objections related to the need for a new settlement in principle, specific concerns regarding development at Murrell Green, and representations that Winchfield is a better location in line with the outcome of the 2016 public consultation.</td>
<td>The proposal for a new settlement at Murrell Green has been replaced by an area of search at Murrell Green/Winchfield for a new settlement to meet long term development needs, beyond this plan period (new Policy SS3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SC3: Land at Cross Farm. Main objections related to the need for additional specialist accommodation site allocation - affordable housing provision, development of a strategic gap, the need for additional specialist accommodation for older persons as there are many care homes and elderly facilities in the area; inappropriate scale and impact on the historic and natural environment and impact on the M3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC5: Land allocations for new homes.</strong> Site specific objections were received to the allocation of sites identifies in SC5. There was support for the use of the settlement hierarchy where settlements are tiered according to services and facilities. A number of additional sites were proposed for allocation.</td>
<td>The smaller sites included within Draft Policy SC5 either now have permission or are no longer proposed as housing allocations having regard to changes in the housing numbers and other evidence. A further 25 additional sites were submitted for consideration. These sites have been subject to assessment in the latest SHLAA but none are proposed for allocation. This Policy has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC6: Mix for Market Housing.</strong> There was a level of support for this Policy. Objections included the requirements being too onerous, issues of viability and the need for a minimum size threshold.</td>
<td>A number of changes have been made to the criteria in this Policy to provide clarification. The requirements have been tested through the Viability Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC8: Affordable Housing.</strong> Many objected to the “uplift” above the OAN as being unjustified and not needed, others suggested a greater uplift of 20% will be needed.</td>
<td>Comments on the housing target are dealt with in relation to Policy SS1. A number of changes have been made to the wording of the Policy and text to provide clarification. The Policy has been renumbered H2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of comments suggested policy was too inflexible, expressed concerns about the requirement for accessible housing and that it affected the viability of specialist housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC10: Specialist Housing.</strong> Issues were raised over the number of additional bed-spaces needed over the plan period and the lack of evidence to support this figure and the lack of a target for sheltered, enhanced sheltered and extra care sector. Developers promoting this type of housing cited the SANG policy as a barrier to delivery of additional older persons accommodation.</td>
<td>Policy and supporting text has been amended to take account of issues raised and provide further clarity. Policy has been re-numbered H4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED1: New Employment.</strong> Comments included objections to the protection of brownfield land for use as residential, the justification for additional allocations, site specific comments, and the general approach to the economy being too restrained.</td>
<td>Minor wording changes have been made to this Policy to clarify the approach to the countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED2: Safeguarding Employment land and premises.</strong> Concerns related to the safeguarding of all strategic employment sites in areas with an over-supply of low grade office space such as Fleet. In addition, many support the redevelopment of brownfield sites for residential.</td>
<td>The Employment Land Review 2016 identifies that there is a sufficient land supply to meet employment needs over the Plan period and the Plan's focus is therefore on protection, regeneration and renewal of existing premises within defined areas. Following representations, Rawlings Depot, Hook has been deleted from the list of Locally Important Employment Areas and Beacon Hill Road, Church Crookham has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED4: Town District and Local Centres.</strong> In addition to support for this Policy, comments related to questioning the level of floorspace involved and comments on specific centres, particularly Fleet, Hook and Blackwater.</td>
<td>Minor amendments have been made to this Policy to delete reference to new local centres as part of the strategic sites and to add in reference to local neighbourhood facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE1: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.</strong> In addition to comments of support, detailed comments were made seeking clarification and changes to individual criteria.</td>
<td>A number of amendments were made to the Policy to provide clarification and respond to representations made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1: Infrastructure.</strong> There was support for the need to provide additional infrastructure. Concerns related to an assessment of viability, the need for further detail on specific infrastructure needs, and the lack of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</td>
<td>Consideration of specific infrastructure requirements for a particular development will be made on a case by case basis and will be informed by an 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' (IDP). An IDP has been published with the proposed Submission Local Plan and will inform preparation of the 'Community Infrastructure Levy' which will enable the Council to receive funds from new development towards delivery of infrastructure, particularly infrastructure that is required in combination as a result of a number of individual developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I3: Transport Infrastructure.</strong> Comments related to the need for transport infrastructure improvements, for a review of car parking standards and for improvements to walking and cycling.</td>
<td>This policy identifies transport related infrastructure requirements that will be required from all development. It does not specify individual site schemes; these will be considered on a site by site basis and where relevant in conjunction with the IDP, the Hampshire Local Transport Plan and responses from statutory consultees including Hampshire County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority. It is not therefore necessary for the policy to be amended to specify individual infrastructure requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Policies</strong></td>
<td>Minor amendments have been made to all policies to provide further clarification and in response to comments from stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments were made on all policies as set out in the Summary of Responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Comments</td>
<td>How they were addressed in drafting the Local Plan (Regulation 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence base</strong></td>
<td>ED8 – Local Centres – combined with ED6 District Centres I8 – Strategic SANG – deleted following deletion of Strategic sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objections related to:</td>
<td>A review of the SHMA methodology has been undertaken on behalf of the HMA authorities and is published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This concludes that the OAHN is robust. However, since publication of the Draft Local Plan, the Government has consulted on a new standardised methodology to assess local housing needs. As set out in the response to Policy SS1 this has been used as the starting point for the calculation of housing needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the SHMA figure as being too high and the uplift not being justified;</td>
<td>The sustainability work undertaken by the Council is an important consideration in testing the Plan’s overall approach and the settlement options. Revisions to the spatial strategy means that specific new settlement sites have not been tested in the Proposed Submission version of the Plan, this has now been tested on 'areas' of search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the lack of a robust sustainability appraisal;</td>
<td>An updated SHLAA, updated Sustainability Appraisal, a Transport Assessment, Habitat Regulations Assessment and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan have been prepared to support the Hart’s spatial strategy and policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the lack of an updated SHLAA which fails to deliver additional suitable sites to meet housing requirements over the plan period;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- outstanding evidence such as a transport assessment, infrastructure delivery plan and HRA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>