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INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND

1.1.1 AECOM is commissioned by Hart District Council to lead on Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the emerging Hart Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (‘the plan’). The plan will allocate land for development and set policies to guide decisions on changes to the use of land.

1.1.2 SA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the likely effects of an emerging plan, and alternatives, with a view to avoiding and mitigating negative effects and maximising the positives. SA of Local Plans is a legal requirement.¹

SA EXPLAINED

2.1.1 It is a requirement that SA is undertaken in-line with the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which transposed into national law EU Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).²

2.1.2 In-line with the Regulations, a report (known as the SA Report) must be published for consultation alongside the draft plan that essentially “identifies, describes and evaluates” the likely significant effects of implementing “the plan and reasonable alternatives”.³ The report must then be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the plan.

2.1.3 More specifically, the SA Report must answer the following three questions:

1. What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?  
   - Including in relation to ‘reasonable alternatives’.

2. What are the SA findings at this stage?  
   - i.e. in relation to the draft plan.

3. What happens next?

2.1 This SA Report ⁴

2.1.1 This report is the Hart Local Plan SA Report. It is published alongside the final draft version of the plan – the Proposed Submission Plan - in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Local Planning Regulations.

2.1.2 Questions 1 - 3 are answered in turn, in order to provide the required information. Before answering Question 1, two initial questions are answered in order to further set the scene:

i) What is the plan trying to achieve?

ii) What is the scope of the SA?

¹ Since provision was made through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it has been understood that local planning authorities must carry out a process of Sustainability Appraisal alongside plan-making. The centrality of SA to Local Plan-making is emphasised in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require that an SA Report is published for consultation alongside the ‘Proposed Submission’ plan document.

² Procedurally SA and SEA are one and the same, on the basis that there is no legislation or guidance to suggest that SA process should differ from the prescribed SEA process. SA and SEA differ only in terms of substantive focus. SA has an equal focus on all three ‘pillars’ of sustainable development (environment, social and economic), whilst SEA involves a degree of focus on the environmental pillar. SA can therefore be said to ‘incorporate’ SEA.

³ Regulation 12(2) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

⁴ See Appendix I for further explanation of the regulatory basis for answering certain questions within the SA Report, and a ‘checklist’ explaining more precisely the regulatory basis for presenting certain information.
3 WHAT IS THE PLAN SEEKING TO ACHIEVE?

3.1 Overview

3.1.1 As discussed above, the plan - once adopted - will allocate land for development and set policies to guide decisions on development and changes to how land is used within the District - see Figure 3.1.

3.1.2 However, it is important to recognise that the plan seeks to do more than this, in that it seeks to contribute significantly to a vision for Hart, and to achieve a wide range of objectives relating to local communities, the economy and the environment within Hart (and beyond).

3.1.3 The aim of this section is to explain more fully the Local Plan vision and objectives, introduce the policy and legislative context, and also present a brief discussion of what the plan is ‘not trying to achieve’, in order to explain the role of the plan within the wider planning process.

Figure 3.1: Hart District and neighbouring local authorities
3.2 The Local Plan objectives

3.2.1 The plan is being prepared with a view to achieving the following objectives -

- Plan for sufficient land to be available for at least 6,208 new homes to be built in the District in the period 2016 – 2032 such that it provides a continuous supply of housing.

- Deliver a sustainable new community at Hartland Village by 2032.

- Provide for longer term development needs through planning for a sustainable new settlement within the Winchfield/Murrell Green area of search.

- Provide new homes of a mix of sizes and tenures to meet the current and future needs of Hart’s residents, including a viable mix of affordable housing; new homes and care accommodation to meet the needs of an ageing population, and homes for other specialist groups.

- Support the vitality and viability of the District’s town and village centres to serve the needs of residents.

- Support economic growth by protecting and providing a range of size and types of employment land and buildings, including those supporting the rural economy, to meet future needs and to contribute to economic growth both in the District and the wider Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath functional economic area.

- Ensure that transport, social and physical infrastructure required to support new development is delivered in a timely and coordinated manner including through partnership working with infrastructure providers and neighbouring local authorities.

- Through partnership working with the education authority (Hampshire County Council), plan for the provision of sufficient primary and secondary school places. This will include new primary provision and a new secondary school at the new settlement within the Winchfield/Murrell Green area of search.

- Conserve and enhance the distinctive built and historic environment in the District including the protection of heritage assets and their settings.

- Maximise opportunities for the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure that supports new development, including facilities for walking, cycling and public transport, and the delivery of measures to minimise, or mitigate the impact of new development on the existing network with priority given to the improvement of sustainable transport options.

- Protect and enhance the District’s natural environment, including landscape character, water environment and biodiversity, including appropriate mitigation for new development to avoid adverse impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

- Reduce the risk of flooding by directing development away from areas at risk of flooding, ensuring appropriate mitigation is in place such as Sustainable Drainage Systems, and using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding from all sources.

- Promote healthy and sustainable local communities through protecting and enhancing community, sport, health, cultural, recreation and leisure facilities, and through the delivery of a multi-functional green infrastructure network across the District.

- Maintain the separate character and identity of settlements by avoiding development that would result in their physical or visual coalescence.

- Ensure new development is well designed creating safe, inclusive environments and taking account of character, local distinctiveness and sustainable design principles.

- Provide measures for adapting to the impacts of climate change and reducing the contribution of new and existing development to the causes of climate change including more efficient use of energy and natural resources and increased use of renewable low carbon energy infrastructure.
3.3 Legislative and policy context

3.3.1 The plan is being prepared under the Town and Country (Local Planning) Regulations 2012, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Localism Act 2011. It must reflect current government policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012) and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015), and also be in accordance with Government’s online Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In particular, the NPPF requires local authorities to take a positive approach to development and for an up-to-date local plan to be produced which meets objectively assessed needs as far as is consistent with sustainable development.

3.3.2 The plan is also being prepared taking careful account of objectives and policies established by various other organisations at the national and local level, in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate established by the Localism Act 2011. For example, important context is provided by the strategic growth aspirations of the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The LEP covers much of Hampshire and west Surrey, stretching from the edge of London, along the M3 motorway corridor to the New Forest. Hampshire County Council is another key stakeholder, and further context is provided by the established and emerging policies of neighbouring authorities within the sub-region, in particular Rushmoor and Surrey Heath with whom Hart shares a Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Area (FEA).

3.4 What is the Local Plan not seeking to achieve?

3.4.1 The plan will be strategic in nature, and hence naturally omit consideration of some detailed issues in the knowledge that they can be addressed at subsequent stages of the planning process, specifically -

- A second part of the Hart Local Plan will be prepared from 2018, dealing with development management policies (i.e. a suite of detailed thematic policies to be used in the determination of planning applications) and specific designations (notably settlement gaps).
- Decisions taken on planning applications will provide a forum for establishing and addressing site-specific issues (taking account of development management policy), meaning that not all issues need be identified and addressed through site-specific policy within the Local Plan.
4 WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF THE SA?

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The scope of the SA refers to the sustainability issues / objectives that should be a focus of, and provide a broad methodological framework for, the appraisal of “the plan and reasonable alternatives” (see para 2.1.2). The aim of this chapter is to introduce the SA scope.

4.1.2 Further information on SA scope – i.e. a more detailed review of issues/objectives highlighted through a review of the sustainability 'context' and 'baseline' - is presented in Appendix II.

Consultation on the scope

4.1.3 The SEA Regulations require that “When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the Environmental Report [i.e. the SA scope], the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies”. In England, the consultation bodies are the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England. As such, these authorities were consulted on the SA scope in 2014. Since that time, the SA scope has evolved as new evidence has emerged, and understanding of the plan scope has clarified; however, the broad scope remains the same as that agreed on the basis of the consultation.

4.2 Key issues / objectives

4.2.1 Table 4.1 presents the sustainability objectives agreed through scoping, and groups them under ‘topic’ headings. Taken together, the sustainability topics and objectives provide a methodological ‘framework’ for undertaking appraisal.

N.B. the number of topic headings has increased since the Draft Plan / Interim SA Report stage (April 2017), to reflect consultation responses received. Whilst no comments were received on the SA scope from the statutory consultees, there was feedback on the need for ‘community infrastructure’ considerations to be given greater prominence through SA. As such, the ‘Communities’ topic heading from 2017 was split into:

1) ‘Accessibility’, under which there is the potential to give specific consideration to matters of access to community infrastructure; and

2) ‘Communities’, under which there is the potential to give consideration to other issues/objectives.

5 In-line with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because 'by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programmes.'
**Table 4.1: Sustainability topics and objectives (i.e. the SA framework)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Accessibility</td>
<td>SA2 Protect and enhance the health and well-being of the population; SA3 Encourage increased engagement in cultural activity, leisure, and recreation across all sections of the community; SA17 Improve accessibility to all services and facilities; SA19 Maintain and improve opportunities for everyone to acquire the education and skills they need to find and remain in work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Biodiversity</td>
<td>SA8 Protect and enhance biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>SA12 Reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impacts of climate change; SA14 Increase energy efficiency, security and diversity of supply and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Communities</td>
<td>SA4 Reduce inequality, poverty and social exclusion; SA5 Improve community safety by reducing crime and the fear of crime; SA6 Create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive settlements and communities; SA21 Stimulate regeneration where appropriate and encourage urban renaissance. N.B. the objectives listed above, under ‘Accessibility’ are also relevant here, i.e. there is cross-over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Employment and the economy</td>
<td>SA20 Maintain high and stable levels of employment and promote sustainable economic growth and competitiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Flood risk / climate change adaptation</td>
<td>SA12 Reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impacts of climate change; SA13 Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Housing</td>
<td>SA1 Provide all residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home which meets their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Historic environment</td>
<td>SA7 Protect and enhance the District’s historic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Land and other resources</td>
<td>SA11 Maintain and improve soil quality; SA15 Promote the efficient use of land through the appropriate re-use of previously developed land; SA16 Improve the efficiency of resource use and achieve sustainable resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Landscape</td>
<td>SA9 Protect and enhance the District’s countryside and rural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Transport</td>
<td>SA17 Improve accessibility to all services and facilities; SA18 Improve efficiency of transport networks by enhancing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and promoting policies which reduce the need to travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Water</td>
<td>SA10 Maintain and improve the water quality of the District’s rivers and groundwaters and other water bodies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These topics align with the issues listed in the Regulations as potentially necessitating consideration through SA (see Schedule II(f)). ‘Air’ is a deliberate omission, as air quality is not a major issue locally, with no designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).
PART 1: WHAT HAS PLAN-MAKING / SA INVOLVED UP TO THIS POINT?
5 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 1)

5.1.1 Preparation of the Hart Local Plan has included three public consultations under Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations (see Figure 5.1) prior to this current consultation under Regulation 19. SA work has been undertaken alongside plan-making - see Figures 5.2.

Figure 5.1: Key steps in the plan-making / SA process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 - 2016</td>
<td>Early plan-making, consultation and SA steps</td>
<td>Plan-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Draft Plan (Reg 18)</td>
<td>Interim SA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td>Further work to consider options / alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Publication of the Proposed Submission Plan</td>
<td>SA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
<td>Submission to the Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 The aim here, within Part 1, is not to recount in detail the entire ‘story’ of plan-making / SA to date, but rather to explain how work was undertaken to develop, and then appraise, reasonable alternatives prior to finalising the Proposed Submission Plan.7 More specifically, this part of the report presents information regarding the consideration of reasonable alternative approaches to housing growth, or spatial strategy alternatives. It is clear that allocating land for housing is at the heart of the plan objectives (see Chapter 3).8

What is not (or less) a focus of this part of the report?

5.1.3 There is a need to discuss several matters -

- **Thematic plan issues** - whilst the plan will set policy to address a range of other thematic, and site-specific issues, no strategic choices warranting formal appraisal were highlighted. As such, ‘other plan issues’ are not examined further here, within Part 1 of the SA Report (but are examined in Part 2).

- **New settlement area of search** - a stated objective of the plan is to identify an area of search for a new settlement; a distinct matter to be addressed through the plan, quite separate to the matter of allocating land for development within the plan period. Alternatives are given stand-alone consideration within Appendix III of this report.

- **Site options** - are discussed as an input to the establishment of spatial strategy alternatives for appraisal, i.e. within Chapter 6 (“Establishing the reasonable alternatives”). As part of this, there is a signpost to GIS analysis presented within Appendix IV.

- **Past appraisal findings** - are not repeated here, but rather are discussed as an input to the establishment of reasonable alternatives.

Structure of this part of the report

- Chapter 6 - explains the process of establishing the reasonable alternatives, undertaken by the Council and AECOM working in collaboration
- Chapter 7 - presents AECOM’s appraisal of the reasonable alternatives
- Chapter 8 - explains the Council’s reasons for establishing the preferred option

---

7 There is a requirement for the SA Report to present an appraisal of ‘reasonable alternatives’ and ‘an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with’. The aim is to inform the consultation, and subsequent plan finalisation.

8 The Regulations require that, when determining what should be a focus of alternatives appraisal, account is taken of ‘the plan objectives’. Recent case-law has established that planning authorities may apply discretion and planning judgement in this regard.

9 Options are not ‘alternatives’ where there is no mutually exclusive choice to be made between them; hence there is no requirement to report ‘site options’ appraisal findings within this SA Report.
6 ESTABLISHING THE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The aim here is to discuss the key steps undertaken in autumn 2017 that led to the development of reasonable spatial strategy alternatives for appraisal and consultation.

6.1.2 Ultimately, the aim of this chapter is to present ‘an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with’, in accordance with the Regulations. ¹⁰

6.1.3 Specifically, this chapter explains how reasonable alternatives were established subsequent to certain initial steps - see Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1: Establishing reasonable spatial strategy alternatives

Structure of this chapter

- 6.2 - Discusses high-level issues / options
- 6.3 - Discusses new settlement options
- 6.4 - Discusses settlement edge and rural site options
- 6.5 - Explains how understanding was drawn upon to establish the reasonable alternatives

¹⁰ Schedule II of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (‘SEA’) Regulations 2004
6.2 High-level issues/options

Introduction

6.2.1 This section gives consideration to high-level issues and options of relevance to the development of spatial strategy alternatives. Specifically, this section gives consideration to -
- housing quanta; and
- broad spatial distribution.

Housing quanta

6.2.2 The NPPF (para 47), requires local plans to provide for “the full, objectively-assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with [sustainable development].” Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath share a Housing Market Area (HMA), and, as such, a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was completed in 2014 in order to establish Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN).

6.2.3 The SHMA was then updated to reflect more up-to-date information in 2016. The starting point for the assessment of OAHN was the 2012-based Government household projections, which indicated a demographic need (i.e. need purely resulting from births, deaths and migration) in the HMA for around 785 additional dwellings per annum (dpa) up to 2032. The projections were then adjusted (uplifted) through the SHMA, to take account of increasing problems with the affordability of housing; the housing needs of concealed households in the area; and the need to ensure a local labour supply. The outcome was an OAHN figure for the HMA of around 1,200 dpa. The SHMA was also able to suggest an indicative split of OAHN between the three component authorities (based on household projections), finding OAHN for Hart District to be 382 dpa.

6.2.4 In early 2017 the Council gave consideration to the possibility of delivering above the OAHN figure, in order to better provide for affordable housing needs. The 2016 SHMA identified a higher need for affordable housing than the 2014 SHMA (306 dpa in contrast to 92 dpa), and suggested the respective component authorities should consider making a ‘policy-on’ decision to deliver additional housing for this reason. To inform a decision, different affordable housing delivery scenarios were considered in the SHMA (see the “Affordable Housing Policy Discussion” appendix of the SHMA), and options were considered in more detail by Hart District Council through an Affordable Housing Background Paper. The Paper advised an uplift of 103 dpa, over-and-above OAHN. This led to the figure of 485 dpa that was used as the basis for preparing the Draft Local Plan.

6.2.5 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Local Plan consultation, the Government began a consultation on “Planning for the right homes in the right places”, which included consultation on a draft standardised methodology for calculating local housing needs. Applying the draft methodology leads to a significant reduction in housing need for each of the three authorities within the HMA - see Table 6.2.

6.2.6 Whilst the standardised methodology remains in draft, and the associated housing need figures are only indicative, the transitional arrangements set out in the consultation paper imply that Hart should use the new methodology, given its local plan timetable.12

---

11 A concealed family is one living in a multi-family household in addition to the primary family, e.g. a young couple living with parents.
12 The ‘Planning for the right homes in the right places’ consultation document states that, where plans have not yet been published, the new standardised method should be used, unless the plan will be submitted for examination on or before the 31 March 2018, or before the revised NPPF is published (whichever is the later).
Table 6.1: Comparing the draft standardised housing needs methodology with the OAHN in the SHMA (dwellings per annum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Indicative Government figures from 2017</th>
<th>SHMA OAHN (2014-2032)</th>
<th>Net difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmoor</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA total</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>-262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower/higher growth options?

6.2.7 Firstly, given national policy in the NPPF and the characteristics of Hart District, there is little or no argument for planning for a level of growth lower than that identified as required to meet housing needs within the District. This was the view taken when preparing the Draft Local Plan (as reported in the Interim SA Report), and remained the view in late 2017, when giving consideration to reasonable alternatives, ahead of preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.

6.2.8 There are, however, arguments for supporting higher growth -

- Firstly, there is the matter of planning for potential unmet needs, i.e. planning to reflect the likelihood, or risk, of a shortfall in provision elsewhere in the HMA.\(^{13}\) The possibility of providing for unmet needs has been given close attention over recent years (e.g. see discussion at Box 6.1 of the March 2017 Interim SA Report); however, by late 2017 the likelihood of unmet needs within the HMA was understood to have reduced significantly. This is on the basis of the indicative housing need figures issued by the Government - for Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath authorities - being significantly below the OAHN figures set out in the SHMA, and also on the basis of the Proposed Submission Rushmoor Local Plan (June 2017). Box 6.1 presents further explanation.

- Secondly, there is the potential to plan to more fully meet affordable housing needs. Government’s Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that: “An increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes.” An uplift for affordable housing was reflected in the Draft Local Plan (April 2017), and this approach remained a consideration in late 2017, when seeking to establish reasonable alternatives.

- Thirdly, there can be arguments for supporting high housing growth in order to reflect likely, or potential, future employment growth (i.e. to deliver the housing necessary to ensure a sufficient workforce to support said employment growth). However, the Hart Employment Land Review (ELR; 2016) anticipates only modest growth in demand for employment land within Hart, and Hart is not a focus of the Local Enterprise Partnership’s growth ambitions. There is little or no reason to suspect the likelihood of a spike in employment growth in Hart over the course of the plan period.

6.2.9 The matter of precise housing quanta to reflect across the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives is returned to below (Section 6.5; Establishing the reasonable alternatives).

\(^{13}\) There is also the possibility of being asked - under the Duty to Cooperate - to provide for unmet needs arising from outside of the HMA, including from London. However, there is currently little precedent of such ‘beyond HMA’ arrangements nationally and the GLA has not approached Hart regarding unmet housing needs.
As discussed, there is a need to prepare the Hart Local Plan taking close account of what is being proposed through the Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Local Plans, with a view to ensuring that the net effect of the three local plans is to provide for identified housing needs within the HMA.

**Rushmoor Local Plan**

Rushmoor Borough responded to the 2017 Draft Hart Local Plan consultation stating -

“With regard to Rushmoor’s ability to meet its share of the HMA’s housing need, the update to the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) has determined that there is adequate capacity to accommodate this, with a small surplus of around 850 units over the Plan period (8,700 new homes in total). This is sufficient to allow some flexibility should some sites for any reason not be delivered as anticipated, and to help maximise opportunities for affordable housing delivery. However, given the tight urban nature of Rushmoor, and the fact that much of the land outside the settlement boundary is subject to nature conservation designations or is in military ownership, there is no opportunity to increase housing delivery beyond this level to assist the HMA partners with meeting any unmet need.”

Subsequently, in June 2017, the ‘draft submission’ version of the Rushmoor Local Plan was published, providing for 8,762 homes over the plan period (2014-2032).

Subsequently, in September 2017, the Government published the draft ‘standardised methodology’ for establishing local housing needs, with an annual figure for Rushmoor Borough of 294 dpa. This is significantly lower than the 436 dpa OAHN figure in the SHMA.

Using the housing supply figures provided in the plan, between 2016 and 2032 there are expected to be 8,290 new homes, which compares to a local housing need of 4,704 homes (i.e. 294*16). In other words, Rushmoor Borough is planning to exceed the new Government figures by around 3,500 homes to 2032.

**Surrey Heath Local Plan**

Surrey Heath District responded to the 2017 Draft Hart Local Plan consultation stating -

“Currently the Council’s most recent Strategic Land Availability Assessment (July 2016) indicates that there will be a shortfall of land within the Borough to deliver the Council’s OAHN. Over the course of developing the Local Plan the Council will consider spatial strategies that could reduce this shortfall...

However as a Borough, Surrey Heath is severely constrained in terms of available land by the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area… In addition the Borough has large areas of operational MOD land and Green Belt designation. It is therefore unlikely that Surrey Heath will be in a position to meet the OAHN for the Borough.

The Council is formally requesting that Hart recognise in developing their spatial strategy and policies to deliver housing that these are flexible enough to meet any demonstrated unmet need arising in Surrey Heath.”

Subsequently, in November 2017, Surrey Heath Borough Council published a Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA), which concluded: “The Borough has a land supply for 4,675 potential new residential units. This is less than the objectively assessed need of 5,730 units over the 15 year period up to 2032.”

However, the Surrey Heath’s Local Plan is at an early stage; the Plan and supporting evidence have yet to be tested through consultation or examination. Consequently this shortfall could reduce or even disappear. Furthermore, it is assumed that Surrey Heath will prepare their plan based on the new standard methodology for housing needs, as per the transitional arrangements set out in the consultation paper. This would mean using a figure of 352 dpa (or whatever the final figure is), rather than the 382 dpa figure for OAHN in the SHMA. Under this scenario the shortfall would be around 950 homes.

This scale of shortfall, should it materialise, is clearly much less than the surplus provision planned in Rushmoor, thereby indicating a very low likelihood of the Hart Local Plan having to provide for unmet needs.

---

14 See [http://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=17850&p=0](http://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=17850&p=0)

15 See [http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/SLAA](http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/SLAA)
6.2.10 Broad spatial distribution

Important understanding was established through the consultations held under Regulation 18, between 2014 and 2017.

6.2.11 The August 2014 ‘Housing Development Options’ consultation set out five strategic spatial options (not necessarily mutually exclusive): settlement focus strategy; dispersal strategy; focused growth strategy based on strategic urban extensions; new settlement strategy; and focused growth away from the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

6.2.12 Subsequently, in November 2014 the Council confirmed its preferred approach for further testing. This involved a mixed strategy but with a preference for a new settlement at Winchfield for 5,000 homes, with around half of those provided in the plan period.

N.B. new settlements are supported by the NPPF, with Government support for new settlements having increased over recent years - see Box 6.2.

Box 6.2: Government support for new settlements, and in particular ‘garden’ villages, towns and cities

The NPPF acknowledges that the supply of new homes “...can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities...” (paragraph 57).

The Government’s support for new settlements was further enshrined within the 2016 Budget, which set out the Government’s backing for the construction of a “new wave” of garden villages, towns and cities. This was accompanied by a Garden Villages, Towns and Cities Prospectus.

The Government has set out its intention to place a renewed emphasis on the delivery of new settlements via the strengthening of the NPPF, with new and updated legislation also expected. The 2017 Housing White Paper (“Fixing our Broken Housing Market”) is strongly supportive, including because of the potential to deliver community benefits over-and-above what can be achieved through urban extensions.

Statements from the White Paper include -

“Provided they are supported by the necessary infrastructure, they are often more popular with local communities than piecemeal expansion of existing settlements.”

“The Government... will work with… garden communities to ensure that development and infrastructure investment are as closely aligned as possible…”

“[The Government will] strengthen local representation and accountability, and increase opportunities for [garden] communities to benefit from land value capture.”

6.2.13 In February 2016 the Council then held a consultation on ‘Refined Options for Delivering New Homes’, which involved presenting a mutually exclusive set of broad spatial strategy alternatives. The document also notably: identified the sites in contention to deliver each of the spatial strategy alternatives; and clarified that a new settlement would be centred on Winchfield. Whilst consultation responses were varied, it was possible to identify a broad order of preference. Most favoured was the option of ‘dispersal and a new settlement’, followed by the option of ‘strategic urban extensions and a new settlement’.

6.2.14 In Spring 2017 the Council published a Draft Plan involving a new settlement at Murrell Green (within the ‘area of search’ shown in the Refined Options consultation document), coupled with a number of smaller, dispersed site allocations. Three ‘reasonable alternatives’ to this strategy were also subject to appraisal and consultation at the time (see the 2017 Interim SA Report), giving close consideration to options involving strategic urban extensions.

6.2.15 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, there was a need to revisit the distribution strategy in light of changes to the strategic context (see discussion of ‘housing quanta’, above) and updated understanding in respect of specific sites (see discussion below).
6.3 **New settlement options**

**Introduction**

6.3.1 The Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan published in April 2017 included two new settlement allocations: one at **Hartland Park** (east of Fleet) and another at **Murrell Green** (a short distance to the west of Winchfield). Also, the Interim SA Report published at that time examined another new settlement option at **Winchfield**.

6.3.2 In light of representations received, the altered strategic context (notably in relation to housing needs; see Section 6.2) and other evidence, the issue of new settlements was revisited in late 2017. This section -

- introduces Hartland Park;
- introduces the new settlement options in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area; and
- introduces another new settlement option, namely Rye Common.

N.B. to reiterate, the aim of the discussion within this section is to inform the establishment of reasonable alternatives (see Section 6.5) for appraisal. The aim is not to present an *appraisal*.

*Figure 6.2: New settlement options in Hart District*
Hartland Park

6.3.3 Hartland Park is a c.55ha, previously-developed site located between Fleet and Farnborough. There is extant planning permission for a warehousing and distribution scheme, which was granted in 2009; however, in recent years attention has focused instead on delivering a housing-led scheme. The site offers an opportunity to create a new community linked to Fleet and Farnborough; however, there are a range of constraints.

Figure 6.3: The Hartland Park site

6.3.4 The Draft Plan (2017) proposed a 1,500 home new community “with facilities to meet local needs, and with its own sense of place and identity… separated from other built up areas by woodland.” A site-specific policy notably required “a local centre that provides a focal point for the scheme… [with] educational, community, retail and other services… located at the local centre along with public open space including children’s play facilities.” The policy also included detailed biodiversity-focused policy, recognising close proximity to internationally and nationally important habitats, and also onsite and adjacent locally important habitats. Other key considerations include traffic generation and maintenance of the Fleet/Farnborough gap.

6.3.5 Subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, in January 2018, the Council granted outline planning permission for the whole site, and full permission for Phase 1, subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement. This being the case, at the beginning of 2018, there was understood to be little justification for giving further detailed consideration to the ‘no development’ option, or options involving a significantly different scheme. In other words, it was determined that a site allocation for a new community could be taken as a ‘given’, for the purposes of establishing reasonable spatial strategy alternatives (see Section 6.5).

N.B. there remain important decisions to be made through future planning applications on the site, and hence policy established through the Local Plan has an important role to play.

New settlement options in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area

6.3.6 A new settlement in this area of central Hart, in the vicinity of Winchfield train station, has been considered as a location for a new settlement for a number of years. As discussed above, in 2014 the Council identified ‘Winchfield’ as the preferred location for a new settlement in the District. Subsequently, in early 2017, the Council determined ‘Murrell Green’ to be the preferred location for a new settlement. Figure 6.4 shows the Murrell Green new settlement proposed by the 2017 Draft Plan. The Draft Plan (2017) proposed “an attractive new settlement of around 1,800 new homes by 2032”. As can be seen, the intention was to ensure landscape buffers between Hook (to the west) and Hartley Wintney (to the northeast); deliver a large (seven form entry) new secondary school in the northern part of the site; and deliver a c.3.5 ha extension to the existing Murrell Green Business Park.

16 Planning Application 17/00471/OUT
Subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, the need to revisit the approach to delivering a new settlement in this area was recognised, in light of: A) the altered strategic context (see discussion of ‘housing quanta’, within Section 6.2, above); and B) site specific considerations. Specifically -

- In relation to (A) - whilst a new settlement in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area is considered an integral part of the long-term solution to meeting housing needs and wider sustainable development objectives, latest understanding is that a new settlement in the this area is not needed to meet housing needs within the plan period.

- In relation to (B) - whilst there could be the potential to deliver a successful/sustainable new community at Murrell Green, the opportunity might be even greater if the land at Winchfield was also brought into play.

Ultimately, for the purposes of establishing reasonable spatial alternatives (see Section 6.5), the option of specifically allocating a site for a new settlement in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area through the Local Plan was ruled out. It was recognised, however, that there is the potential to identify a new settlement area of search through the Local Plan, with a view to allocating a specific site through a subsequent Development Plan Document. This matter is returned to below, within Section 6.5, and is a focus of detailed examination in Appendix III.

Rye common

A 1,600 – 1,900 home new settlement is also being promoted at Rye Common, located in the southern part of the District on the A287, which runs west-east between Odiham and Ewshot. This is the only other new settlement option being actively promoted in the District.

Rye Common was not proposed for allocation by the Draft Plan (2017), nor was it considered by the Interim SA Report as part of the examination of reasonable alternatives. Similarly, in late 2017, it was decided to rule-out - for the purposes of establishing reasonable spatial alternatives - the option of allocating land for a new settlement at Rye Common. However, it was deemed appropriate to give some further examination to the option of a new settlement at Rye Common, as a comparator to the option of a new settlement within the Murrell Green / Winchfield area of search (as discussed above, see para 6.3.8). This matter is returned to below, within Section 6.5, and is a focus of detailed examination in Appendix III.
6.4 Settlement extension site options

Introduction

6.4.1 In addition to Hartland Park and Murrell Green (discussed above), the March 2017 Draft Plan proposed allocation of ten ‘settlement’ extension sites, with the Interim SA Report examining a range of alternative approaches. In light of representations received, the altered strategic context, and other evidence, there was determined to be a need to revisit the approach to settlement extension allocations in late 2017.

6.4.2 As such, this section examines settlement extension site options at each of the main settlements in turn. Box 6.3 presents further methodological discussion.

N.B. for maps of the site options discussed within this section, please see Appendix 5 of the Council’s 2017 SHLAA, available at: https://www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base.

Box 6.3: Methodological approach to examining settlement extension options

The aim of this section is to present a brief discussion of site options, rather than a formal ‘appraisal’. The aim of the discussion is to inform the establishment of reasonable alternatives for appraisal (Section 6.5).

Sites are discussed in varying degrees of detail. As a rule-of-thumb, attention is focused on -

- sites that were supported at the Draft Plan stage;
- sites where notable new evidence came to light through the Draft Plan consultation; and
- sites at higher order settlements, as these are more likely to have better access to jobs, facilities and public transport.

The discussion of site options presented within this section was informed by -

- the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA);
- further work undertaken to examine site options, including the GIS analysis presented in Appendix IV and the analysis reported at www.hart.gov.uk/site-assessments; and
- officer views, as presented to AECOM through a series of internal workshops and discussions in October and November 2017.

Settlements discussed within this section

---

17 Reference is made to existing settlements being within a certain ‘Tier’ of the settlement hierarchy, based on a background paper published by the Council in 2010, namely “A Settlement Hierarchy for Hart District” (January 2010; updated August 2010) available at: https://www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base.

18 Included on the Council’s ‘site assessments’ webpage is a series of assessments for specific SHLAA sites (prepared by Adams Hendry Consulting Limited). These assessments were completed ahead of the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, and were not subsequently updated.
6.4.3 Fleet, incorporating Elvetham Heath to the north and Church Crookham to the south, is the District’s main settlement, with services/facilities and employment opportunities that potentially indicate suitability for growth. However, Fleet has seen significant recent housing development, most notably the creation of Elvetham Heath to the north, Crookham Park (former QEII Barracks) to the south, and Edenbrook to the west. Most recently, planning permission was granted at appeal for 300 homes at Watery Lane to the southwest and 423 homes at Grove Farm to the west. Furthermore, there are constraints to further growth, most notably the TBHSPA, which constrain Fleet’s eastern edge.

6.4.4 Other than Hartland Village (new settlement; discussed above), the Draft Local Plan did not propose any allocations at Fleet (albeit a retirement and care village was proposed at nearby Cross Farm, Crookham Village; see further discussion below).

6.4.5 The Interim SA Report examined two further strategic site options - Grove Farm (423 homes to the west; now with planning permission) and Pale Lane (650 homes to the north west), as part of the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.6 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Fleet can still be supported, there is merit to giving further consideration to site options.

6.4.7 The 2017 SHLAA lists 24 site options at Fleet as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list includes 23 of the 24 sites included within the 2016 SHLAA (one site now being a commitment, i.e. it has planning permission), plus one previously excluded site which has been re-categorised as included after site specific Flood Risk Assessment work was submitted to the Council.

6.4.8 Of the 24 sites, ten are outside of the settlement boundary, and hence a focus of consideration here. All ten are given stand-alone consideration, reflecting the fact that Fleet is the District’s main settlement.

6.4.9 Beginning with the north of Fleet, there is a single large site option - SHL153 Brook House (~500 homes) - lying to the north of the M3. This site was excluded from the 2016 SHLAA due to flood risk concerns, but is included in the 2017 SHLAA, following receipt of new evidence provided by the site promoter. However, it remains the case that the site does not relate well to the existing settlement given the severance created by the M3 motorway. It is also notably constrained by flood risk, proximity to the TBHSPA and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).

6.4.10 Moving south, there are two sites either side of Elvetham Heath, which is the northern part of Fleet. The first is a small site option to the northeast of Fleet - SHL357 Land at Sankey Lane (~20 homes). The site is currently in use; however, it is not clear that it is suited for housing redevelopment. It does not relate well to the existing settlement, sits squarely within the Fleet/Farnborough settlement gap, and is also constrained by an adjacent SSSI.

6.4.11 The second site adjacent to the Elvetham Heath part of Fleet is a much larger site to the west - SHL52 Land Adjacent to Pale Lane Farm (‘Pale Lane’; up to 700 homes). A planning application has been submitted for 700 homes (Ref 16/03129/OUT). The site option was examined closely within the March 2017 Interim SA Report, as part of the consideration given to ‘reasonable alternatives’, and in late 2017 it was again determined that the site warrants close consideration. It is discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

---

19 Sites within the settlement boundary can justifiably be less of a focus of SA, reflecting the need to account for detailed deliverability and design issues more so than strategic sustainability issues.
Finally, there is a cluster of seven SHLAA sites at the southern extent of Fleet, i.e. to the south of Church Crookham. The combined capacity of all seven sites is potentially quite large; however, the option of a large scheme involving all sites was determined to be ‘unreasonable’ as an option for this Local Plan, recognising the amount of recent and committed growth at Church Crookham (Crookham Park to the east, and Watery Lane to the west). It is also the case that the sites are disjointed, and hence there would be a need for a considerable amount of work ahead of a coordinated strategic allocation. However, the option of a more modest scale scheme does warrant examination. In particular, a scheme can be envisaged involving the two adjacent sites to the east of the cluster, which fall either side of Ewhurst Lane: SHL90 Stillers Farm (100 homes); and SHL166 West of Ewshot Lane (150 homes). Both of these sites were actively promoted through the Draft Plan consultation (whilst other sites in the cluster were not), and development could potentially serve to ‘round-off’ the settlement edge. These sites are discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

The situation at Fleet, in respect of recent completions, commitments, site options and SANG is quite complex, and so Figure 6.3 is presented in order to aid understanding.

**Blackwater (Tier 2 settlement)**

A primary local service centre, located on the edge of the series of linked settlements stretching from Camberley (in Surrey Heath) through to Farnborough and Aldershot (in Rushmoor District). It benefits from its close proximity and good access to Farnborough, Camberley, and the Meadows retail park; and Blackwater train station also links the town with Reading and Guildford. However, the town is heavily constrained with flood risk areas to the north and the TBHSPA to the south. There has been some recent development around Blackwater - with an 85 home scheme (Clarke’s Farm) having recently been completed at Darby Green²⁰ - and there is one existing commitment for 126 homes at Hawley Park Farm on the edge of Farnborough; however, further development opportunities are limited.

As such, the **Draft Local Plan** did not propose any allocations, nor did the **Interim SA Report** examine the option of any allocation at Blackwater, through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

In **late 2017**, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Blackwater can still be supported, there is merit to giving further consideration to site options.

The 2017 **SHLAA** lists two site options at Blackwater as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is as per the 2016 SHLAA. Of the two sites, only one is outside of the settlement boundary, and hence a focus of consideration here.¹⁹

The site in question is **SHL303 Frogmore Community College** (~10 homes), which is notably constrained. The site forms the edge of a school playing field, intersects (just) the 400m TBHSPA buffer and is also subject to access constraints.

---

²⁰ Darby Green is actually in the Parish of Yateley, but being west of the Gap between Yateley and Blackwater is discussed under the ‘Blackwater’ heading.
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FIGURE 6.5
Hook (Tier 2 settlement)

6.4.19 A settlement that has grown significantly over recent decades, and now acts as a primary service centre. Hook has seen several large planning permissions over recent years, including 618 homes at two sites either side of the Reading Rd, northeast of the settlement (548 at North East Hook; 70 at land adjacent to Reading Rd), and 60 homes at High Ridge Farm, to the west; plus there have been ‘office to residential’ conversions under permitted development rights. There are constraints to growth in all directions; however, Hook benefits from a railway station, proximity to the M3 Junction, a large employment area and relative distance from the TBHSPA (the western edge of Hook is outside of the 5km buffer).

6.4.20 The Draft Local Plan assigned 87 homes to Hook, but did not propose any site allocations, instead proposing that this task should be left to the emerging Hook Neighbourhood Plan.

6.4.21 The Interim SA Report examined the possibility of allocating an additional strategic site at Owens Farm, to the west of Hook, as part of the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.22 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is appropriate to reconsider the approach of assigning a number of homes to Hook, to be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan. This approach remains an option, but the altered strategic context (see Section 6.2) means that there is less of a pressing need to follow this approach. In turn, there is a need to re-examine site options at Hook.

6.4.23 The 2017 SHLAA lists 13 site options at Hook as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list includes 12 of the 14 sites included within the 2016 SHLAA (one now being a commitment and one having been withdrawn), plus one new site submitted to the Council in late 2017. All but one of these sites falls outside of the existing settlement boundary.

6.4.24 These sites broadly comprise three clusters -

- **West of Hook** - comprising SHL9 Land off Hop Garden Road (up to 60 homes), SHL130 Land west of Varndell Road (up to 40 homes) and SHL173 Owens Farm (700 homes). The two smaller sites adjoin the existing settlement boundary and are reasonably modest in size; however, development would nonetheless impinge on the Local Gap between Hook and Newnham. The larger site relates less well to the settlement edge, and would impinge more significantly on the Local Gap.

- **North of Hook** - comprising SHL3 Land at Searles Farm (500 homes), SHL5 Land north-west of Hook (350 homes), SHL111 Hook Garden Centre, Reading Road (55 homes) and SHL294 Land to the Rear of Hook Garden Centre (90 homes). A primary factor counting against these sites is that they would comprise further extensions to the two committed sites north and north east of Hook. This factor does not necessarily reduce suitability for development, but does make the sites less attractive as options for the current Local Plan. SHL5 Land north-west of Hook (350 homes) is notable for having been actively promoted over a number of years, with the proposed scheme having been scaled-back over time. The current proposal is to develop just the eastern part of this extensive site, in order to avoid landscape, biodiversity and heritage impacts. The site promoters suggest that a somewhat linear scheme, stretching along the Reading Rd, away from Hook, would “reflect the historic linear growth of Hook”, and also suggest the potential to deliver a long term defensible boundary to Hook; however, these assertions are debatable.

- **East of Hook** - comprising two sites to the north of the railway, and three sites to the south, all of which perform relatively poorly as site options. Beginning with sites to the north of the railway, the small site adjoining the settlement edge is constrained by flood risk, including at the point of access to the road network, whilst the large site does not adjoin the settlement boundary, and is being actively promoted as SANG, as part of a Murrell Green new settlement. South of the railway, all sites suffer from poor access, with access achievable only through a commercial estate or via a narrow railway underpass.

---

21 Reference sites and quanta.
Ultimately, as per early 2017, it was determined that the West of Hook cluster offers the greatest potential to support an allocation (or more than one allocation) at Hook. These sites are discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

Yateley (Tier 2 settlement)

Although the District’s second largest settlement, development opportunities are limited given constraints including flood risk to the north, the TBHSPA to the south and narrow settlement gaps to the west (Eversley) and east (Blackwater).

The Draft Local Plan proposed allocation of SHL273 Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road for 88 homes. The Interim SA Report examined the option of not allocating this site (i.e. nil allocations at Yateley), through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is necessary to reconsider allocation of this site, and in turn re-examine other site options at Yateley.

The 2017 SHLAA lists four site options at Yateley as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list includes all three of the sites included within the 2016 SHLAA, plus one new site submitted to the Council in 2017.

Of the included SHLAA sites, there is again (i.e. as per early 2017) a need to give particular consideration to the option of growth to the West of Yateley. In light of representations received and discussions with specialists, there are significant concerns regarding SHL273 Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road as a stand-alone allocation, as the proposed on-site SANG provision is insufficient. However, through the Draft Plan consultation it was recognised that there is potentially an opportunity to address the SANG issue if the site is delivered in conjunction with a site to the west, on the eastern edge of Eversley, namely SHL23 West of Marsh Lane (70 homes). The scheme might deliver 16ha of SANG, comprising all of the remaining land between Yateley and Eversley. As stated by the Marsh Lane site promoter: “The allocation of the land at Marsh Lane and its associated SANG in combination with the proposed allocation on land at Firgrove Road… provides the opportunity for a strategic approach to development… together with a strategic SANG which preserves the Gap and provides connectivity…” Figure 6.6 shows the proposed scheme. This proposed linked scheme is discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

Figure 6.6: A submitted linked scheme

N.B. the allocation of 87 homes within the Draft Local Plan reflected the combined capacity of the two smaller sites west of Hook.

Whilst the site promoters have worked to improve the SANG offer, the proposal is to deliver SANG around the edge of the housing development, in the form of a circular walk, which could prove insufficient to divert residents from the TBHSPA.
6.4.31 A closely related site is **SHL103 Land adjoining Crosby Gardens** (11 homes). This site comprises a small field on the western edge of Yateley, directly north of the Eversley Road. Its location can be seen in Figure 6.6. A small housing scheme would be well contained by the existing hedgerow / boundary trees; however, it would nonetheless represent a small encroachment into the Yateley / Eversley Local Gap. A preferable option might be to achieve a clear and distinct western boundary to Yateley, through development of SHL273 Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road only (i.e. the orange shaded site above).

6.4.32 There are two further sites to consider -

- **SHL20 North of Reading Road** (35 homes) - sits within the Yateley/Blackwater Strategic Gap, abutting Yateley and within easy walking distance of the District Centre. The site is heavily vegetated, which is a constraint to developing the site in its entirety, but could also mean that there is potential to deliver a small scheme that is well screened. SANG capacity is an uncertainty at the current time, although it is noted that SANG was recently delivered adjacent to the north, following completion of a care village development. This site is discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

- **SHL37 Land at Reading Road** (35 homes) - is a new site promoted through the Draft Plan consultation. It sits squarely within the narrow Strategic Gap between Yateley and Blackwater (albeit the gap only exists on one side of the road, with the site well linked to Frogmore, to the south of the road, where there is a primary school, Community College and Leisure Centre). The gap is considered to be a significant constraint, despite the suggestion of the site promoters that “after observing patterns of development on the ground, these gaps have already been breached therefore are no longer fulfilling their intended function.”

**Hartley Wintney (Tier 3 settlement)**

6.4.33 A secondary local service centre lying just north of the M3 motorway, with the valley of the River Hart creating a natural boundary to the north and the east of the village, and the TBHSPA also constraining potential development opportunities to the north. There are limited development opportunities; however, Hartley Wintney is relatively well placed in transport terms, given its location at the junction of the A30 (Camberley to Hook) and A323 (Fleet), and proximity to the A327 (Reading).

6.4.34 The **Draft Local Plan** did not propose any allocation(s) at Hartley Wintney, nor did the **Interim SA Report** examine the option of any allocation(s) through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.35 In **late 2017**, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Hartley Wintney can still be supported, there is merit to giving further consideration to site options.

6.4.36 The **2017 SHLAA** lists seven site options at Hartley Wintney as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

6.4.37 Of the included SHLAA sites, three were actively promoted through the Draft Plan (2017) consultation. Of these a notably large site - **Land at Grange Farm** - was promoted to the southwest of the village, involving a proposal for c.150 dwellings on land between West Green Road and Thackham's Lane. However, this land does not relate well to the settlement, and is constrained in heritage terms, given that it would extend a part of the settlement that comprises very low density housing and is designated as part of the Hartley Wintney Conservation Area. There is also a need to consider the settlement gap role of this land, given the small hamlet of West Green - with a designated conservation area - to the west.
6.4.38 The remaining site options are -

- To the **north** of the village - SHL155 Land at Hare’s Farm, Hartley Wintney (117 homes) does not relate well to the village, lies within the Hartley Wintney Conservation Area and adjacent to Elvetham Hall Registered Park and Garden, and is partly within 400m of the TBHSPA (with footpath accessibility). A planning application for a care village was refused in 2015 and then appealed, but the appeal was subsequently withdrawn.

- To the **east** of the village - SHL89 Land adjacent to Causeway Green (79 homes) and SHL94 Land adjacent to Causeway Farm (21 homes) are two adjacent sites, both of which benefit from proximity to the village centre, but which fall within the Conservation Area. A 100 home scheme was recently completed directly to the south of these sites at Rifle Range Farm.

- To the **south** of the village - two small sites (SHL35 Land South of Thackhams Lane, 21 homes; and SHL177 Land at Croft Lane, 12 homes) within the Conservation Area, as well as a larger site (SHL132 Wintney Court, 63 homes). The larger site is being promoted for “a specialist housing scheme aimed towards providing housing opportunities to the local ageing population in combination with community facilities and SANG”; however, it relates poorly to the settlement boundary, and would reduce the gap between the Phoenix Green area of Hartley Wintney and any future new settlement in the Winchfield area.

**Odiham and North Warnborough (Tier 3 settlement)**

6.4.39 Two closely related smaller secondary local service centres, considered together here as they are both covered by the recently ‘made’ Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan. Along with the main villages of Long Sutton and South Warnborough, these two villages fall outside of the 5km zone of influence for the TBHSPAs and hence should be an area of consideration under Policy NRM6 (retained from the South East Plan). However, there are a range of constraints, including relating to landscape, heritage and access/traffic.

6.4.40 The **Draft Local Plan** assigned 119 homes to Odiham and North Warnborough, but did not propose any site allocations, instead proposing that this task should be left to the Neighbourhood Plan, which was in development at the time of the consultation, and has since been ‘made’ (allocating sites for 119 homes) - see https://www.hart.gov.uk/odiham.

6.4.41 The **Interim SA Report** assumed, under all scenarios examined, that the 119 homes would be delivered, and did not examine higher growth options.

6.4.42 In **late 2017**, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the quantum of growth provided for by the Neighbourhood Plan can still be supported, there is merit to giving further consideration to site options. The Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report (December 2016) was supportive of the approach to growth proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan, describing the approach as “proportionate to the size of the [Neighbourhood] Plan area” and contributing “significantly to boosting the supply of housing land in the [Neighbourhood] Plan area.” However, the Examiner did also state: “The eventual adoption of the emerging local plan may require a reassessment of the policies set out in this Plan to address the level of growth required.”

6.4.43 The 2017 **SHLAA** lists 18 site options at Odiham / North Warnborough as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list includes 18 of the 19 sites included within the 2016 SHLAA (one now being a commitment).

N.B. six of the Odiham and North Warnborough included SHLAA sites are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan, on the basis that they do not yet have planning permission and hence are not yet fully committed.

---

24 In February 2013 the South East Plan was formally abolished except for Policy NRM6 which relates to new residential development close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.
Of the included SHLAA sites that are not Neighbourhood Plan allocations, two ‘stand-out’ sites are those located to the west / southwest of North Warnborough, namely SHL108 Land to the north of Deptford Lane (387 homes) and SHL330 Land west of Adams Farm (14 homes). Considerations include -

- the smaller site could feasibly represent a logical extension of the existing linear development, in simple built form terms; however, it abuts the North Warnborough Conservation Area, with listed buildings being in very close proximity; and
- the larger site is being actively promoted, with proposals that aim to respond to the constraints that exist, and the potential to deliver a retirement village is noted. However, a concern with this site is the impact on the separation between North Warnborough and Greywell, with another consideration being proximity to the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and Odiham Castle Scheduled Monument.

Crontall (Tier 4 settlement)

The largest of the main villages, located c.2km south of Fleet / Church Crookham, also relating closely (c.3km) to Farnham, in neighbouring Waverley Borough. Crondall Parish is also notable for including a small hamlet - Mill Lane - c.1km to the north west of the main village.

The Draft Local Plan assigned 66 homes to Crondall, but did not propose any site allocations, instead proposing that this task should be left to the Crondall Neighbourhood Plan, which is in development (and covers the entire Parish). The Interim SA Report examined the option of nil allocations at Crondall, through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is appropriate to reconsider the approach of assigning a number of homes to Crondall, to be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan. This approach remains an option, but the altered strategic context (see Section 6.2) means that there is less of a pressing need to follow this approach. In turn, there is a need to re-examine site options at Crondall.

The 2017 SHLAA lists four site options at Crondall as 'included', in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

Focusing on the three sites outside of the settlement boundary, one site - SHL74 North West of Crondall (66 homes) - is notable for being subject to relatively few 'headline' constraints. This site was used as the basis for assigning a figure of 66 homes to the Crondall Neighbourhood Plan through the 2017 Draft Local Plan, and it is considered that this site might feasibly be allocated through the Local Plan. This site is discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 & 7.

The other two sites appear to be subject to greater degree of constraint -

- SHL178 Broden Stables and Stable Yard, to the east of the village, which was refused planning permission for 30 homes in 2017 on the basis that: “The combined impact of the overall scale and urban character/layout/design/landscaping would result in unacceptable harm to the rural character of the local area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and setting of the Crondall Conservation Area.”

- SHL159 Land at Dippenhall Street, Crondall (65 homes) - comprises a large field adjacent to the Crondall Conservation Area. The field is visible from the road, and may contribute significantly to the attractive setting to the conservation area, including on the basis that the start of the conservation area is marked by two prominent listed buildings.

---

25 A formal gap designation was proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but then deleted by the Examiner (see para 7.5.6 of the Examiner’s Report, December 2016). The Examiner’s report notably references “the significant local support for the proposed new local gap” and “the developer’s own evidence to the extent that the proposed development could be achieved without detracting from the separation between the two settlements.” Subsequently, the Draft Local Plan (2017) proposed designation of a gap.
Also of note is a site at the eastern edge of Mill Lane, the aforementioned hamlet to the northwest of Crondall village. This site was promoted through the Draft Local Plan consultation, and it is also noted that a brownfield site at the western end of the village is also available. Mill Lane is a relatively unconstrained location, benefitting from direct access to the A287; however, there are no local facilities of note, and the two sites in question would not serve to change this situation (e.g. would not deliver a primary school).

Crookham Village (Tier 4 settlement)

A main village located a short distance to the west of Fleet / Church Crookham.

The Draft Local Plan proposed allocation of Cross Farm, to the south of the village, as a retirement village (comprising a 64-bed care home and up to 100 new homes for the elderly, along with new SANG). The Interim SA Report assumed allocation of this site under all scenarios, and did not examine higher growth options.

In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: there is a need to reconsider allocation of SHL116 Cross Farm, in light of significant local opposition, with landscape and historic character being a key concern. Development would alter the characteristic linear settlement pattern associated with the Crookham Village Conservation Area, and the impact on the gap between Fleet/Church Crookham and Crookham Village. There is also a need to consider the extent of newly committed housing growth nearby, in particular the Grove Farm (‘Netherhouse Copse’) scheme to the north, which recently gained permission at appeal. In turn, there is a need to re-examine site options at Crookham Village.

The 2017 SHLAA lists three site options at Crookham Village as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

Of the included SHLAA sites, it is difficult to identify any stand-out site(s), with only Cross Farm having been actively promoted through the Draft Plan consultation, and it naturally being the case that, as a lower order settlement, there is limited strategic argument for allocation (also recognising the potential for rural exception sites, and sites for specialist accommodation, to come forward under other policies in the draft plan, without an allocation).

Dogmersfield (Tier 4 settlement)

A village located a short distance to the west of Fleet / Church Crookham, in quite close proximity (c.1km) to the edge of ‘Winchfield’ new settlement site option, to the west.

The Draft Local Plan did not propose any allocations at Dogmersfield, nor did the Interim SA Report examine the option of any allocation(s) through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Dogmersfield can still be supported, it is pragmatic to give further consideration to site options.

The 2017 SHLAA lists five site options at Dogmersfield as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

Of the included SHLAA sites, it is difficult to identify any stand-out site(s), with no sites having been actively promoted through the Draft Plan consultation, and it naturally being the case that, as a lower order settlement, there is limited strategic argument for allocation (also recognising the potential for rural exception sites, and sites for specialist accommodation, to come forward under other policies in the Local Plan, without an allocation).
Eversley (Tier 4 settlement)

6.4.62 The settlement referred to here as ‘Eversley’ is in fact two separate, but closely related, main villages: Eversley Centre; and Eversley Cross and Up Green. These villages are located close to the northern extent of the District, to the west of Yateley. As per Yateley, the villages are constrained by flood risk and proximity to the TBHSPA.

6.4.63 The Draft Local Plan proposed the allocation of two sites - CEMEX A and B - for 124 homes. The Interim SA Report examined the option of not allocating these sites (i.e. the option of nil allocations at Eversley), through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.64 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is necessary to reconsider the approach of allocating land at either CEMEX site in light of the following -

- With regards to CEMEX B - a small site (19 homes) at the eastern extent of the land controlled by CEMEX - the site promoters have decided to withdraw the proposal.
- With regards to CEMEX A - a larger site at the western extent of land controlled by CEMEX - the site promoters have identified an issue with the original proposed access, and hence propose a larger scheme with a new access point at the western extent of the site; however, this new scheme is deemed to be out of scale with the village, and the access proposal is deemed problematic, given the need to pass through a small woodland copse.

6.4.65 In turn, it was recognised that there is a need to re-examine site options at Eversley.

6.4.66 The 2017 SHLAA lists nine site options at Eversley as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

6.4.67 In addition to SHL23 West of Marsh Lane (70 homes), which is discussed above, under the ‘Yateley’ heading, two potential ‘stand out’ sites are -

- SHL26 North of Reading Road (29 homes) - could be seen as a logical extension of the built form, and benefits from its location opposite the village primary school; however, the site is quite heavily vegetated, and the land to the north is designated as a SINC. This site is discussed further below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.
- SHL127 Paul’s Field (50 homes) - a relatively unconstrained site, and would be screened from the Reading Road (the main viewpoint); however, considered out of scale with the current built form of Eversley (which is mainly linear).

6.4.68 Other sites, including SHL112 CEMEX (discussed above) are more constrained: SHL122 Land west of the Fielders (31 homes) and SHL247 Land north of Hollybush Lane (38 homes), both of which fall within the settlement gap between Eversley Centre and Eversley Cross; and SHL246 Land at Eversley Cross, which falls within the Eversley Cross Conservation Area.

Ewshot (Tier 4 settlement)

6.4.69 A main village located c.1km to the south of Fleet / Church Crookham (and specifically the new community at Crookham Park), and also relating closely to Hale / Aldershot to the east.

6.4.70 The Draft Local Plan did not propose any allocations at Ewshot, nor did the Interim SA Report examine the option of any allocation(s) through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.71 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Ewshot can still be supported, it is pragmatic to give further consideration to site options.

6.4.72 The 2017 SHLAA lists 1 site option at Ewshot as ‘included’, in that it passes an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA. This is a very small site in area characterised by low density housing. Its suitability for a Local Plan allocation is far from clear.
Long Sutton (Tier 4 settlement)

6.4.73 A notably rural village in the south of the District. Long Sutton is close to South Warnborough (discussed below), but the nearest higher order settlement is Odiham, 4km to the north.

6.4.74 The Draft Local Plan proposed allocation of SHL62 Granary Field (10 homes). The Interim SA Report examined the option of not allocating this site (i.e. nil allocations at Long Sutton), through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.75 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is appropriate to reconsider allocation of this site. Allocation remains an option, but the altered strategic context (see Section 6.2) means that there is less of a pressing need to follow this approach. In turn there is a need to re-examine site options at Long Sutton.

6.4.76 The 2017 SHLAA lists six site options at Long Sutton as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

6.4.77 Of the included SHLAA sites, the site proposed as an allocation by the Draft Plan, namely Granary Field, can still be seen to have some relative merit. Unlike four of the six SHLAA sites, it is not directly adjacent to the Conservation Area, and unlike most of the other SHLAA sites there would be potential to make some use of existing field boundaries, albeit these boundaries are very weak. However, the logic of the development, in built form terms, is questionable. Given the crescent of development opposite, development would lead to quite a high density of housing on this outskirt of the village, almost as a satellite to the village.

6.4.78 The other site options are all either adjacent to the conservation area, or are notable for comprising only part of a larger agricultural field; however, there would be a need for further investigation before determining that they are less suitable than the Granary Field site. The matter of site options at Long Sutton is returned to below, within Sections 6.5 and 7.

Rotherwick (Tier 4 settlement)

6.4.79 A main village located c.1.5km to the north of Hook. The site is notably constrained by an extensive Conservation Area, and a Registered Historic Park / Garden. The Parish is subject to a ‘made’ Neighbourhood Plan.

6.4.80 The Draft Local Plan did not propose any allocations at Rotherwick, nor did the Interim SA Report examine the option of any allocation(s) through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.81 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: whilst the approach of nil allocations at Rotherwick can still be supported, it is pragmatic to give further consideration to site options nonetheless.

6.4.82 The 2017 SHLAA lists three site options at Rotherwick as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

6.4.83 Of the included SHLAA sites, it is difficult to identify any stand-out site(s), with no sites having been actively promoted through the Draft Plan consultation, and it naturally being the case that, as a lower order settlement, there is limited strategic argument for allocation (also recognising the potential for rural exception sites, and sites for specialist accommodation, to come forward under other policies in the Local Plan, without an allocation).
South Warnborough (Tier 4 settlement)

6.4.84 Located in the south of the District, a short distance to the west of Long Sutton (discussed above). South Warnborough is notable for not having a primary school.

6.4.85 The Draft Local Plan proposed allocation of two small sites - SHL33 Plough Meadow and SHL172 Granary Court (34 homes in total). The Interim SA Report examined the option of not allocating either site, through the consideration of reasonable alternatives.

6.4.86 In late 2017, subsequent to the Draft Plan consultation, a view was taken that: it is appropriate to reconsider allocation of these sites; indeed, latest understanding is that the Plough Meadow site is unavailable (drainage issues effectively rendering the site unviable) and Granary Court is a functioning rural employment site. In turn there is a need to re-examine site options.

6.4.87 The 2017 SHLAA lists five site options at South Warnborough as ‘included’, in that they pass an initial sift. This list is unchanged from the 2016 SHLAA.

6.4.88 As discussed above, SHL33 Plough Meadow and SHL172 Granary Court are no longer deemed suitable for allocation, which leaves three site options. Of these, two sites - SHL75 Land at Street Farm House and SHL70 Stables at Lees Cottage - are notably constrained as they fall within the South Warnborough Conservation Area, and in all likelihood do contribute significantly to historic setting, given proximity to listed buildings and location on a hill that overlooks the church, and has a footpath running up it.

6.4.89 The final site option is SHL71 Land adjacent to Nash Meadows/Ridley’s Piece (40 homes), which would involve extending a relatively recent small housing estate on the edge of the village, further up hill. There might be some opportunity, but development of the full parcel of land would likely result in over development, given that this is high land potentially visible within the landscape (notably from Gaston Lane, which is an attractive lane stretching north), and given potential access issues (access would be at the end of a quiet residential road).

Rural area

6.4.90 Rural sites are those not associated with a settlement within Tiers 1 to 4 of the Hart settlement hierarchy. The SHLAA lists a number of sites; however, the majority are parcels of land being promoted as part of a new settlement within the Murrell Green/Winchfield area, which need not be examined here (see Section 6.3 for a discussion of new settlement options).

6.4.91 The following rural sites were promoted through the Draft Plan consultation -

- SHL39 Fermoy, Farnham Road, Odiham (9 homes) - located along the A287, but a long way distant from either Odiham (to the west) or Ewshot (to the east). Falls within Dogmersfield Park Historic Park and Garden.

- SHL106 Bramshill Police Training Centre - located 2 to 3km north of Hartley Wintney. An application for 283 homes was refused in 2017. However, the developer has appealed and the appeal hearing was recently held. In addition to the site's isolation, there is a need to consider impacts to Grade I listed main Bramshill House and the adjacent TBHSPA.

- SHL118 Oakfield Farm, Hartley Wintney (53 homes) - a greenfield site that does not relate well to either Hartley Wintney (to the east) or the small hamlet of West Green (to the west).
6.5 Establishing reasonable alternatives

Introduction

6.5.1 In light of the three ‘interim’ steps discussed above it was possible to establish reasonable spatial strategy alternatives, i.e. a series of alternative packages of site allocations.

6.5.2 When establishing the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives, there was firstly a need to consider which site allocations should be a ‘constant’ across all alternatives, and which should be a ‘variable’, i.e. allocated under certain options only.

Constants

6.5.3 In light of the discussion presented in Section 6.3, it was determined appropriate to treat the approach to delivery of a new settlement as a constant across the reasonable alternatives. Specifically, it was determined that allocation of Hartland Park only should be a constant across the reasonable alternatives. This approach is in-line with that taken in early 2017, as reported within the Interim SA Report, and is strongly justified on the basis of the Council decision in January 2018 to grant outline planning permission (see para 6.3.5).

N.B. whilst the capacity of the site is understood to be 1,500 homes, a proportion of the homes (c.100) will likely be delivered beyond the plan period. As such, delivery of 1,400 homes within the plan period is assumed.

6.5.4 The corollary was a decision to treat ‘non-allocation of other new settlement options’ as a constant across the reasonable alternatives. Whilst an objective of the plan is to “provide for longer term development needs through planning for a sustainable new settlement within the Murrell Green/Winchfield area of search”, current understanding is that a new settlement is not needed in order to meet housing needs within the current plan period, meaning that land for a new settlement need not be allocated within the current Local Plan.

N.B. see further discussion of reasonable alternatives in relation to the matter of “planning for a sustainable new settlement within the Murrell Green/Winchfield area”) within Appendix III.

6.5.5 The final constant was ‘non-allocation’ of many of the settlement extension site options (plus all of the rural site options) referenced/discussed in Section 6.4. The matter of precisely which sites were applied as a constant, and which as a variable, is discussed further below.

Variables 1 - Strategic allocations

6.5.6 As per early 2017, the decision was taken to vary the approach to strategic allocations. The approach of no strategic allocation is certainly a reasonable option, but equally there is the potential for one or more strategic allocation(s).

6.5.7 In light of the discussion presented in Section 6.4, the decision was taken to consider options involving allocation of: Pale Lane (700 homes) and/or West of Hook (comprising Land off Hop Garden Road, West of Varndell Road and Owens Farm; 790 homes in total).

6.5.8 It was determined that the other potential strategic site options discussed within Chapter 6.4 (notably Brook House, Fleet; North West of Hook; North East of Hook; and Land to the north of Deptford Lane, North Warnborough; albeit it is recognised that all might potentially deliver a smaller, non-strategic scheme) need not feature within the reasonable alternatives as they are sequentially less preferable to both Pale Lane and West of Hook.

Variables 2 - Non-strategic allocations

6.5.9 As per early 2017, the decision was taken in late 2017 to vary the approach to non-strategic allocations. The approach of nil non-strategic allocations is certainly a reasonable option, but equally there is the potential for one or more non-strategic allocation(s).
6.5.10 In light of the discussion presented in Section 6.4, the following non-strategic allocations were identified as potentially ‘standing-out’ in planning and sustainability terms, and hence worthy of detailed examination through the appraisal of reasonable spatial strategy alternatives -

- **South of Church Crookham, Fleet** (comprising Stillers Farm, and West of Ewshot Lane; conservatively assumed to deliver 200 homes in total)
- **West of Hook** (Land off Hop Garden Road, and West of Varndell Road; 90 homes)
- **West of Yateley** (Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road, and West of Marsh Lane; 170 homes)
- **East of Yateley** (North of Reading Road; 25 homes)
- **North West of Crondall** (65 homes)
- **North of Reading Road, Eversley** (25 homes)

6.5.11 In addition, on the basis of the discussion presented in Section 6.4, it is apparent that either **Long Sutton or South Warnborough** is potentially suited to a modest housing allocation, but that it is difficult to identify precisely a best performing site, without further detailed work. At South Warnborough there is potentially a ‘stand-out’ site, in the form of SHL71 Land adjacent to Nash Meadows/Ridley's Piece, but it is not clear that this site is preferable to all of the sites at Long Sutton, and it is deemed appropriate to consider the two villages jointly. As such, 25 homes at an **undefined site** is assumed as an option.

6.5.12 The selection of these sites reflects both suitability when considered in isolation, and also the position of the settlement in question within the settlement hierarchy. The reasoning behind identification of these sites is presented within Section 6.4, with key points to note -

- **Blackwater, Hartley Wintney and Odiham / North Warnborough** are notable for being higher order settlements not assigned a potential non-strategic site option. This is primarily on the basis that the site options that exist are all significantly constrained. Also, all three settlements have seen recent completions and/or have commitments in place.
- **Crondall** is potentially suitable for an allocation both because a relatively unconstrained site exists, and because it is the largest of the Tier 4 settlements.
- **Eversley** is a notably smaller Tier 4 settlement, but is well linked to Yateley and beyond, with a built form that suggests some opportunity to grow.
- **Long Sutton or South Warnborough** are both notably rural, but must be considered for growth due to falling outside of the 5km TBHSPA buffer. Plus there may be specific opportunities, e.g. around increasing the capacity of Long Sutton primary school.
- **It is recognised that the Hook and Crondall Neighbourhood Plans are emerging, and hence would be well placed to make allocations, in place of the Local Plan, under most scenarios. However, it is important to consider the possibility of Local Plan allocations Nonetheless, as there is feasibly a scenario whereby there is an urgent need to make allocations through the Local Plan, in order to meet housing needs / deliver a five year housing land supply.**
The reasonable alternatives

6.5.13 The reasonable alternatives are presented within Table 6.3 and across the subsequent maps. As can be seen, each of the constants and variables introduced above (see bold text) is assigned a row within Table 6.3. Other points to note are -

- For pragmatic reasons, the decision was taken to take an ‘all or nothing’ approach to non-strategic allocations. In other words, each option either contains the full set of non-strategic allocations, or no non-strategic allocations at all. Whilst in practice there is the potential to support any combination of the seven sites/locations, it would not be feasible to appraise every combination. There is also a need to limit the total number of reasonable alternatives, with a view to ensuring an effective consultation process.

- The total quantum of homes varies between 397 dpa and 490 dpa. This is in the context of an OAHN figure of 382 dpa (see para 6.2.3) and a ‘draft local housing need’ figure of 292 dpa (see para 6.2.5). The total quantum of homes varies between 397 dpa and 490 dpa. This is in the context of an OAHN figure of 382 dpa (see para 6.2.3) and a ‘draft local housing need’ figure of 292 dpa (see para 6.2.5).

Focusing on 292 dpa, this would mean that the alternatives involve providing for a ‘buffer’ of between 36% and 68%. Points to note are -

- 397 dpa (Option 1) is a reasonable low growth option. It involves providing for a considerable buffer over-and-above the draft local housing need figure of 292 dpa; however, there is no potential to plan for lower growth, given the planning permissions that are in place.

- It is appropriate to explore options involving providing for significantly in excess of 397 dpa given a number of factors, including: 1) understanding of OAHN as understood from the 2016 SHMA; 2) the risk of delayed delivery at one or more sites; and 3) arguments for providing for ‘higher growth’, including with a view to better providing for affordable housing needs (see para 6.2.8), which was the approach supported at the time of the 2016 Draft Plan, which proposed 485 dpa.

- 490 dpa (Option 7) is a reasonable high growth option. There is feasibly a ‘do max’ option, which would involve allocation of both strategic sites (variable category 1) plus the package of non-strategic allocations (variable category 2); however, this option would involve providing for an unreasonably high number of homes (292 plus 78%).

26 The Government’s standard methodology does leave open the possibility of adjusting this figure upwards. Specifically, the figure could be adjusted upwards to 310 dpa by removing the ‘cap’ that is applied as part of the methodology. The cap is applied to reflect deliverability concerns; however, housing deliverability is not thought to be a constraint to growth in Hart District.
### Table 6.3: The reasonable alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1 Do minimum</th>
<th>Option 2 Non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 3 Pale Lane</th>
<th>Option 4 West of Hook</th>
<th>Option 5 Pale Lane + non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 6 West of Hook + non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 7 Pale Lane + West of Hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>3663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within settlements</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windfall</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartland Park</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale Lane, Fleet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Church Crookham, Fleet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Yateley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Yateley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West of Crondall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Reading Road, Eversley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Sutton or S Warnborough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6348</td>
<td>6948</td>
<td>7048</td>
<td>7138</td>
<td>7648</td>
<td>7648</td>
<td>7838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total p.a.</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% over 292 dpa</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7 APPRAISING REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The aim of this chapter is to present summary appraisal findings in relation to the reasonable alternatives introduced above. Detailed appraisal findings are presented in Appendix IV.

7.2 Summary alternatives appraisal findings

7.2.1 Table 7.1 presents summary appraisal findings in relation to the seven alternatives introduced above. Detailed appraisal methodology is explained in Appendix IV, but in summary:

Within each row (i.e. for each of the topics that comprise the SA framework) the columns to the right hand side seek to both categorise the performance of each option in terms of ‘significant effects’ (using red / amber / green) and also rank the alternatives in order of relative performance. Also, ‘=’ is used to denote instances where the alternatives perform on a par (i.e. it not possible to differentiate between them).
### Table 7.1: Summary spatial strategy alternatives appraisal findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Categorisation and rank</th>
<th>Option 1 Do minimum</th>
<th>Option 2 Non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 3 Pale Lane</th>
<th>Option 4 West of Hook</th>
<th>Option 5 Pale Lane+ non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 6 West of Hook + non-strategic</th>
<th>Option 7 Pale Lane + West of Hook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and the economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk / climate change adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and other resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary findings and conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane + non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and conclusions

The first point to note is that the appraisal shows Option 1 ("Do minimum", i.e. allocate Hartland Park only) to perform well in terms of the majority of sustainability objectives, reflecting the identified constraints to growth within Hart. Higher growth options do perform better from a ‘Housing’ perspective; however, all options would result in significant positive effects as there would be a land supply in place to deliver the Government’s draft local housing needs figure in practice (i.e. with a sufficient ‘buffer’ for non-delivery, or delayed delivery, at one or more sites). Higher growth is supported because of the size of the buffer, with Options 5 and 6 performing particularly well as they would also involve a good mix of sites, in terms of size and distribution. Option 1 could potentially give rise to a degree of risk, in respect of ensuring a housing supply (potentially with knock-on implications for other sustainability objectives), given the degree of reliance on one site (namely Hartland Park); however, the risk is considered small. Also, the Council’s support for allocating land for a new settlement through a subsequent DPD helps to allay any concerns (see further discussion of the Council’s response to the alternatives appraisal findings within Chapter 8).

Focusing on other objectives -

- **Accessibility** – there are a number of factors, but on balance it is fair to conclude that Option 6 is worst performing, due to concerns regarding secondary school capacity at Fleet, plus concerns regarding the distribution of growth amongst lower order villages, including several with limited or no bus service.

- **Biodiversity** - both strategic sites are associated with significant constraints, as are certain of the smaller sites under consideration; hence ‘do minimum’ is the preferred option. Significant negative effects are predicted, for options other than the ‘do minimum’.

- **Climate change mitigation** - Option 7 performs best as it would involve a concentration of growth at two strategic-scale schemes, giving rise to the potential to deliver innovative measures that enable per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment to be minimised. However, in practice, it is not clear that there are significant opportunities (going by the proposals submitted as part of current planning applications for these two sites), plus there is also a need to factor-in CO₂ emissions from transport.

- **Communities** – both of the strategic urban extension options (Pale Lane and West of Hook) give rise to certain concerns (e.g. in respect of noise pollution and safe walking/cycling) but issues are fairly limited.

- **Employment and the economy** – None of the sites in question would involve delivery of new employment land, and hence the alternatives are judged to perform broadly on a par.

- **Flood risk / climate change adaptation** – the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited flood risk concerns.

- **Historic environment** – both strategic sites are associated with significant constraints, as are certain of the smaller sites under consideration; hence ‘do minimum’ is the preferred option. Significant negative effects are predicted, for options other than the ‘do minimum’, albeit with some uncertainty.

- **Land and other resources** – the ranking of the alternatives, and the conclusion on ‘significant effects’, reflect an understanding that ‘West of Hook’ does not comprise ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land.

- **Landscape** - the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension at Pale Lane gives rise to relatively limited landscape concerns.

- **Transport** – the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited transport concerns.

- **Water** - the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited concerns in respect of water-related issues/objectives.

In conclusion, all alternatives are associated with certain ‘pros and cons’. The intention is for the Council and stakeholders to take this understanding into account when considering how best to ‘trade-off’ between competing objectives, and establish the ‘most sustainable’ option.
8 DEVELOPING THE PREFERRED APPROACH

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 The aim of this Chapter is to present the Council’s response to the alternatives appraisal / reasons for developing the preferred approach in-light of alternatives appraisal.

8.2 ‘Outline reasons’ for supporting the preferred option

8.2.1 The preferred approach is Option 1, which involves allocating Hartland Park only, and therefore putting in place an overall land supply sufficient to provide 397 dwellings per annum (dpa) (assuming no delays in delivery). The plan commits to 388 dpa as a ‘target’ that delivery of the plan should be monitored against, and which should be used for the purposes of calculating the rolling ‘five year housing land supply’ position.

8.2.2 The appraisal finds Option 1 to have pros and cons, as per all the alternatives; however, it is apparent that Option 1 performs well in terms of the majority of sustainability objectives, which itself is a strong indicator of overall ‘sustainability’. The general message, for the majority of sustainability objectives, is that allocation of one or more additional sites (whether through a strategic extension or package of smaller extensions) would lead to conflicts, given the constraints that exist across Hart, and not lead to significant opportunities for delivering enhancements, particularly in relation to infrastructure delivery.

8.2.3 The appraisal highlights that allocation of one or more sites, in addition to Hartland Park, would lead to stronger performance in terms of ‘Housing’ objectives; however, it is noted that Option 1 (i.e. allocation of Hartland Park only) would still lead to significant positive effects. Even if there were some unforeseen delay to delivery at Hartland Park, the size of the contingency under Option 1 (36%) means that, in all likelihood, local housing need (as currently understood, namely 292 dpa) would still be achieved; indeed, the likelihood is that ‘above local housing need’ would be delivered. Were ‘above local housing need’ to be delivered in practice, then the effect would be that affordable housing needs are met more fully (recognising that delivering the local housing need figure will result in a shortfall in respect of affordable housing needs). It could also transpire that a modest amount of housing is available to address any unmet needs that may arise within the HMA; however, current understanding is that unmet needs are unlikely in the context of the Government’s proposed standard methodology for calculating housing needs.

8.2.4 With a view to addressing any residual concerns, the Council will work closely with the Hartland Park site promoters to ensure timely delivery, and it is also important to note that a policy framework is proposed to support timely housing delivery. Specifically -

- site specific policy for Hartland Park increases certainty, and should help to ensure smooth progression through the planning application process;

- policy is proposed which is supportive of specialist accommodation in the countryside on suitable sites (Policy H4), rural exceptions sites for affordable housing (Policy H5) and other housing in the countryside, where it is essential for the proposal to be located in the countryside in accordance with Policy NBE1;

- the suite of proposed thematic policy should assist with successful delivery of windfall sites, and also timely progression of neighbourhood plans (which may choose to allocate sites for housing); and

- most importantly, there is the commitment to commence work immediately on a new Development Plan Document, which will allocate land for a new settlement within the Murrell Green/Winchfield ‘area of search’ (Policy SS3), which in turn will deliver homes and infrastructure from around the middle of the plan period, ahead of 2032.
PART 2: WHAT ARE SA FINDINGS AT THIS CURRENT STAGE?
INTRODUCTION (TO PART 2)

The aim of this part of the report is to present an appraisal of the Proposed Submission Plan, as published under Regulation 19 of the Local Planning Regulations.

The aim of this introductory chapter is to: A) provide an ‘at a glance’ overview of the Proposed Submission Plan; and B) introduce the appraisal methodology.

Overview of the Draft Plan

The Draft Plan presents policies under five chapter headings –
- Spatial strategy – three ‘SS’ policies
- Housing - six ‘H’ policies
- Economic development – eight ‘E’ policies
- Natural and built environment – 12 ‘NBE’ policies
- Infrastructure – eight ‘I’ policies.

Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Growth makes provision for “at least 6,208 new homes (388 new homes per annum) between 2016 and 2032”. The figure of 388 dpa is the ‘target’ that delivery of the plan will be monitored against, and which should be used for the purposes of calculating the rolling ‘five year housing land supply’ position.

“Table 1: Sources of housing supply” then identifies a supply sufficient to deliver 397 dpa, with the difference (397 - 388 = 9 dpa) a contingency for non-delivery, or delayed delivery, at one or more sites. Table 1 of the plan is repeated below, as Table 9.1.

In addition, the policy notes that additional housing allocations could well come forward through Neighbourhood Plans, and that additional housing could come forward through permitting of rural exception sites in accordance with Policy H4, and other housing where it is essential for the proposal to be located in the countryside in accordance with Policy NBE1.

Table 9.1: Sources of housing supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of new homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions between 1st April 2016 to 6th October 2017 ('completions')</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with outstanding planning permission at 6th October 2017</td>
<td>3,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other deliverable sites&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites in the Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan without planning permission at 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2017</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites within settlement boundaries&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small site windfall allowance&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartland Village</td>
<td>1,428&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>27</sup> This includes sites where there is a Committee resolution to grant permission subject to completion of a S106 Agreement.

<sup>28</sup> This is likely to be an underestimate as it is based only on known developable SHLAA sites within settlement boundaries.

<sup>29</sup> Appendix 2 of the plan document explains how the small sites windfall allowance is calculated.

<sup>30</sup> The site is allocated for 1,500 dwellings), but it is expected that approximately 1,400 will be constructed within the plan period.
9.2.5 Policy SS1 addresses three further matters -

- In relation to a new settlement, the policy states: “To help address longer term growth requirements, an area of search is identified in this Plan for a new settlement (see the key diagram and Policies Map). The new settlement will be brought forward through a separate development plan document (DPD) in accordance with Policy SS3.”

- New employment development will be focused on existing Strategic and Locally Important Employment Sites and at any other suitable sites that come forward as in accordance with the criteria listed in Policy ED1, and other policies in the plan including Policy NBE1: Development in the Countryside.

- Hart’s hierarchy of retail centres will be maintained and enhanced by encouraging a range of uses, consistent with the scale and function of the centres in line with Policy ED4. Provision will be made for approximately 5,900 square metres (net) of convenience retail floorspace and 3,960 sq m (net) of comparison floorspace in the District over the plan period. This will be within existing centres, with the majority within Fleet Town Centre. New local retail provision will be promoted within existing District and Local Centres and will also be provided at Hartland Village and the new settlement at Murrell Green/Winchfield.

9.2.6 The plan vision is presented below (Box 9.1) as is the key diagram (Figure 9.1).

**Box 9.1: The vision**

In 2032 the District will still be an attractive, largely rural area with thriving towns and villages and a variety of landscapes. Our countryside will be recognised for its importance to the quality of life, as the setting where people live and work, and for its contribution to biodiversity, leisure and recreation.

We will have played our role in meeting future housing, social and economic needs, with priority given to the redevelopment of previously developed (brownfield) land. This includes the creation of a new community at Hartland Village, east of Fleet.

To meet longer term needs the creation of a new settlement will have begun, providing new homes, jobs and infrastructure, including a new secondary school.

In addition to market housing, the number of affordable homes will have increased, along with more accommodation for the elderly and other forms of specialist housing.

The number of jobs in the District will also have increased as Hart plays its role in delivering the employment needs of the wider functional economic area. The best employment sites will have remained in employment use and there will be enhanced opportunities for businesses in rural areas.

Fleet will have maintained and developed its role as the main service centre, providing employment, services and facilities, including improved entertainment facilities. Hart’s other settlements including Yateley, Blackwater, Hook, Hartley Wintney and Odiham will have retained and enhanced their vibrant centres providing shops and services for their respective local communities.

Our infrastructure will have been enhanced to support the changing population. There will be a new primary school at Hartland Village and educational facilities at the new settlement. New development will also have provided improvements to health care facilities. There will have been investment in our roads to tackle congestion and make them safer, and in measures to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport. Green infrastructure will have been protected and enhanced encouraging healthy communities and opportunities for wildlife to thrive.

New development will have been built to high environmental and design standards including measures to meet the challenges of climate change. These developments will have respected the individual characteristics of the towns and villages across Hart and will have avoided the coalescence of settlements.

The character, quality and diversity of our natural, built and heritage assets will have been preserved, and where possible enhanced. These assets include the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), such as the Basingstoke Canal and other protected habitats, the chalk downland in the south west of the District, riverine environments, the Forest of Eversley, Historic Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.
Figure 9.1: The Key Diagram
9.3 Appraisal methodology

9.3.1 The appraisal identifies and evaluates ‘likely significant effects’ of the plan on the baseline, drawing on the sustainability topics/objectives identified through scoping (see Table 4.1) as a methodological framework. The SA framework covers the following 12 topics:

- Accessibility
- Biodiversity
- Climate change mitigation
- Communities
- Employment and the economy
- Flood risk / climate change adaptation
- Housing
- Historic environment
- Land and other resources
- Landscape
- Transport
- Water

9.3.2 Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high level nature of the policies under consideration, and an understanding of the baseline (now and in the future under a ‘no plan’ scenario) that is inevitably limited. Given uncertainties there is a need to make assumptions, e.g. in relation to plan implementation and aspects of the baseline that might be impacted. Assumptions are made cautiously, and explained within the text (with the aim to strike a balance between comprehensiveness and conciseness/accessibility to the non-specialist). In many instances, given reasonable assumptions, it is not possible to predict ‘significant effects’, but it is nonetheless possible and helpful to comment on merits (or otherwise) of the Proposed Submission Plan in more general terms.

9.3.3 Finally, it is important to note that effects are predicted taking account of the criteria presented within Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004). So, for example, account is taken of the duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are also considered, i.e. the potential for the Hart Local Plan to impact on the baseline when implemented alongside other plans, programmes and projects. These effect ‘characteristics’ are described within the appraisal as appropriate.

Adding structure to the appraisal

9.3.4 Whilst the aim is essentially to present an appraisal of the Proposed Submission Plan ‘as a whole’, it is appropriate to also give stand-alone consideration to elements of the plan. As such, within each of the twelve appraisal narratives below, sub-headings are used to ensure that stand-alone consideration is given to distinct elements of the plan, before the discussion under a final sub-heading concludes on the plan as a whole.

N.B. Specific policies are referred to only as necessary within the narratives below. It is not necessary to give systematic consideration to the merits of every plan policy in terms of every sustainability topic/objective.
10 APPRAISAL OF THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION PLAN

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 The aim of this chapter is to present an appraisal of the Proposed Submission Plan in terms of the eleven SA topic headings, drawing on the issues/objectives established through scoping (see Table 4.1). This chapter ends with a brief ‘conclusions’ section.

10.2 Accessibility

SA2 Protect and enhance the health and well-being of the population; SA3 Encourage increased engagement in cultural activity, leisure, and recreation across all sections of the community; SA17 Improve accessibility to all services and facilities; SA19 Maintain and improve opportunities for everyone to acquire the education and skills they need to find and remain in work.

Commentary on the spatial strategy

10.2.1 Policy SS1 and SS2 make provision for the development of a new community at Hartland Park, with supporting services, facilities and infrastructure. Notably, the new community will include a primary school; with a financial contribution towards secondary school provision in nearby Fleet, which is understood to have capacity (following expansion in 2021) - see further discussion in Appendix II.

10.2.2 Residents would also need to travel to access higher order services, facilities and retail in Fleet or Farnborough, but this should not prove problematic, given proximity and good transport links. Notably, there is potential to divert existing bus routes to serve the new development; also, there is potential to link the site to Fleet train station via improved cycle and foot paths.

10.2.3 There is also good potential to deliver open space and outdoor recreational facilities, with the current outline planning application proposing a total of 11.31ha of open accessible space, which includes play areas, the local centre public realm and teenage play. This exceeds the recommended standard of 8.75ha. The proposal is to prioritise the provision of onsite children’s play areas and teenage provision, including a multi-use games area (MUGA). Other provision, notably playing pitches and allotments, will be provided off site via a contribution.

10.2.4 Finally, with regards to healthcare facilities, the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has agreed to accept a significant contribution (£1.1m) towards off-site provision. This is an important arrangement, recognising the following consultation response received, from the CCG, to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation: “We have and can supply evidence to demonstrate that local primary care service providers are already under pressure, and are finding it difficult to keep pace with rising demands and that, in some cases, are already working within buildings that are not meeting the preferred standards of suitability and sufficiency.”

10.2.5 With regards to site specific policy, the proposal is to require: “The provision of a local neighbourhood centre comprising community uses, small scale local retail, service and food and drink facilities… with landmark buildings in appropriate locations and high quality public civic space.” Also, the proposal is to require “primary school and early years facility to be provided on site, and financial contributions towards the provision of secondary school places off-site”. The policy also provides for health care considerations through requiring development to deliver “measures to improve access to local health facilities”.
10.2.6 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a **new settlement** in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area of search through a subsequent Development Plan Document, the key point to note is that there will be good potential to achieve the necessary critical mass to deliver supporting services, facilities and infrastructure, to include a new secondary school. Indeed, the desire to deliver a new secondary school at an optimum location (such that it will also be accessible to children from other settlements), and as part of an early phase of development, is a key motivation for planning the new settlement carefully, through a separate DPD. However, the degree of ‘self-containment’ achieved at the new settlement will be limited. Residents will need to travel to access many community services / facilities in Hart, and beyond (notably Basingstoke). In this respect, residents will benefit from access to Winchfield train station. It may also be fair to say that residents will benefit from good road and walking/cycling links; however, there is uncertainty at this stage / a need for further work.

**Commentary on other policies**

10.2.7 **Policy I5** (Community Facilities) states that: “*Development proposals for the provision of new community facilities or the improvement of existing facilities will be supported where they enhance the sustainability of communities.*” The supporting text explains that: “*Our aim is to promote sustainable, cohesive, integrated communities and to support better local services and facilities that reflect community needs and support well-being...*”

10.2.8 **Policy I8** (Safeguarded land for Education) safeguards land adjacent to Robert May’s School in Odiham (2.8 ha) and Calthorpe Park School, Fleet (1.45ha) for future educational use. The supporting text notes that: “*The Government places great importance on ensuring that sufficient school places are provided to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Consequently, the Council is required to take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement.*”

10.2.9 **Policy I4** (Open space, sport and recreation) seeks to safeguard the open space, sport and recreational facilities. It states that “*development proposals will be supported where they enhance and improve the quality, capacity, accessibility and management of sports and recreational facilities including playing fields, built facilities and the open space network within the District.*” The policy also requires that: “*New open space, sport and recreational facilities and services (including built facilities) should be provided within new residential development sites*”. The supporting text specifies the standards that are to be achieved; for example, all homes should be within 600m of a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP).

10.2.10 **Policies ED4 – ED7** deal with town, district and local centres, setting out to reinforce the existing retail hierarchy, ensuring that centres complement each other. Within the defined centres, developments for retail and community uses will be encouraged where they are appropriate to the scale, function and character of the centre. Measures are proposed to restrict proposals for retail and community uses that are not in the centres defined, and to restrict proposals for non-retail / community uses (e.g. residential uses) within the centres. The effect should be to support the ongoing viability and vitality of centres. This is important, as the centres are a focal point for provision of services and facilities.

10.2.11 **Policy NBE10** (Design) seeks to ensure high quality design is achieved on all developments. The policy notably makes specific reference to ensuring accessibility for future residents through the design of external spaces, parking facilities, and the layout of buildings.

**Appraisal of the plan as a whole**

10.2.12 The proposed spatial strategy performs well, in that Hartland Park will involve delivery of new community infrastructure, thereby helping to ensure that housing growth does not put undue strain on existing community infrastructure. The recently approved (subject to a legal agreement) hybrid application for the site proposes 1.6 ha for a primary school, 1ha for a local centre and almost 12 ha of open/amenity space (the total site area being 55ha).
10.2.13 The commitment to plan for a new settlement, through a separate DPD, is also strongly supported, as this will ensure that opportunities for delivering a new secondary school, and other community infrastructure, are fully realised.

10.2.14 The proposed development management policy framework is robust and helps to alleviate concerns, with Policies I8 (Safeguarded land for Education) and I4 (open space, sport and recreation) of particular note.

10.2.15 Whilst the plan performs well, significant positive effects are not predicted, recognising that there are no existing strategic problems/issues set to be addressed as a result of the plan. Much hinges on delivery of a new secondary school through a future new settlement.

10.3 Biodiversity

SA8 Protect and enhance biodiversity.

Commentary on the spatial strategy

10.3.1 A key consideration is the need to avoid significant adverse effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), which in practice involves: A) directing housing growth to less sensitive locations, i.e. locations beyond the 5km and 7km buffers that have been defined; and B) ensuring that there is potential to deliver sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to mitigate increased recreational pressure. There is a need to ensure avoidance and mitigation in accordance with South East Plan Policy NRM6 and the TBHSPA Delivery Framework.

10.3.2 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of a new community at Hartland Park, which is located in close proximity to the TBHSPA; however, there is good potential to deliver effective SANG and other mitigation (see below). Hartland Park is also in close proximity to Fleet Pond and Basingstoke Canal Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), and has some on-site biodiversity value, including land designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Box 10.1 summarises information contained within the recent (August 2017) report to Elected Members, which informed the decision to support a 1,500 home scheme in principle.

10.3.3 Some concerns have been raised regarding the density of the proposed scheme, and in turn the implications for open space on-site (to attract dog-walking and other recreational uses, as alternative to visiting sensitive offsite habitats), with it noted that the proposed density is significantly higher than that of the nearby new Elvetham Heath development. Hampshire Wildlife Trust commented, through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation, that “… It is acknowledged that this is a ‘brownfield site’ and as such it is well suited to development. However, part of the site is located within 400m of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA exclusion zone and the site is located within a functioning ecological corridor that links components of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA to the north with those to the south. Recent work by Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust has restored adjacent habitat on Bramshot Heath SINC to a condition whereby it now supports two of the three SPA species (nightjar and woodlark) and as such it must be considered part of the ecological network supporting the SPA. We do not consider that it will be possible to mitigate impacts of residential development on this heathland site given its proximity to the development site (within 400m). We note that there is currently insufficient SANG capacity within the proposed bespoke SANG… Kennels Lane Wood (Land North of Pystock). We do not consider that any other proposed SANG not directly linked to the development site will mitigate impacts on the TBHSPA nor the adjacent Bramshot Heath SINC and as such it will be necessary to reduce housing numbers on the site and provide more open space within it…”
10.3.4

With regards to site specific policy, proposed Policy SS2 makes a generic requirement regarding avoidance of impacts to the TBHSPA, before going on to require that: “Any adverse effects on the Fleet Pond Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are avoided; and any adverse effects on the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) within or adjoining the site avoided, mitigated or if necessary compensated for.” This tiered approach is appropriate, and reflects a situation on the ground whereby work has been undertaken to establish the potential to translocate areas of grassland SINC habitat.

10.3.5

The supporting text to Policy SS2 is also of note, as it adds detail regarding proposals for avoiding/mitigating recreational impacts to Fleet Pond (the SANG “should be designed to maximise its potential as a local alternative to recreation at Fleet Pond”) and proposals for avoiding/mitigating/compensating for impacts to the SINCs.

*Figure 10.1: Hartland Park Green Infrastructure Strategy*

10.3.6

Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Winchfield area through a subsequent DPD, the area of search is within the 5km TBHSPA buffer; however, the nearest component of the SPA is some way distant, being north of Hartley Wintney. There is an opportunity to deliver effective SANG. For example, depending on the preferred locations for development, there is the potential to include a ‘riverside parkland’ within the Whitewater Valley east of Hook, which is a designated Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA), and potentially to connect with other existing or proposed SANG. Aside from the TBHSPA, the area is constrained by Odiham Common Site SSSI to the south, the northern-most part of which is in ‘part destroyed’ condition (albeit the vast majority is in favourable condition). The SSSI will be easily accessed from new settlement, and increased traffic through the SSSI can be anticipated; however, SANG could potentially act as a buffer.

10.3.7

Notably, the proposed policy (Policy SS3) requires “net gains in biodiversity where possible”. The statement may be appropriate, but there are question-marks regarding ‘net gains’ might be measured. It is recommended that further work be undertaken to ‘benchmark’ the baseline situation. For example, a specialist adviser might work with the Council to establish a qualitative description of valued characteristics of the area, with that description then subsequently serving as a benchmark for monitoring. Without such a ‘benchmark’, the risk is that unsubstantiated claims might be made regarding the achievement of policy aims.
Box 10.1: Addressing biodiversity issues at Hartland Park

**TBHSPA**

Alongside the planning application for Hartland Park itself, the Applicant has submitted a planning application for the change of use of land at Kennels Lane for SANG (Re: 17/01506/FUL). The new Kennel Lane SANG will deliver 27.9ha of SANG; however this SANG will not provide the full area of land to mitigate the total number of homes proposed, consequently the applicant will need to secure access for the Council to the nearby Bramshot Farm SANG in lieu of the shortfall of new provision at Kennels Lane.

Natural England is concerned that the development only achieves the minimum standard for the SANG provision, which is 8ha/1,000 population. However, the applicant suggests that the minimum standard in respect of SANG **quality** is comfortably exceeded, and would also highlight that directly to the east of the Kennels Lane SANG (separated by Kennels Lane) is the existing Southwood Woodlands SANG, measuring approximately 33ha in area. The applicants refer to a combined ‘super-SANG’ measuring 63.1ha.

With regards to SANG quality, the applicants explain that: “The new SANG will include all required features (as defined by Natural England) to attract new residents, such as a safe and attractive environment with clear signage, information boards, dog bins, and circular walks. However, the proposed SANG goes far beyond such standard requirements, with the land comprising mature woodland, ponds, and heathland, all of which are diverse and of a high visual standard… [Additionally] further facilities will come forward at the SANG on a phased basis, including picnic areas and a Mountain Bike Trail.”

The proposed SANG is immediately adjacent to the proposed Hartland Village development, and at least two pedestrian crossing points will provided across Bramshot Lane, providing safe and attractive links. Whilst the proposed development is under construction, interim footway links will be provided from each Phase of the development to the SANG. This is in contrast to the (only) footpath link from the proposed development to the SPA, which is only accessible along a busy ‘A’ road and across a major roundabout junction.

Finally, the applicants commit to a range of measures to advertise the new SANG, including a dedicated website and ‘several community events throughout the year’. The possibility of a volunteer group will also be explored, which will encourage residents to ‘take ownership’ and invest in the SANG.

**Fleet Pond and Basingstoke Canal SSSIs**

Fleet Pond lies 240m distant and the Basingstoke Canal lies 400m to the west of the site. Subject to conditions Natural England raises no objections. The applicants focus on potential adverse effects arising from recreational pressure on Fleet Ponds SSSI, concluding that these are not likely to be significant, as: the proposed development will retain the existing MoD fencing along the site’s northern and western boundaries; and new residents will be directed to, and naturally attracted towards, the new Dog Kennels SANG.

There is a commitment to monitoring impact upon Fleet Pond SSSI, with the suggestion that: “The Applicant will also be obliged to maintain the quality and standard of SANGs to ensure that the mitigation is effective in providing a viable alternative recreational attraction to the Pond and thereby reducing visitor pressures. These measures can be secured via a combination of contributions secured as part of the S106 and conditions to secure a detailed management plan and monitoring programme.”

**SINCs**

Pyestock (North Grasslands) SINC lies in the northern part of the site. Pyestock (Fairway) SINC is in the southern part of the site and extends beyond the southern boundary. A small section of Bramshot Common SINC extends into the site on the northern boundary. There has already been some translocation of the Pyestock (North Grasslands) SINC, and it is proposed the Pyestock (Fairway) SINC will be similarly translocated. Bramshot Common SINC will be retained, with opportunities to enhance the habitats through controlled thinning, allowing grassland to come through.

**Other biodiversity considerations**

The proposed development will result in some loss of areas of coniferous woodland (some of which is covered by a Tree Preservation Order) and open space, which will result in reduced habitat for a range of bird species. Most are common; however loss of open space may impact on foraging and breeding opportunities for Nightjar, Woodlark and Little Ringed Plover, which are of conservation concern.
Commentary on other policies

10.3.8 **Policy NBE5** (Biodiversity) seeks to protect designated sites; avoid the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland; and ensure that opportunities enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity are taken where possible, including “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations.”

10.3.9 Also of note is the statement within the supporting text that: “All development proposals will be expected to avoid negative impacts on existing biodiversity and provide a net gain where possible.” This is supported, although there is some uncertainty regarding how ‘net gain’ might be measured / ‘benchmarked’ in practice. The following further statement in the supporting text is helpful in this regard: “Biodiversity enhancement in and around development should be led by a local understanding of ecological networks.”

10.3.10 **Policy I2** (Green Infrastructure) supports development which avoids loss, fragmentation or significant impact to the function of the green infrastructure network in the council area. The policy goes on to state that development proposals that result in the loss of green infrastructure will only be supported if an appropriate replacement is provided that is of equal or better value.

10.3.11 **Policy NBE4** (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) clarifies the approaches to avoidance and mitigation that have been agreed by all authorities in the sub-region. As part of this, supporting text explains that: “Proposals for new SANGs must be approved by the Council following advice from Natural England and will be expected to follow Natural England’s SANG guidelines. Applicants may propose bespoke SANGs that provide mitigation for their own developments, either within the development site or off-site in an appropriate location. The requirements of the SANG guidelines often mean that SANGs cannot not be delivered on smaller sites. Where we have capacity we may make Council administered SANG available to developers of smaller sites subject to the payment of a tariff.”

10.3.12 **Policy NEB7** (Water Quality) will also have positive implications for biodiversity associated with the water environment. The supporting text explains that the District forms part of the Thames River Basin, and that development should be planned to support the environmental objectives of the Water Framework Directive. In this context, there are a number of Groundwater Protection Zones affecting development in North Warnborough and Odiham. With regard to these, the text states that “development proposals that have the potential to contaminate groundwater within Groundwater Source Protection Zones will need to demonstrate that groundwater and surface water is adequately protected to prevent any deterioration in water quality and pollution of the water source.”

Appraisal of the plan as a whole

10.3.13 On balance, it is fair to conclude that the proposed spatial strategy performs well. At Hartland Park there is good potential to take a strategic approach to biodiversity mitigation, albeit this does involve some relocation of SINC habitat (this has been successful in the past, which helps to allay any concerns). There remains a degree of uncertainty regarding impacts to the TBHSPA and Fleet Pond SSSI at this stage, with careful monitoring necessary (and committed to, in the form of a detailed management plan and monitoring programme).

10.3.14 The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate DPD, is quite strongly supported, as the Murrell Green/Winchfield area is less sensitive than other areas to the north/east (albeit still within the 5km TBHSPA buffer), and there is very good opportunity to deliver effective new strategic SANG.

10.3.15 The proposed development management policy framework is robust and helps to alleviate concerns, although there could be potential to strengthen site specific policy for Hartland Park.
10.3.16 In conclusion, whilst there are significant biodiversity sensitivities (TBHSPA, SSSIs and locally important habitats) within proximity to proposed areas of growth, there is confidence in the ability to deliver effective avoidance / mitigation measures. Significant negative effects are not predicted.

N.B. this conclusion differs to that reached at the Draft Plan stage, when ‘significant negative effects’ were predicted, given uncertainties regarding achievement of effective avoidance/mitigation measures. The situation has moved on considerably, with the proposed strategy now essentially ‘lower growth’, with no proposal to allocate small settlement extensions (which are more likely to be at risk of not providing effective SANG) nor an allocation for a new settlement (rather, the proposal is to plan for a new settlement in the longer term, which will include careful planning of SANG).

10.4 Climate change mitigation

| SA12 | Reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impacts of climate change; SA14 Increase energy efficiency, security and diversity of supply and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources. |

Commentary on the spatial strategy

10.4.1 A key climate change mitigation consideration relates to the potential to affect average per capita transport-related CO₂ emissions, which are relatively high in Hart, reflecting the district’s rural character; however, this is considered under ‘Transport’ below. Instead, the discussion here focuses on the potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, and hence minimise per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment. In practice, this means supporting larger scale developments, of several hundred homes (or clusters of smaller developments that can be developed in a coordinated way), as development at scale enables delivery of the necessary infrastructure.

10.4.2 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of new community of 1,500 homes at Hartland Park, which is supported on the basis that there could be economies of scale that enable delivery of low carbon infrastructure and also standards of sustainable design and construction over-and-above national requirements. However, in practice there is considerable uncertainty regarding the extent to which opportunities to minimise per capita built environment CO₂ emissions will be achieved. This conclusion is reached on the basis of the ‘Energy and Sustainability Strategy’ submitted as part of the current outline planning application, which proposes a focus on energy efficiency measures only, as “the most cost-effective way of delivering the Proposed Development whilst balancing the requirements of Part L [of the Building Regulations] with the design intent and aesthetic considerations for the development”. The proposal is essentially to comply with the Building Regulations, rather than to exceed them; albeit there is also a commitment to explore options for renewable heat/electricity generation “as part of each future phase of the development.”

N.B. the option of a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility is ruled out, as: A) the development will be low-rise, rather than high-rise / high density; B) the development will be relatively low diversity (i.e. mainly residential, with no employment) leading to a very uneven spread of demand throughout the day; C) the phasing of the development would make installing a centralised district energy network complicated, with temporary plant required until such a time as a sufficient base load would be available to run a CHP engine efficiently; and D) CHP involves making efficient use of gas, and so the value of CHP will decrease in the future at such time as the national grid is decarbonised, and there is less need for gas.

10.4.3 With regards to site specific policy, Policy SS2 does not set any requirements in respect of energy efficiency measures or low carbon heat/electricity generation. This may be appropriate, given the proposed district-wide policies (see below).
10.4.4 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a **new settlement** in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a subsequent DPD, there will be excellent potential to achieve the necessary critical mass, and mix of uses, to enable combined heat and power generation (potentially even fuelled by biomass, which might even be locally sourced), with a network of piping to provide ‘district heating’ (although it might be that a ‘polycentric’ layout is needed which would reduce efficiencies). However, it is noted that proposals received from site promoters to date have been non-committal, at best, with the promoter of land to the east suggesting (through the Draft Plan consultation) that the **“unconstrained nature of the site means further opportunities for renewable energy will be provided as additional homes are provided, if required”**; and the proposal received from the promoter of land to the west not referencing any low carbon infrastructure (or design) opportunities.

Commentary on other policies

10.4.5 **Policy NBE10** (Design) states that development will be supported where **“it reduces energy consumption through sustainable approaches to building design and layout;...; and it incorporates renewable or low carbon energy technologies, where appropriate.”** The supporting text goes on to explain the importance of **“balancing the merits of any proposals for renewable and low carbon energy generation against any adverse impacts”**.

N.B. this statement within the supporting text was amended to reflect an earlier SA recommendation. Previously the statement was less permissive, with the suggestion that proposals **“should not be at the expense of meeting the other requirements of good design.”** This is a matter that could necessitate further discussion, noting that Historic England stated the following, through the Draft Plan consultation -

**“We would also prefer the policy to be more assertive (in accordance with paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework) and only allow renewable and low carbon energy developments where there would be no adverse impact on heritage assets...”**

10.4.6 **Policy NBE11** (Renewable and low carbon energy) states that: **“Proposals for the generation of energy from renewable resources, or low carbon energy development (with the exception of wind turbines) will be supported providing that any adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily including individual and cumulative landscape and visual impacts.”** The policy then goes on to list the main issues that are likely to be relevant when balancing the merits of any proposals for renewable and low carbon energy generation against any adverse impacts.

Appraisal of the plan as a whole

10.4.7 There is support for the decision to allocate a single large brownfield site (Hartland Park), as there will be economies of scale achieved that should lead to good potential to design-in measures to minimise per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment; however, current proposals (as understood from the current planning application) perhaps lack ambition, and the proposed site specific policy does not deal with this matter.

10.4.8 The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate DPD, is also strongly supported, as this will help to realise opportunities for delivering decentralised renewable or low carbon heat and/or electricity generation.

10.4.9 The proposed development management policy framework is fairly robust, albeit support for low carbon measures is caveated, i.e. numerous other competing factors are highlighted as potentially overriding.

10.4.10 Whilst the plan performs well, although **significant positive effects are not predicted**, recognising that climate change mitigation is a global issue.
10.5 Communities

SA4 Reduce inequality, poverty and social exclusion; SA5 Improve community safety by reducing crime and the fear of crime; SA6 Create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive settlements and communities; SA21 Stimulate regeneration where appropriate and encourage urban renaissance.

N.B. the objectives listed above, under ‘Accessibility’ are also relevant here, i.e. there is cross-over.

Commentary on the spatial strategy

10.5.1 Aside from implications for ‘accessibility’ (which are discussed above, see Section 10.2), there are relatively few points to make regarding the proposed new community at Hartland Park. As a brownfield site with past industrial uses, and also one that is in proximity to MOD training areas, there is a need to give close consideration matters of health and safety; however no major concerns are raised by the Environmental Statement (ES) recently submitted as part of a planning application -

- With regards to contaminated land, an Outline Remedial Strategy has been submitted that “provides a strategy which produces a site that is suitable for its intended purpose... whilst providing a safe working environment with respect to site workers and adjacent users.” The Council’s Environmental Health team have reviewed and agreed the methodology. This is an important step, recognising that the Environment Agency responded to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, suggesting that “previous uses of this site is likely to have resulted in areas of contamination. Uncontrolled or poorly managed development of these areas could potentially mobilise contaminants, resulting in contamination passing through to ground and/or surface water receptors...”

- With regards to noise pollution, surveying work has been completed, which indicates that the existing noise climate at the site is dominated by road traffic noise from the immediately surrounding road network, but predominantly from Ively Road to the south of the site. The assessment identified that there would be the potential for adverse effects to arise in the absence of appropriate mitigation measures. Accordingly, the design evolution process of the proposed development has been subject to noise modelling and consultation to agree an appropriate scheme design. This includes the location of individual new homes as well as the provision of a 2.5m high acoustic barrier.

- With regards to air quality, a review of air quality monitoring data indicates that the site and the surrounding area have complied with national objectives for all pollutants.

10.5.2 Another important health and safety consideration relates to walking and cycling access to Fleet and Farnborough, including given constrained local roads and the prevalence of woodland, MOD land and industrial / commercial uses in the locality. This matter is considered further below, under ‘Transport’.

10.5.3 With regards to site specific policy, there is a focus on the matter of noise, with the proposal to: “Ensure that residents are not subject to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.” Future residents need to live within acceptable levels of noise pollution, whether from off-site or on-site activities. A noise survey will be required to support an application. Applicants are advised to consult the MOD Defence Infrastructure Organisation given the proximity of MOD training areas to the site and the potential for associated noise issues.

10.5.4 The policy also seeks to: “Address the treatment of the site’s boundaries with regards to accessibility, and security issues and the achievement of good design.” It is recommended that this requirement is expanded upon, potentially within the supporting text.

10.5.5 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area, there are several points to make -

- Noise pollution - associated with the M3, A30 and the railway is a constraint to the location of residential uses and a secondary school; however, there is always good potential to mitigate noise pollution through attenuation and design measures.
• Gas pipeline - a gas main passes through the west of the area, which will necessitate either a considerable ‘buffer’ of open land either side, or major work to re-route the pipe. The representation received from the site promoter in 2017 states that the preferred approach is to “divert and at the same time upgrade the Bramshill/Foyle pipe. One option is to divert and upgrade the pipeline to the east of its current route, on an alignment that follows the [proposed] main north-south street. The current pipe was laid in the 1960s and is of a thin walled steel construction. A replacement thicker walled pipe will very significantly reduce the risk and the hazard.”

• Pylons - high voltage power line that runs through the east of the area, which can feasibly be run underground.

• Road safety - two notable issues are A) the narrow railway underpass, to the east of Winchfield station; and B) footpath / cyclepath links along the A30 and/or B3016.

Commentary on other policies

10.5.6 Policy NBE10 (Design) states that development will be permitted where it would provide or positively contribute to public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe and inclusive for all users, including families, disabled people and the elderly. Also, external spaces (such as highways, parking areas, gardens and areas of open space) should be designed to facilitate safe use by future residents, service providers or visitors, according to their intended function. The supporting text explains that: “Proposals will need to take account of the health and well-being of future residents, workers and visitors, and will need to take an inclusive approach to design that will allow everyone to benefit.”

10.5.7 Policy I3 (Transport) supports development proposals that provide ‘safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users’ and provide an on-site movement layout compatible for all potential users. The supporting text explains that: “New development must… demonstrate that it will not have a severe residual impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to either the local or strategic highway networks. It should also provide a safe and secure on-site movement layout that minimises conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, whilst taking into account the needs of people with disabilities…”

10.5.8 Policy NBE12 (Pollution) sets out that development will only be supported provided that it “does not give rise to, or would be subject to, unacceptable levels of pollution; and is satisfactorily demonstrated that any adverse impacts of pollution, either arising from the proposed development or impacting on proposed sensitive development or the natural environment will be adequately mitigated or otherwise minimised to an acceptable level.”

10.5.9 Also of relevance are the housing policies, which seek to ensure mixed and inclusive communities and ensure that specialist housing needs are met, notably -

• Policy H1 (Housing Mix) requires that “at least 15% of new homes are accessible and adaptable homes as defined by requirement M4(2) of the building regulations; [and] that provision is made for specialist/supported accommodation where appropriate.” Along with Policy H4, this is a key policy for meeting the accommodation needs of older persons / the ageing population.

• Policy H2 (Affordable Housing) includes provision, where evidenced by local need, for a proportion of affordable dwellings to be built as wheelchair user dwellings. This is in addition to the requirement that 15% of affordable homes meet requirement M4(2) of the building regulations

• Policy H4: (Specialist and supported accommodation) is the other key policy for meeting the accommodation needs of older persons / the ageing population. It supports new schemes: on sites within settlement boundaries; and on suitable sites in the countryside provided there is a demonstrated need and there are no available or viable alternatives within settlement boundaries.
Policy H5 (Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) requires that: “Existing permanent authorised gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites will be retained for the use of these groups unless acceptable replacement accommodation can be provided or it has been established that the sites are no longer required.” The policy also contains criteria against which the suitability of new sites (or site extensions) can be assessed should a need arise over the plan period.

Finally, it is noted that there are no policy measures to prevent / manage the proliferation of hot food takeaways (use class A5). Indeed, supporting text explains that a need for hot food takeaways floorspace is identified within Hook and Yateley. In this respect, it is noted that Hampshire Count Council Health and Wellbeing stated the following through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation: “We are concerned that a need for more hot food takeaways is mentioned on several occasions in the Local Plan. Recent UK based research has found that proliferation of fast-food outlets has a detrimental impact on young people’s dietary behaviour and obesity levels. Another large-scale UK study looking at fast food in three locations (neighbourhoods, commuting and near work) found that the density of outlets correlated with increased fast food consumption and exposure to multiple outlets during the day was strongly associated with higher BMI and risk of obesity.” It is anticipated that this matter can be revisited through the Development Management DPD, which will following the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites.

Appraisal of the plan as a whole

The proposal to allocate a new community at Hartland Park potentially gives rise to certain environmental health, and safety considerations, reflecting the fact that this is something of an unusual site (past industrial uses, surrounded by woodland and MOD land). However, detailed work has been undertaken to demonstrate that issues can be overcome, and a robust policy framework is proposed, such that concerns are alleviated. Of particular note are policies NBE10 (Design), I3 (Transport) and NBE12 (pollution). The plan broadly performs well, although significant positive effects are not predicted.

Employment and the economy

Commentary on the spatial strategy

The Joint Employment Land Review (2016) assessed the requirement for future employment land, having first accounted for the quality and quantity of employment sites across the Functional Economic Area (FEA, which covers Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath). The ELR concluded that there is sufficient employment land in total quantitative terms to meet needs for the FEA over the plan period, although supply is ‘tight’ for industrial and warehousing uses. There is inherently some uncertainty associated with ELR studies, and it is noted that Greater London Authority (GLA) did respond to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation seeking ‘to understand better’ Hart’s ambitions in respect of meeting needs for “industry/ warehousing/ freight/ logistics” (presumably given a likelihood of unmet needs arising); however, it is nonetheless appropriate to plan in accordance with the ELR recommendation. As such, the proposal not to allocate significant new employment land does not give rise to major concerns.

N.B. it should be noted that the ELR calculations assumed non-implementation of the permission for a logistics park (i.e. primarily warehousing) Hartland Park in light of the move towards a residential scheme on that site. An employment scheme has not proved deliverable to date - i.e. since permission was granted in 2009 - and there is little reason to suggest that it would be taken-up any time in the near future.
10.6.2 Furthermore, comfort is provided by the proposal to plan for a **new settlement** (Policy SS3), which should lead to new employment land being provided at some point during the Plan period. It is not clear what form this would take, although it is noted that past proposals have involved an extension to Murrell Green Business Park, and employment floorspace as part of a mixed use local centre close to Winchfield Station. Proposals of this nature might be supported, in light of the following ELR findings –

- “Consider the identification of additional employment land, particularly for industrial and warehousing uses, given the relatively tight supply of such land, and the need to provide opportunities for choice.”

- “There appears to be strong demand from small flexible businesses / light industrial premises to support rural enterprises and SMEs. The types of premises vary significantly from basic converted agricultural barns providing storage/workshop space, to purpose-built light industrial / storage units, such as those at Murrell Green Business Park located on the A30 between Hook and Hartley Witney. Occupancy rates at such accommodation are high demonstrating that there is demand for such accommodation.”

- “It is also important that the FEA [Functional Economic Area] provides a range of affordable floorspace for small high growth start-up businesses, by… [seeking to resist the loss of premises that provide suitable accommodation for SMEs… [and seeking] to provide smaller units within larger employment sites, residential or mixed-use schemes that come forward.”

10.6.3 Also, residents of a new settlement centred on Winchfield station would be able to commute by train to Fleet and Hook (where there is a significant employment cluster at the town’s southeastern extent, potentially within walking distance of a new settlement); as well as to employment centres further afield, e.g. Farnborough and Basingstoke.

10.6.4 However, some concerns have been raised (e.g. Hook Parish Council) regarding the risk that retail at a new settlement would compete with Hook Centre, which is identified as being in need of investment. The amount of retail to be provided within the new settlement would be a matter for the DPD, taking into account these sorts of issues.

**Commentary on other policies**

10.6.5 **Policy ED2** (Safeguarding employment land and premises) confirms protection of the existing portfolio of employment land, and designates a number of sites as Strategic, or Local, Employment Sites, so that they might have appropriate protection against loss to non-employment uses. The safeguarded site at Eversley Storage includes some adjoining land to allow for expansion, adding to the supply of employment land.

10.6.6 **Policy ED3** (The Rural Economy) enables proposals for farm diversification, and the establishment of new business which support economic development in rural areas, where they meet a range of criteria and are “of a use and scale that is appropriate to the location”.

10.6.7 **Policy ED4** (Town District and Local Centres) sets out the intention to maintain and improve the existing hierarchy of town, district, and local centres, with a view to ensuring continued vitality and function. The proposal is to assess and proposals for change of use in light of the scale, function and character of the centre in question. The supporting text also includes a notable reference to supporting proposals that would deliver ‘regeneration’.

10.6.8 **Policy ED5** (Fleet Town Centre) states that: “Development proposals will be permitted that maintains or enhances the vitality and viability of Fleet Town Centre and which contribute to its continued enhancement as the main town centre in Hart.” In this context, the policy aims to permit development within the Primary Shopping Area which a) does not harm the retail character of the centre, b) complements the shopping function of the centre, and c) has no significant adverse impact on the surrounding amenity, including noise, odour, waste collection, highways and parking.
10.6.9 **Policy ED6** (District and Local Centres) further supports Policy ED4 through supporting proposals requesting change of use and new uses subject to these proposals meeting the following criteria: a) “the proposal would maintain or enhance the centre’s vitality or viability; b) The proposal is for a main town centre use, which retains an active frontage; and c) The proposal has no unacceptable impact upon local amenity and the historic environment.”

10.6.10 **Policy NBE1** (Development in the Countryside) lists criteria that must be met in order for development in the open countryside – i.e. development outside of settlement boundaries – to be deemed acceptable. The policy reflects an understanding that certain development can benefit the countryside and the people that live and work there. The emphasis is therefore to allow development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that a countryside location is necessary, with inappropriate types and scales of development not permitted. The policy also reflects an understanding that there are a number of facilities in the countryside such as educational and training institutions, Ministry of Defence facilities, and Blackbushe Airport, where there could be a need for new development for operational reasons.

**Appraisal of the plan as a whole**

10.6.11 The emphasis is on protecting existing employment sites, encouraging their optimum use, and also facilitating the rural economy. This approach is broadly in accordance with the findings of the 2016 ELR, albeit supply of industrial and warehousing land will be ‘tight’. Comfort is provided by the proposal to deliver a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield Area in the long term, given the potential to deliver significant new employment land.

10.6.12 The proposed policy framework is also supported, given a clear focus on protecting existing employment sites from change of use (with sites of strategic importance given greatest protection), and also maintaining the existing hierarchy of town, district and local centre. **Policy NBE1** (Development in the Countryside) is also supported, given the importance of maintaining of new development, and changes of use, to supporting a vibrant rural economy.

10.6.13 In conclusion, effects are somewhat mixed, with **significant effects not predicted**. There may be a need to monitor the employment land supply/demand position, particularly in respect of warehousing and industrial uses.

10.7 **Flood risk and other climate change adaptation issues**

| SA12 | Reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impacts of climate change; SA13 Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy. |

**Commentary on the spatial strategy**

10.7.1 The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) identifies a range of flood risk related issues / constraints across the district. Fluvial flood risk is the main issue with a bearing on site selection / spatial strategy, although there is also a need to consider surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk (a particular issue in parts of Hart, given the local geology).

10.7.2 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of new community at **Hartland Park**, which is a largely unconstrained site, from a flood risk perspective. Most the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk of flooding). A very small portion of the site falls in to Flood Zone 2 and 3; however, this does not extend into the developable area and, as such, a Sequential Test is not required in support of the application. This approach is supported by Hampshire County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority.

10.7.3 With regards to **site specific policy**, the **supporting text** to Policy SS2 refers to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment that takes account of surface and groundwater flood risk, in addition to fluvial flood risk. The text also explains that surface water run-off from the site contributes to flooding in Rushmoor Borough, so it is important that this is reduced through the use of sustainable drainage systems, with opportunities to reduce the amount of hardstanding on site below existing levels realised if possible.
10.7.4 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a **new settlement** in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a separate DPD, there are some flood risk constraints (fluvial, surface water and groundwater); however, there is confidence in the ability to masterplan a new settlement that avoids these constraints.

**Commentary on other policies**

10.7.5 **Policy NBE6** (Managing Flood Risk) establishes that development will be permitted where "over its lifetime it would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and will be safe". The policy also requires that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) are used in major developments unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. The policy establishes the need to consider flood risk from all sources, with specific reference made to ensuring the integrity of reservoir and canal embankments. There is also policy reference to ‘reducing the causes and impacts of flooding’ within the Causal Areas identified by the SFRA.

10.7.6 **Policy I7** (Phoenix Green Flood Alleviation) supports a flood alleviation scheme for Phoenix Green, in order to improve the standard of protection to residential and commercial properties from a major surface water flood event. Specifically, the scheme is looking to reduce surface water and ordinary watercourse flooding to 80 properties. This is likely to be achieved through a combination of upstream storage and property level protection. The project is currently in its developmental stage but is anticipated to be in place by the end of financial year 2021/2022. The Environment Agency responded to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation stating -

> "The culverted watercourses in Hartley Wintney are the main cause of flooding. Opportunities should be explored for the de-culverting of these watercourses. This would provide flood defence and biodiversity benefits. The Phoenix Green Flood Alleviation should also form part of the Green and Blue Infrastructure of the District. Natural Flood Management techniques should be used to deliver the scheme to offer a sustainable and resilient solution."

**Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole**

10.7.7 The proposed spatial strategy performs well, with the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park supported, given that this site is largely unconstrained in respect of flood risk. The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate DPD, gives rise some concerns, given there are some flood risk constraints; however, there is confidence in the ability to masterplan a new settlement that avoids, or addresses, these constraints. In conclusion, the plan performs well, although **significant positive effects are not predicted**.

10.8 **Historic environment**

SA7 Protect and enhance the District's **historic environment**.

**Commentary on the spatial strategy**

10.8.1 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of a new community at **Hartland Park**, which is a largely unconstrained site, from a historic environment perspective. The historic environment was ‘scoped out’ as an issue, as part of a recent Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) completed in support of a planning application on the site. Archaeological interest is the main consideration, although in this respect work undertaken in support of the planning application serves to suggest only ‘low to moderate’ potential for archaeological remains. The proposed site specific policy (SS2) does not reference the historic environment.

10.8.2 With regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a **new settlement** in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a separate DPD, there are a range of notable heritage constraints given listed buildings and a conservation area; and, more generally, a rural landscape with historic character. See Appendix III for a detailed discussion. In light of these constraints, proposed Policy SS3 requires: "A layout and form of development that respects the landscape character as well as the character, significance and setting of heritage assets within and adjoining the site".
Commentary on other policies

10.8.3 **Policy NBE9** (Historic Environment) sets out criteria to be met by development proposals, in order to “protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings, taking account of their significance, as well as the distinctive character of the district’s townscapes and landscapes.” The supporting text goes on to explain that:

“The Council will seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment through a range of measures:

a) Determining planning applications for proposals that affect heritage assets in accordance with national and local policies…

b) Designating Conservation Areas and preparing and reviewing Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans;

c) Introducing and reviewing Article 4 Directions within Conservation Areas where necessary…

d) Monitoring buildings or other heritage assets which are at risk and seeking to bring them back into appropriate condition and use…

e) Maintaining a ‘local list’ of heritage assets and seeking to achieve their conservation and enhancement.”

10.8.4 The reference (albeit only within supporting text) to heritage at risk is notable, given the following response received from Historic England to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation -

“Accordingly, as currently drafted, we do not consider that the Local Plan sets out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of, or a clear strategy for enhancing, the historic environment. However, if the changes we have suggested are made, including the addition of a paragraph or paragraphs explaining how the Council will address the issue of heritage assets at risk, we would consider that the Plan satisfies these requirements.”

10.8.5 **Policy NBE10** (Design) states that all developments should seek to achieve a high quality design and contribute positively to the overall appearance of the local area. In this regard policy NBE10 requires that development meets a number of criteria of particular note for the historic environment is the requirement for development “protects or enhances surrounding heritage assets, including their settings”.

10.8.6 **Policy ED3** (The Rural Economy) supports development proposals for economic uses in the countryside. However, notably, it includes a requirement for development to be of a use and scale which is appropriate for the site when considering landscape, heritage and environmental impacts. This should go some way to ensuring that the historic environment is not disproportionately impacted on by such development.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

10.8.7 The proposed spatial strategy performs well, with the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park supported, given that this site is largely unconstrained in respect of heritage.

10.8.8 The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate Development Plan, gives rise to some issues/concerns, given some notable constraints (listed buildings and a conservation area, and more generally a rural landscape with historic character); however, there is confidence in the ability to masterplan a new settlement that avoids/mitigates impacts. A robust development management policy framework is proposed which should help to ensure that this is the case.

10.8.9 In conclusion, the Proposed Submission Plan performs well, although **significant positive effects are not predicted.**
### 10.9 Housing

**SA1** Provide all residents with the opportunity to live in a decent **home** which meets their needs.

**Commentary on the spatial strategy**

10.9.1 The proposed spatial strategy involves the allocation of a new settlement at Hartland Park (only), leading to a total land supply with the potential to deliver 6,346 homes over the plan period (397 dpa). This figure is **36% above local housing needs** (i.e. 36% above the indicative 292 dpa figure set out by the Government in September 2017; see Table 6.1). This contingency, or buffer, is pragmatic, given a potential scenario whereby the Government’s local housing needs figure for Hart increases. A contingency, or ‘buffer’, can also be appropriate, given the risk of one or more sites not delivering as anticipated. Were all sites to deliver as anticipated, the outcome could be significantly more homes delivered in the District than are strictly needed; however, the outcome under such a scenario would be that affordable housing needs are more fully met locally (an important consideration, given the extent of affordable housing needs that exist, see Section 6.2). Furthermore, under such a scenario, land supply could possibly be made available to address unmet needs from elsewhere which, whilst not currently anticipated, cannot be ruled out.  

10.9.2 Another consideration is the need to deliver the housing target over the plan period, and maintain a robust ‘housing trajectory’, i.e. maintain a situation whereby there is a five year supply of deliverable sites. This is important, as in the absence of a five year land supply the housing policies of the Local Plan would be considered ‘out of date’ leading to a situation whereby there is a likelihood of planning applicants winning planning permission at appeal, in accordance with the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’, as defined by the NPPF. The result would mean a distribution of development that is not ‘plan led’, which could in turn mean that certain areas of the District do not receive sufficient new housing (and that other areas receive more than can be sustainably accommodated). In this respect, the proposal to allocate only one large brownfield site (Hartland Park) rather than a package of smaller greenfield sites has a degree of risk attached. This is on the basis that new settlements and brownfield developments can be subject to a considerable lead-in time, as infrastructure upgrades are completed and measures put in place to address constraints. However, this single allocation needs to be seen in the context of the array of other sites all around the District with planning permission, which will contribute to supply over the plan period, including a number of large, greenfield urban extensions at the main settlements of Fleet/Church Crookham, Yateley and Hook.

10.9.3 With regards to **site specific policy**, the Hartland Park supporting text includes sections dealing with ‘housing mix’ (with specific reference to older persons housing) and ‘affordable housing’. In light of what has been agreed through the planning application process, the supporting text to the policy states: “We will seek to achieve the maximum level of affordable housing provision in accordance with Policy H2, but this should not be less than 20%. Each phase of the development will be subject to review.” This approach reflects the challenges around viability on this site, with the requirement having evolved since the 2017 Draft Plan stage. The term ‘not less than’ is important, in that it provides certainty.

---

31 Surrey Heath’s position is that they may have a shortfall in housing provision, but this has not been agreed with Hart and Rushmoor. It is also the case that under the indicative government figures, Rushmoor’s planned housing provision - as understood from the proposed submission version of the Rushmoor Local Plan (June 2017) - would result in a large surplus of supply which would far exceed the potential shortfall that Surrey Heath currently refer to.
Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a separate DPD, this is supported, recognising that: 1) there is always a risk that local housing need for Hart will be revised upwards; 2) there will continue to be a need to build significant numbers of new homes beyond 2032; 3) there is a risk that at some point, under the duty to cooperate, Hart may need to provide for unmet housing needs from elsewhere within the Housing Market Area (which comprises Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath), and 4) there will be excellent potential to deliver a good housing mix, including specialist accommodation, self/custom build plots and a high proportion of affordable housing. In this respect, it is noted that proposed Policy sets an aim that the development will include specialist accommodation for the elderly.

Commentary on other policies

**Policy H1** (Housing Mix) seeks to ensure a mixed and balanced community, through requiring the provision of homes for one-person households, couples, families and older persons. The policy enables the Council to adopt a flexible approach when assessing development proposals, as an appropriate housing mix for an individual development site will depend on site-specific factors, such as its location and the local density and built character.

**Policy H2** (Affordable Housing) requires that developments resulting in 11 or more dwellings (gross), or of greater than 1,000 square metres gross residential floor space, provide a minimum of 40% affordable housing, subject to viability. Only in exceptional circumstances, where it is clearly demonstrated that it is not possible to deliver all the affordable housing on site, will the Council accept off-site provision, or a financial contribution of equivalent value in lieu of on-site provision. This approach is in accordance with the evidence provided by the Council’s Housing Register and SHMA, which serves to demonstrate a high level of need for affordable housing within the District. The proposed approach is also in accordance with a Whole Plan and CIL Viability Report (2016).

**Policy H3** (Rural Exception Sites) supports rural exception sites in the villages and other small settlements where there is a proven local need for affordable housing. The supporting text states that the policy “will seek to meet local affordable housing needs in rural areas by encouraging affordable housing schemes that meet a local need on suitable sites outside settlement boundaries.” Importantly, the policy states: “An element of market housing will be supported where at least 70% of the total number of proposed dwellings would be affordable housing solely for subsidised rent.” This statement is important, in respect of improving the viability and hence deliverability of Rural Exception Sites.

**Policy H4** (Specialist and supported accommodation) supports specialist housing proposals, whether these fall into Use Class C2 (residential institutions) or C3 (dwelling house). The supporting text notes that: “Over the plan period there is likely to be a very substantial increase in the number of older people residing within the District. The projected increase for the number of people aged 75+ years is relatively large, compared to the South East as a whole or to the national average. As people age, there is likely to be an increased requirement for specially-adapted housing and care accommodation, to address their health-related problems [e.g. dementia and mobility problems].” Although many of these residents will be older persons, there will also be adults with disabilities of working age who require specialist housing to meet their care needs.

---

32 In applying this policy the Council will use the latest government definition of affordable housing. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Council at an early stage for advice on affordable housing mix requirements.
Specialist housing needs are also reflected in the requirements set out in Policy H1 and H2; in particular both policies require that at least 15% of the affordable units will be accessible and adaptable as defined by requirement M4(2) of the Building Regulations; and Policy H2 requires "where evidenced by local need, a proportion of affordable dwellings will be built as wheelchair user dwellings to meet the requirements of Building Regulations M4(3)". In this respect, it is noted that Hampshire County Council Health and Wellbeing notably commented, through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, that: "The section on specialist accommodation mentions the move towards extra care housing. However, we would also emphasise here the importance of Lifetime Homes or Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. We note the requirements at… Hartland Village to have between 5-10% of housing built to these standards and that 5% is an optional standard across the borough but we recommend higher thresholds throughout in order to prepare for the older population."

Policy H5 (Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) supports planning applications for new sites where certain criteria are met. Criteria are not overly restrictive, recognising that there is a need to maintain a five year supply of deliverable land for the travelling community, in the same way as there is for general housing. Having said this, the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) has served to establish that there is currently a surplus of pitches / plots, and hence no need for a land supply.

Policy NBE1 (Development in the Countryside) lists criteria that must be met in order for development in the open countryside – i.e. development outside of settlement boundaries – to be deemed acceptable. The policy reflects an understanding that some development can take place which is beneficial to the countryside and the people that live and work there. It is important to deliver a wide choice of homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community including planning for affordable homes in rural areas. The emphasis is therefore to allow development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that a countryside location is necessary, with inappropriate types and scales of development not permitted.

Policies ED4 – ED7 deal with town, district and local centres, setting out to reinforce the existing retail hierarchy, ensuring that centres complement each other. Within the defined centres, developments for retail and community uses will be encouraged where they are appropriate to the scale, function and character of the centre. Measures are proposed to restrict proposals for retail and community uses that are not in the centres defined, and to restrict proposals for non-retail / community uses (e.g. residential uses).

Appraisal of the plan as a whole

The plan will lead to significant positive effects, in light of the proposal to provide for local housing need (as currently understood), and indeed potentially provide for a quantum of homes above local housing need. The proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park is potentially associated with a degree of risk, given that it is a large brownfield site that could prove challenging to deliver, with implications for the number of affordable homes that can be delivered, and potentially also the timing of delivery. However, the planning application indicates that the vast majority of the site will be delivered within the Plan period. Furthermore this single allocation needs to be seen in the context of the array of other sites all around the District with planning permission, and which will contribute to supply over the plan period.

Finally, there is strong support for the proposal to plan for a new settlement in the long term, and there is also strong support for the proposed framework of development management policies, which should serve to ensure that the full range of housing needs are met. The policy on rural exception sites helps to alleviate concerns regarding the lack of any proposed allocations within the rural area, and the policy on specialist accommodation helps to alleviate concerns regarding the removal of the Cross Farm site, which was included in the 2017 Draft Plan.
10.10 Land and other resources

SA11 Maintain and improve soil quality; SA15 Promote the efficient use of land through the appropriate re-use of previously developed land; SA16 Improve the efficiency of resource use and achieve sustainable resource management.

Commentary on the spatial strategy

10.10.1 There is a need to avoid loss of higher quality ('best and most versatile') agricultural land. In this respect, all undeveloped land in Hart is either Grade 2 (very good quality), Grade 3 (good to moderate quality) or Grade 4 (moderate quality) in the Agricultural Land Classification, according to the nationally available 'Provisional Agricultural Land Quality' dataset. The dataset shows there to be three patches of Grade 2 agricultural land, in the south of the District.

10.10.2 However, the national data-set is of very low resolution, which means that it is difficult to apply it to the appraisal of individual sites. The other available dataset - known as the ‘Post 1988’ dataset - is an accurate reflection of agricultural land quality, on the basis that the methodology involves field surveys; however, the data-set is very patchy, with data only being available for a small proportion of the District.

Policy SS1 makes provision for development of a new community at Hartland Park, which is a brownfield site, and hence strongly supported from a 'Land and resources' perspective. HCC as Minerals & Waste Planning Authority, made the following comments in relation to Hartland Park through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation -

“A large area of this 54 ha site is within the minerals and waste consultation area (MWCA) sand and gravel (superficial) layer. Should the decision be made to progress this site for development, Hampshire County Council, as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority would need to be consulted at the application stage. It would be expected that a mineral assessment is conducted and opportunities for mineral extraction as part of the preparation for the development are considered and maximised.”

10.10.3 With regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a separate DPD, this is tentatively supported, recognising that the national data-set shows there to be a concentration of Grade 4 land in Winchfield area, broadly associated with the centre of the site (where there is a high density of woodland, potentially indicative of poorer soils). However, the dataset shows the majority of land to the east and west, namely that land that is currently mainly in agricultural use, to be Grade 3. Also, the detailed ‘Post 1988’ dataset potentially serves to indicate that agricultural land may be higher quality than is indicated by the nationally available, low resolution dataset. Specifically: the western part of the area, around Totters Farm (west of the Brenda Parker Way) is largely Grade 2 (with the remaining land Grade 3a, i.e. also BMV). The only other land that has been surveyed is a relatively small parcel directly north of Winchfield station, found to comprise Grade 3a.

N.B. Another consideration is that the eastern part of the Winchfield area falls within a sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area (this is primarily land at risk of flooding, the use for which would need to be considered through the preparation of the DPD).

Commentary on other policies

10.10.4 Policy NBE1 (Development in the Countryside) supports development of previously developed land where possible.
10.10.5 Waste management is addressed by **Policy NBE10 (Design)** and **Policy I3 (Transport)**. The former requires consideration of the future maintenance and servicing requirements of buildings, including the storage and collection of waste and recycling; whilst the latter requires appropriate waste and recycling storage areas and accessible collection points for refuse vehicles. In this respect, it is noted that Hampshire County Council responded to the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, stating -

“The draft Local Plan also frequently references the need for appropriate waste facilities to be provided within the infrastructure of the proposed development sites. Again, this is something that HCC would strongly support as large new housing developments would present demanding waste management needs, on the site itself and at waste facilities handling the waste. Therefore, HCC would be keen to see support for waste management plans within the overall development plan.”

10.10.6 The plan will lead to **significant positive effects**, in light of the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park. The proposal to plan strategically for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield Area is also supported, as this will enable time for detailed agricultural land surveys to be completed, and considered as a key element of the evidence-base; however, it seems likely that significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land will be inevitable.

10.11 **Landscape**

SA9 Protect and enhance the District’s **countryside** and rural landscape.

**Commentary on the spatial strategy**

10.11.1 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of new community at **Hartland Park**, which is broadly supported as a brownfield site that is well screened by woodland and has planning permission for warehouses and other large scale employment buildings. However, the site is associated with notable landscape sensitivities, given its location within the Fleet/Farnborough settlement gap. In particular, there is a concern that the scheme is relatively high density, in the Fleet context (albeit not so in the Farnborough context) and that a new community could impact on the openness of the Strategic Gap through ‘obtrusive light’. With regards to density, the separation of the site from existing settlements provides scope for higher density; however, on the other hand, there is a need to limit the impact on the gap by considering the height and location of buildings, and an having an appropriate landscaping strategy. With regards to light pollution, whilst it is accepted that there will be an increase relative to the current baseline situation, there is a need to bear in mind that past industrial uses were a major source of light pollution, and that the current permitted employment scheme would also be a source of light pollution (albeit one that could be strictly controlled). Furthermore, there are numerous technical measures that can be implemented to minimise light pollution.

10.11.2 With regards to site specific policy, the proposal is that development must be “**well designed**” and include “**appropriate landscaping**” recognising its location within the Gap. There is also a specific reference to addressing “**the treatment of the site’s boundaries with regards to… the achievement of good design.**” The supporting text goes on to discuss the Gap, referencing the importance of landscaping, careful siting of tall buildings and “**the impact of lighting**”.

10.11.3 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a **new settlement** in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a separate DPD, this is not an area that stands out as relatively constrained, in the Hart context, on the basis of the evidence provided by the Hart Landscape Capacity Study (2016); however, there are nonetheless clear landscape sensitivities. In short, it is fair to say that there is good landscape capacity in the centre of the area, given urbanising influences (most notably the railway and M3) and extensive woodland, but that there are sensitivities within the area of search that will need to be considered through the DPD process. See Appendix III for further detailed discussion.
Commentary on other policies

10.11.4 **Policy NBE3** (Landscape) seeks to ensure that development respects and, where possible, enhances “the special characteristics, value or visual amenity of the District’s landscapes”. Any new development should be in keeping with the character of the local landscape in terms of its location, siting and design. The supporting text helpfully explains that: “Smaller, individual features can combine to establish character and identity. These elements, such as trees, hedgerows and watercourses often provide recognisable boundaries to settlements which help to establish an identity of an area. These features should be protected as their loss, either individually or cumulatively, could have a potential impact…”

10.11.5 **Policy NBE2** (Gaps Between Settlements) aims to ensure the protection of 13 key gaps between settlements, with a view to minimising the loss of countryside that plays an important role in defining the character of Hart District. The policy states that “Development in Gaps will only be permitted where it does not lead to the physical or visual coalescence of settlements, either individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed developments.” Although the primary purpose of this policy is to protect the separate character and identity of settlements by preventing the coalescence, it will be likely to have beneficial effects in terms of providing certainty in respect of planning for green infrastructure. It should be noted, however, that the policy also states: “In some circumstances limited development may be acceptable, for example where the proposal is of a rural character, e.g. agricultural buildings…”

10.11.6 **Policy NBE1** (Development in the Countryside) lists criteria that must be met in order for development in the open countryside – i.e. development outside of settlement boundaries – to be deemed acceptable. The policy reflects an understanding that some development can take place which is beneficial to the countryside and the people that live and work there. The emphasis is on allowing development where it can be demonstrated that a countryside location is both necessary and justified. Inappropriate types and scales of development will not be permitted.

10.11.7 The supporting text to **Policy NBE9** (Historic Environment) identifies a need to take into account the Hampshire Historic Landscape Assessment, where appropriate, and also references “historic landscapes [including] Eversley Forest”.

10.11.8 **Policy NBE10** (Design) states that: “All developments should seek to achieve a high quality design and positively contribute to the overall appearance of the local area. Development will be permitted where it… promotes, reflects and incorporates the distinctive qualities of its surroundings in terms of the proposed scale, density, mass and height of development, and choice of building materials.”

10.11.9 **Policy NBE11** (Renewable and low carbon energy) states that: “Proposals for the generation of energy from renewable resources, or low carbon energy development (with the exception of wind turbines) will be supported providing that any adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily including individual and cumulative landscape and visual impacts.” The policy then goes on to list the main issues that are likely to be relevant when balancing the merits of any proposals for renewable and low carbon energy generation against any adverse impacts.

**Appraisal of the plan as a whole**

10.11.10 The proposed spatial strategy performs well, with the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park supported, given that this is a brownfield site (albeit nonetheless a site with landscape sensitivities to be addressed through future detailed planning applications).

10.11.11 The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate DPD, gives rise to some landscape issues/concerns; however, there is confidence in the ability to masterplan a new settlement that avoids/mitigates these constraints. A robust development management policy framework is proposed which should help to ensure that this is the case.

10.11.12 In conclusion, the plan performs well, but **significant positive effects are not predicted.**
10.12 **Transport**

SA17 Improve **accessibility** to all services and facilities; SA18 Improve efficiency of **transport** networks by enhancing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and promoting policies which reduce the need to travel.

10.12.1 Policy SS1 makes provision for development of a new community at **Hartland Park**, which is broadly supported, recognising proposals that are in place in respect of upgrading walking, cycling and bus links, and also given relatively good proximity to services, facilities and employment in Fleet and Farnborough (including the adjacent Technology Park), and also Fleet Station. However, it is naturally the case that movement is somewhat constrained by surrounding land uses, notably movements directly west towards Fleet - see **Figure 10.2**.

*Figure 10.2: Indicative car trip destinations from Hartland Park*

10.12.2 Extensive discussions and modelling works have been undertaken between Hampshire County Council (the local Highway Authority) and the applicant to demonstrate that the proposals can mitigate its impact upon the local highway network. On the basis of an agreed package of new works/contributions totalling £7.17m Hampshire County Council has confirmed that the development would be appropriately mitigated. Measures include -

- a new lit footway/cycleway on Norris Hill Road to allow better connectivity between the south of the development and Fleet and a safe route to the nearest secondary school;
- contributions towards improvements to the Windy Gap junction;
- replacement of the roundabout at the site’s northern entrance with a signalised junction;
- alterations to the roundabouts at the northerly point of Kennels Lane at the junction with Bramshot Lane to incorporate a signalised junction to improve traffic flow (giving priority to Summit Avenue traffic and helping to limit potential “rat-running”);
- extension of the third lane of the A327 between the roundabout with Fleet Road and the signalised junction on the northern side of the railway line to reduce congestion during peak hours leaving Fleet to access junction 4a of the M3;
- a contribution towards public transport which will either be used to subsidise the existing bus route 10 or for the provision of a shuttle bus to Farnborough and Fleet stations; and
- proportionate contributions towards development related traffic issues within Farnborough Town centre.

---

**33 Sourced from the Design and Access Statement submitted in support of the current planning application (17/00471/OUT)**
10.12.3 These agreed measures are encouraging, and demonstrate what can be achieved through allocation of strategic sites. However, there is perhaps also a need to consider capacity issues at M3 Junction 4a itself. The Hampshire Infrastructure Statement (2017) identifies necessary upgrades to M3 Junction 4a to be the most costly strategic infrastructure upgrade facing Hart District, with a cost of £5m. As of April 2017, the suggestion was that nil funding had been secured, but there was an expectation that significant funding would be made available through development of Hartland Park.

10.12.4 With regards to site specific policy, the proposal is to require applicants to: “Provide mitigation for impacts on the local highway network, footpaths and cycleways (including the Basingstoke Canal) and promote sustainable transport. This will include measures to connect the site with Fleet, Fleet Station and Farnborough by sustainable transport modes.”

10.12.5 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area through a subsequent Development Plan, there is considerable uncertainty at this stage, and a number of important considerations, including in relation to: self-containment, a potential need for a ‘polycentric’ layout, rail services / capacity, and traffic (on the strategic road network, within Hook, through Odiham Common SSSI and along rural roads). See Appendix III for further detailed discussion.

Commentary on other policies

10.12.6 Policy I3 (Transport) states that: “Development should offer maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes, including walking and cycling, improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future”. The policy establishes a number of criteria that must be met, for development to be permitted, and the supporting text explains: “Development proposals that generate significant amounts of movement must be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and will be required to provide a robust Travel Plan.”

10.12.7 Policy I1 (Infrastructure) states that: “All development that requires planning permission must make appropriate provision for infrastructure, on and off-site, or through financial contributions to off-site provision.” And that “Planning obligations secured through Section 106 agreements will be used to provide necessary site related infrastructure requirements such as new access arrangements, provision of open space and other community infrastructure, local highway/transportation mitigation and environmental enhancements”. Necessary off-site infrastructure will continue to be secured through Planning Obligations and, once adopted, according to the Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule to ensure that all such development makes an appropriate and reasonable contribution to the costs of provision.

10.12.8 Policy NBE10 (Design) states that development will be permitted where it “provides or positively contributes to public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe and inclusive for all users… [and] enhances permeability by facilitating access by walking or cycling modes”. Also, developments should include “sufficient well-designed facilities/areas for parking (including bicycle storage) taking account of the need for good access for all users.”

Appraisal of the plan as a whole

10.12.9 The proposed spatial strategy performs well, with the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park supported, given that this site is relatively well located from a transport perspective, and there is the potential to deliver significant upgrades to transport infrastructure.

10.12.10 The commitment to planning for a new settlement, through preparation of a separate DPD, gives rise to some transport issues/concerns; which will require further detailed examination. A robust development management policy framework is proposed which should help to ensure that this is the case.

10.12.11 In conclusion, the plan performs well, but significant positive effects are not predicted.

**10.13 Water**

**SA10 Maintain and improve the water quality of rivers and groundwaters and other water bodies.**

**Commentary on the spatial strategy**

10.13.1 The published Water Cycle Study (WCS) has highlighted capacity issues at Eversley Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW) and at Camberley WwTW, in neighbouring Surrey Heath District. Upgrades ahead of housing growth could well be feasible, although it is noted that the capacity issue at Camberley WWTW is more significant, as the WwTW already requires upgrades just to accommodate committed growth in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Districts. **Hartland Park** is located in the catchment of the Camberley WwTW, although there may be potential to instead drain to Fleet WwTW. Also, there is a need to consider issues related to drainage and surface water run-off.

10.13.2 There are some sensitivities associated with Hartland Park, and on this basis the site specific policy establishes the need for the development to “reduce surface water run-off over existing levels through the use of sustainable drainage systems”. The supporting text goes on to state that: “holistic approach to flood risk and site drainage is required, whereby surface water overland flow routes are identified and integrated with the site’s green infrastructure and amenity provisions wherever feasible. A wide variety of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be employed across the site within SuDS treatment drains; maximising water quality, wildlife and amenity benefits. The drainage strategy must consider the on-going maintenance requirements of the drainage system proposed.” Also, the supporting text states identifies the need for developers to “work with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to ensure delivery of timely upgrades to infrastructure.” This latter requirement is important, given that Thames Water made the following comment, through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation: “We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically sewage treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan: “Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure.”

10.13.3 Finally, with regards to the proposal to bring forward an allocation for a new settlement in the Winchfield area through a subsequent DPD, a new settlement would either need to provide its own WwTW, or transfer wastewater to Fleet via new/improved infrastructure. For developers, the former may prove to be a preferable option, although there will be cost implications under either option; and there is also a need to explore the potential environmental impacts carefully (working with the Environment Agency), given that the rivers Whitewater and Hart in this area have relatively low flow, i.e. a level of flow that may not be suited to receiving discharges from a WWTW. The WCS only considers growth options associated with a new settlement within the Murrell Green/Winchfield area of search, but the quantum of development in the catchment area for Fleet WwTW is likely to be very similar under an alternative scenario involving a new settlement centred further east.

**Commentary on other policies**

10.13.4 **Policy NBE6** (Managing Flood Risk) requires Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) as part of “major developments unless demonstrated to be inappropriate”.

---
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10.13.5 **Policy NEB7** (Water Quality) states: “Development will be required to protect the quality of the District’s water environment, and where possible contribute towards improvements that are necessary to meet statutory requirements for water quality”. The policy also establishes a number of criteria that must be met, for development to be permitted, and the supporting text explains: “Contributions may be sought to upgrade existing water supply and drainage infrastructure, where this would be necessary to ensure that local water quality is not compromised and that statutory requirements are met. The WCS identifies that upgrades at relevant Waste Water Treatment Works are likely to be required during the plan period. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where they would help to manage the discharge of water into the environment and prevent existing infrastructure from becoming overloaded.

10.13.6 The policy does deal with the water quality of watercourses; however, there might be the potential to go further (if not in this local plan, through the subsequent Development Management DPD) noting the following comment received from the Environment Agency, through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation:

> “[Y]ou may wish to consider the inclusion of a separate policy for the protection and enhancement of river corridors and watercourses. Watercourses are important environmental assets and an undeveloped 8 metres buffer zone should be required on both sides of a main river to promote green and blue infrastructure links, water quality and human health (pleasant amenity space). The policy should make it clear to applicants how the Council will expect protection and enhancement of all watercourses, culverted or otherwise. This policy will reduce the likelihood that new developments next to main rivers will contribute to the deterioration of the ecological status of the waterbodies and where feasible will contribute to raising their status while providing a pleasant living environment with the associated positive social and health benefits.”

10.13.7 **Policy NBE8** (Sustainable Water Use) states that: “All new homes must meet the water efficiency standard of 110 litres/person/ day, to be achieved by compliance with the Building Regulations.” Water efficiency is important, particularly given future climate change projections. All new homes already have to meet the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations of 125 litres/person/day; however, in Hart there is justification to apply the tighter optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/person/day.

**Appraisal of the plan as a whole**

10.13.8 There is understood to be some capacity issues associated with Camberley Wastewater Treatment Works, and so it will be important to ensure that this does not have an unforeseen impact on delivery of the proposed Hartland Park allocation. In other respects, the proposed spatial strategy performs well, and a robust policy framework is proposed. In particular, it is noted that the Proposed Submission Plan responds to the Council’s WCS through Policy NBE8, which requires that a high standard of water efficiency is achieved by development.

10.13.9 In conclusion, one issue has been highlighted; however, **significant negative effects are not predicted** on the basis that developers will work with the Environment Agency and Thames Water to ensure delivery of timely infrastructure upgrades.
10.14 Conclusions

10.14.1 In conclusion, the appraisal has highlighted the likelihood of the Proposed Submission Plan resulting in significant positive effects in respect of ‘Housing’ objectives (due to local housing needs being provided for, and potentially exceeded with positive implications for affordable housing delivery) and ‘Land’ objectives (due to the decision to focus housing growth entirely on brownfield land), with no ‘significant negative effects’ predicted.

10.14.2 A range of other issues and impacts are also discussed, notably -

- **Accessibility** - the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park is broadly supported, given the potential to deliver (or fund) new community infrastructure; however, it is noted that the site is not of a sufficient size to deliver a new secondary school.

- **Biodiversity** - Hartland Park is a sensitive site, and hence there is a need to apply caution. Detailed measures are proposed to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts; however, the potential for additional measures to be in place can be envisaged.

- **Climate change mitigation** - whilst a concentration of growth is supported, there remains a need for further work to ensure that opportunities for delivering ambitious low carbon energy infrastructure (and energy efficiency measures) are fully realised.

- **Economy and employment** - the proposal not to allocate any new employment sites, despite the housing permission/allocation at Hartland Park is broadly in accordance with the findings of the ELR. Also, there is added comfort in the knowledge that there will be good potential to deliver new employment land in the future, as part of a new settlement in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area. It is also noted that a robust strategy is proposed in respect of safeguarding existing strategic and locally important sites.

- **Landscape and historic environment** - the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park, rather than allocate a package of smaller greenfield urban extension sites, is strongly supported; however, there are certain landscape sensitivities associated with Hartland Park.

- **Housing** - in addition to the ‘headline’ matter of providing for local housing need, there is also a need to consider the mix of housing sites provided for by the plan, and also the potential for the allocated sites to deliver affordable housing. In this respect, Hartland Park has a risk attached in that it may prove costly to deliver, with implications for the number of affordable homes that can be delivered, and potentially also the timing of delivery.

- **Transport** - the proposal to focus growth at Hartland Park is supported, given that this site is relatively well located from a transport perspective, and there is the potential to deliver upgrades to transport infrastructure; however, detailed investigations are ongoing.

- **Water** - there is some uncertainty regarding Wastewater Treatment Capacity to accommodate Hartland Park, which could feasibly have implications for phasing / delivery.

10.14.3 The appraisal is also strongly supportive of the decision to defer an allocation of land for a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield Area, i.e. the proposal to identify an area of search at the current time, and then undertake further work ahead of making a formal allocation through a separate DPD. This provides an excellent opportunity to ensure that issues are addressed (e.g. in respect of biodiversity, landscape, heritage, traffic and agricultural land quality) and opportunities fully realised (most notably in respect of secondary school delivery).

10.14.4 The Council, and the appointed Planning Inspector, can give consideration to these appraisal conclusions during the Examination. Similarly, consideration should be given to suggested specific changes to policy wording (highlighted as recommendations) covering -

- **Biodiversity** - including around the matter of monitoring ‘no net loss’ and ‘net gain’;

- **Design at Hartland Park** - the matter of the site’s boundaries, including implications for movement, might be more explicitly addressed through policy;

- **Housing mix at Hartland Park** - the Council might consider whether this is a policy priority that deserves the establishment of more stringent requirements.
Cumulative effects

10.14.5 Cumulative effects are considered here as those impacts that arise from the plan acting in combination with other reasonably foreseeable policy initiatives, plans, programmes and projects. These could include, for example, the local plans of neighbouring authorities. Sustainability impacts resulting from the Proposed Submission Plan in combination with other reasonably foreseeable policy initiatives etc. are detailed in the previous sections covering the appraisal of ‘the plan’; however, it is helpful to explicitly draw these out in a separate section. In particular, this provides an opportunity to highlight the often long-term and uncertain nature of these types of effects, the challenge in effectively avoiding/mitigating them and fully realising opportunities, and the consequent need for effective partnership work.

10.14.6 For the Hart Local Plan, the appraisal has included a focus on effects at several larger than local functional scales (i.e. scales at which other policy initiatives, plans, programmes and projects are ongoing) including the Hart / Rushmoor / Surrey Heath Housing Market Area (HMA) and the Functional Economic Area (FEA).

10.14.7 In respect of the former, the situation is understood - at the current time - to be one whereby Surrey Heath may have a shortfall of supply, even when measured against the new Government draft 'standardised methodology' indicative figure (which is lower than the OAHN figure calculated by the 2016 SHMA); however, this shortfall is likely to be more than made up for by Rushmoor providing for a supply of new homes well in excess of its new indicative local housing needs figure. In this context, the proposal for Hart to also provide for a quantum of homes well in excess of the new local housing needs figure leads to confidence that within the HMA as a whole local housing needs will be met. However, there remains a degree of uncertainty, with the Rushmoor Local Plan yet to be submitted for Examination, and the Surrey Heath Local Plan at an early stage of development.

10.14.8 In respect of the latter, the need for Local Plan allocations / interventions was considered by a Joint Employment Land Review (ELR; 2016), following an examination of need/demand (accounting for likely future changes, e.g. related to trends at the national and international level) and supply, before the conclusion was reached that there is not a clear need for the Hart Local Plan to make any employment land allocations. However, there is inherently some uncertainty, in respect of ELR forecasting, and it is noted that, subsequent to ELR, the Greater London Authority (GLA) wrote to the Council seeking 'to understand better' the proposed approach to employment land provision, particularly for logistics and warehousing (presumably given a potential future scenario needs are high, and London's supply limited).

10.14.9 Other important cumulative effects relate to the proposal to support delivery of a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area in the long term. For example, there is a need to consider how the new settlement will impact traffic, particularly on the A30 and M3; and the potential to deliver improved bus services along the A30 corridor is also a factor potentially with 'larger than local' implications.

10.14.10 Finally, there is a need to consider biodiversity matters, recognising the need to plan for biodiversity at 'landscape' scales, which will often cross administrative boundaries. The first point to note is that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process has included a particular focus on the matter of the Hart Local Plan impacting in combination with other local plans. In particular, the HRA Report includes a detailed discussion of how the Hart Local Plan will impact on the integrity of the Thames Basing Heaths SPA in combination with other Local Plans across Berkshire, Hampshire and Surrey. Secondly, it is noted that there will be a need to give careful future consideration to the Whitewater Valley - which may be affected by a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area - recognising the following statement received from Hampshire Wildlife Trust, through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation -

"The Local Plan should acknowledge that the waters across Hart District are at the head of the Loddon catchment – these headwaters feed the rivers and streams downstream, meaning that enhancements and protection across Hart District are not only of direct benefit, but also benefit the downstream waterbodies into which they flow. Equally any pollution of these waters or damage to their ecology is not only a loss to Hart, but may cause downstream impacts..."
PART 3: WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?
11 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 3)

11.1.1 The aim of this chapter is to explain next steps in the plan-making / SA process.

12 PLAN FINALISATION

12.1.1 Subsequent to publication stage, the main issues raised will be identified and summarised by the Council, who will then consider whether the plan can still be deemed to be ‘sound’. Assuming that this is the case, the plan (and the summary of representations received) will be submitted for Examination. At Examination a government appointed Planning Inspector will consider representations (in addition to the SA Report and other submitted evidence) before determining whether the plan is sound (or requires further modifications).

12.1.2 If found to be ‘sound’ the plan will be formally adopted by the Council. At the time of Adoption an ‘SA Statement’ will be published that sets out (amongst other things) ‘the measures decided concerning monitoring’.

13 MONITORING

13.1.1 The SA Report must present ‘measures envisaged concerning monitoring’.

13.1.2 Within the plan document, monitoring is a focus of the final chapter, where it is explained that: “The Council’s annual Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) will be used to report on the effectiveness of delivering the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan…” The Chapter goes on to present a detailed monitoring framework.

13.1.3 The other key proposal is relates to triggers for a Local Plan Review. The proposal is -

“The Council will commence a review of the Local Plan in 2021 unless triggered sooner by other factors which could include: results of annual monitoring on the effectiveness of the plan in line with the Plan’s Monitoring Framework and having particular regard to the monitoring of housing delivery; significant changes to national planning policy and/or legislation; duty to cooperate issues, particularly addressing housing and employment needs within the Housing Market Area / Functional Economic Area; and any other reasons that render the Plan, or part of it, out of date.”

13.1.4 This focus on monitoring of housing delivery, in light of changing understanding of housing needs, is appropriate. Other proposed indicators presented within the monitoring framework are also strongly supported, in light of the appraisal presented above (Chapter 10) -

- Net affordable housing completions at Hartland Village
- Provision of social and community infrastructure at Hartland Village
- Delivery of educational facilities at the new settlement
- Delivery of green infrastructure provision at Hartland Village
- Quality and area of SINCs

13.1.5 A focus of monitoring delivery at Hartland Park is supported; however, there might be the potential to go further, e.g. through specific monitoring targeted at ensuring no ‘net loss’ of biodiversity, potentially to include specific monitoring of the planned translocation and management of the on-site SINCs.
APPENDIX I - REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

As discussed in Chapter 2 above, Schedule 2 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans Regulations 2004 explains the information that must be contained in the SA Report; however, interpretation of Schedule 2 is not straightforward. Table A links the structure of this report to an interpretation of Schedule 2 requirements, whilst Table B explains this interpretation.

Table A: Questions answered by this SA Report, in-line with an interpretation of regulatory requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions answered</th>
<th>As per regulations… the SA Report must include…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What’s the plan seeking to achieve?</td>
<td>• An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s the sustainability ‘context’?</td>
<td>• Relevant environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s the sustainability ‘baseline’?</td>
<td>• The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key issues and objectives that should be a focus?</td>
<td>• Key environmental problems / issues and objectives that should be a focus of (i.e. provide a ‘framework’ for) assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?</td>
<td>• Outline reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with (and thus an explanation of the ‘reasonableness’ of the approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the SA findings at this current stage?</td>
<td>• The likely significant effects associated with the draft plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens next?</td>
<td>• The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the draft plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 1

Part 2

Part 3
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Table B: Questions answered by this SA Report, in-line with regulatory requirements

**Schedule 2**

**The report must include...**

(a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;

(b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan;

(c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;

(d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;

(e) the environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;

(f) the likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors;

(g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan;

(h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;

(i) a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring.

**Interpretation of Schedule 2**

**The report must include...**

An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes

I.E. answer - What’s the plan seeking to achieve?

Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance

I.E. answer - What’s the context?

The relevant environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level

I.E. answer - What’s the baseline?

The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan

Key environmental problems / issues and objectives that should be a focus of appraisal

I.E. answer - What are the key issues & objectives?

The likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors

The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the draft plan

I.E. answer - What happens next?

A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring

[Part 1 of the Report]

The likely significant effects associated with alternatives, including on issues such as...

... and an outline of the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives considered / a description of how environmental objectives and considerations are reflected in the draft plan.

[Part 2 of the Report]

The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the draft plan

[Part 3 of the Report]
Whilst Tables A and B signpost broadly how/where this report meets regulatory requirements. As a supplement, it is also helpful to present a discussion of more precisely how/where regulatory requirements are met - see Table C.

_Table C: ‘Checklist’ of how and where (within this report) regulatory requirements are being met._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory requirement</th>
<th>Discussion of how requirement is met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule 2</strong> of the regulations lists the information to be provided within the SA Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</td>
<td>Chapter 3 (‘What’s the plan seeking to achieve’) presents this information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;</td>
<td>These matters were considered in detail at the scoping stage, which included consultation on a Scoping Report. The Scoping Report was updated post consultation, and is available on the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</td>
<td>The outcome of scoping was an ‘SA framework’, and this is presented within Chapter 4 (‘What’s the scope of the SA’), in a slightly updated form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance…;</td>
<td>Also, more detailed messages from the Scoping Report (context and baseline review) are presented (in an updated form) within Appendix II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation; | The Scoping Report presents a detailed context review, and explains how key messages from the context review (and baseline review) were then refined in order to establish an ‘SA framework’. The SA framework is presented within Chapter 4 (‘What’s the scope of the SA’). Also, messages from the context review are presented within appendix II. With regards to explaining “how… considerations have been taken into account” -  
• Chapter 6 explains how reasonable alternatives were established in late 2017 in-light of earlier consultation and SA.  
• Chapter 8 explains the Council’s ‘reasons for supporting the preferred approach’, i.e. explains how/why the preferred approach is justified in-light of alternatives appraisal (and other factors). |
| f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. | • Chapter 7 presents alternatives appraisal findings (in relation to the spatial strategy, which is the ‘stand-out’ plan issue and hence that which should be the focus of alternatives appraisal/ consultation).  
• Chapter 10 presents the Proposed Submission Plan appraisal. As explained within the various methodology sections, as part of appraisal work, consideration has been given to the SA scope, and the need to consider the potential for various effect characteristics/dimensions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory requirement</th>
<th>Discussion of how requirement is met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>g)</strong> The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</td>
<td>At the current time, the appraisal of the Proposed Submission Plan (Chapter 10) identifies how the plan might potentially ‘go further’ in certain respects, and makes a number of specific recommendations. A number of recommendations were also made within Chapter 10 of the March 2017 Interim SA Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h)</strong> An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;</td>
<td>Chapters 5 and 6 deal with ‘Reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with’, with an explanation of the reasons for focusing on particular issues and options. Also, Chapter 8 explains the Council’s ‘reasons for selecting the preferred option’ (in-light of appraisal). Methodology is discussed at various places, ahead of presenting appraisal findings, and limitations are also discussed as part of appraisal narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i)</strong> description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;</td>
<td>Chapter 13 presents measures envisaged concerning monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j)</strong> a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings</td>
<td>The NTS is a separate document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SA Report must be published alongside the draft plan, in-line with the following regulations:

- Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2).
- An Interim SA Reports were published for consultation, under Regulation 18, as part of the Housing Options consultation in 2014 and the Draft Plan consultation in March 2017.
- At the current time, this SA Report is published alongside the Proposed Submission Plan, in order to inform the current ‘publication’ stage (Regulation 19).

The SA Report must be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the plan.

- The environmental report prepared pursuant to Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of any transboundary consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 shall be taken into account during the preparation of the plan or programme and before its adoption or submission to the legislative procedure.
- The two interim SA Reports were taken into account when establishing reasonable alternatives, and preparing the Proposed Submission Plan, in late 2017. Appraisal findings presented within this SA Report will inform a decision on whether or not to submit the plan, and then (on the assumption that the plan is submitted) will be taken into account when finalising the plan at Examination (i.e. taken into account by the Inspector, when considering the plan’s soundness, and the need for any modifications).
APPENDIX II - CONTEXT AND BASELINE REVIEW

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 4 (‘What’s the scope of the SA?’) the SA scope is primarily reflected in a list of objectives (‘the SA framework’), which was established subsequent to a review of the sustainability ‘context’ / ‘baseline’, analysis of key issues, and consultation. The aim of this appendix is to present a summary key issues emerging from context / baseline review.

Overview

Hart District, which has approximately 94,000 residents, is a predominantly rural district located in north-east Hampshire, bordering the counties of Surrey and Berkshire. There are around 35 settlements, although some are just isolated groups of houses with no community facilities, leaving 15 to 20 higher order settlements – see Figure A.

The main town is Fleet (including Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath) in the central-eastern part of the District. Approximately 40.4% of Hart’s population (38,000) live in the Fleet area. Other primary local service centres in Hart include Yateley in the north, Blackwater (including Hawley) in the north-east and Hook in the central-western part of the District, which account for 35.1% of the District’s total population.

The District is bisected by the M3 motorway and the mainline railway which by are key parts of the strategic infrastructure for travel/commuting within the District and for outside destinations, such as London and Southampton. Movement patterns are complex and vary with the purpose of the journey. Key services such as main hospitals and larger shopping centres are provided outside of Hart.

The District performs exceptionally well against a range of measures related to health and wellbeing. For example, it is the least deprived local authority area in England on the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015, it has high participation rates in sport (above the national average and the average for the South East) and life expectancy is above the national average. However, this masks some specific areas of challenge in public health. Access to health and social care services is a more challenging issue for the District, particularly given the ageing population, the rural nature of the District and poor public transport in many areas. Other relevant health issues include children in low income families, the level of obesity in certain sectors of the population and levels of smoking.

The District has a varied and highly valued landscape embracing heathland, historic parkland, forestry, woodlands, pastoral farmland, open downland and river valleys. Several meandering river valleys cut across the central part of Hart, notably the River Whitewater and River Hart. The Blackwater Valley forms the county boundary between Hampshire, Berkshire and Surrey. Furthermore, Hart has a rich historic built environment that includes Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens, Conservation Areas, locally-listed buildings and locally-listed parks and gardens. Built and natural heritage features are an important part of the character of the District.

Figure A: Main settlements in Hart

---

Accessibility

Schools

A Hampshire School Places Plan was published in 2017, which considers demand for school places and the ‘supply’, before concluding on capacity surpluses / deficits for each area within the County in the year 2021.

With regards to demand, it is known that Hampshire is experiencing a significant increase across all year groups as high birth years work their way through the system and new housing is delivered (over 49,000 dwellings county-wide). Births in the county have increased in recent years to 14,532 in 2015 representing a 13.6% increase since 2002 (12,794). Ultimately, pupil forecasts show an increase of 6,969 primary pupils from 2016-17 to 2021 (7%) and an increase of 5,275 (8%) secondary pupils (including sixth form) by 2020-21. By 2022-23, secondary numbers will have grown by 10,129 (15%).

Figure B: Pupil number trends in Hampshire

Predicting school place demand spatially is a complex task. Where children go to school involves a range of different factors such as housing growth, inward and outward migration as well as parental preference. Having said this, Table A shows predicted school capacity surplus/deficit across Hart in 2021. N.B. it is not clear whether the Fleet deficit (1%) is calculated taking account of the expansion of Calthorpe Secondary School, which is programmed for 2021, nor is it clear precisely which developments with planning permission the calculation assumes will deliver new homes before 2021.

Table A: School capacity surplus/deficit in 2021 (see final column)36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hart Primary Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Planning Area</td>
<td>Number of Infant/ Primary Schools</td>
<td>Year R: Total PANs Oct 2016</td>
<td>Year R: Number on Roll Oct 2016</td>
<td>Year R: % surplus places Oct 2016</td>
<td>Year R: Proposed PANs Oct 2021</td>
<td>Year R: Forecast No. on Roll Oct 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet / Crookham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yateley / Fyngmore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook / Odiham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hart Secondary Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odiham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yateley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to primary and secondary school capacity, there is also a need to give consideration to special educational needs, early years and post 16 education. In respect of the latter, Hampshire County Council commented, through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, that -

*Based on 4600 eligible dwellings, in the region of 170 Post 16 students would be generated. Local providers at Queen Mary’s College, Basingstoke, Farnborough VI Form College, and Yateley School (11-18) could have sufficient future capacity to meet this additional student’s demand. However, at this early stage the Local Education Authority would wish to keep its options open, and may consider in the future additional VI form provision as part of any new secondary school if required.*

There is a need to take account of predicted surpluses / deficits when consideration the quantum and distribution of growth to provide for through the Local Plan. There is also a need to consider the potential to enable delivery of increased capacity. In this respect, Hampshire County Council commented, through the 2017 Draft Plan consultation, that -

*“Consolidating the provision of new housing development to create opportunities to expand existing schools in this way would provide the best possible opportunity to create additional school places close to the area of new housing development. If housing levels are sufficient then new primary school provision can be considered however, it should be noted that in the current economic climate small schools face particular financial challenges.”*

**Healthcare**

Ten GP surgeries are located in the larger towns and villages, and eleven dental practices. There is also the Fleet Community Hospital and the Odiham Cottage Hospital which provide a range of services including outpatient clinics, community nursing and social day care services. However the District does not have any large hospitals. Instead residents rely on Frimley Park Hospital to the east and Basingstoke Hospital to the west, both out of District. Clare Park Hospital near Crondall offers private healthcare services.

The Council works with health and social care service providers including the Clinical Commissioning Groups and Hampshire County Council (HCC), through the Hart Health and Wellbeing Partnership, to improve the provision of healthcare services. Changes to the population, both in terms of its size and its demographic structure, combined with funding pressures, drive a need for regular reviews of the ways health services are delivered.

**Hampshire Infrastructure Statement (2017)**

Finally, with regards to accessibility to community infrastructure, there is a need to note the recently published Hampshire Infrastructure Statement (2017), which identifies an overall funding gap of £72m for Hart (a figure which is considered to be a conservative estimate, as it does not account for ‘social and community extra care’ or ‘countryside services’. The £72m figure breaks down as: Transport, £34m; and Education: £38m.

**Biodiversity**

The Thames Basin Heaths are a designated Special Protection Area (SPA) under the EU Birds Directive, primarily designated for breeding populations lowland heathland bird species, notably woodlark, Dartford warbler and nightjar. These ground nesting birds are particularly vulnerable to predation and disturbance. There are a number of individual SPA sites that make up the Thames Basin Heath SPA group (such as Bramshill, Castle Bottom to Yateley & Hawley Commons, Bourley & Long Valley), which are primarily distributed in the north, north-east and eastern parts of the District.

Hart has 16 nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) that fall entirely or partially within the District, totalling 2,696ha (12.5% of total District, and include the Thames Basin Heaths SPA). These sites are designated to cover a variety of habitat types including a range of heathland types, meadows, woodland, river valleys, lakes and the Basingstoke Canal.
There are 254 locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) located throughout the District, covering a total of 1,935ha. These sites comprise a wide range of habitat types, and include the great majority of ancient woodlands.

Four Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (as defined by the UK BAP) are located within the District: Blackwater Valley, the Thames Basin Heaths, the Loddon and Whitewater and the Herriard Wooded Downland Plateau. These areas with an existing high density of high quality habitat, and where conservation efforts might be targeted in order to achieve maximum benefits, e.g. through addressing the fragmentation of habitats within the landscape / enhancing ecological connectivity.

Green infrastructure (GI) is defined as: “A network of multifunctional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. Green infrastructure is not simply an alternative description for conventional open space. As a network it includes parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, but also street trees, allotments and private gardens. It can also include streams, canals and other water bodies and features such as green roofs and walls.” Key assets include the green corridors of the Blackwater Valley and the Basingstoke Canal, in addition to parks, woodlands, allotments, common land, and designated sites of nature importance including the TBHSPA. Relatively recent additions to the green infrastructure network are the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) provided to mitigate the effects of residential development on the TBHSPA such as at Bramshot Farm.

Green infrastructure is also important from a climate change adaptation perspective. As stated by Hampshire Wildlife Trust, through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation: “The maintenance of functioning ecological networks will be crucial in providing greater resilience for species and habitats to adapt to climate change.”
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Climate change mitigation

The Government has set a target under the Climate Change Act 2008 to reduce CO₂ emissions by 80% by 2050, with an interim target of 34% by 2020, both against a 1990 baseline. CO₂ emissions have decreased between 2005 – 2011 in Hart from 6.5 to 5.1 tonnes per capita (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011). These levels are less than the county and south-east regional levels.

The Government requires local planning authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change and reduce the consumption of natural resources. For example, the impact of new development on climate change can be reduced by locating it where possible in places where it is not entirely necessary to rely on having access to a car; and by the design of carbon neutral homes which seek to achieve energy efficiency through sustainable construction, and increased use of renewable energy.

The delivery of renewable and low carbon energy schemes will contribute towards the mitigation of impacts of climate change. An Energy Opportunities Plan (EOP) incorporated within the North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study (2011), demonstrates opportunities for low carbon energy generation potential, including wind, photovoltaic solar, biomass for direct combustion and anaerobic digestion and district heating with combined heat and power (CHP).

The district has significant local renewable resource potential and the EOP indicates favoured locations where opportunities might be viable. New developments can be catalysts for decentralised energy network growth and major new developments should assess the feasibility of communal heat distribution to facilitate connecting to an existing decentralised energy network, or establishing a new network.

Communities

Having already discussed matters of ‘accessibility’ above, there is a need to consider other issues with a bearing on the achievement of ‘community’ objectives (also recognising that other issues, e.g. traffic, are considered under separate headings below). Considerations include -

- Air Quality - within the District is generally good, and there are no air quality management areas (AQMAs). On-going monitoring continues to show achievement of the relevant air quality objectives, but there are areas where the air quality requires improving; these are generally located close to the motorway and other main roads which experience high volumes of traffic.
- Odour - and fumes from commercial activities can have a detrimental effect on the health and quality of life of local residents and the environment in general. For commercial kitchens, the siting of extract flues is of concern in relation to its potential impact on amenity. Dust and emissions can often be a particular problem during the demolition and construction phases of any development.
- Noise - from road and rail traffic, aircraft, construction, entertainment venues, and commercial and industrial activities all have the potential to affect health and quality of life significantly and adversely if not properly controlled or planned for.
- Artificial Light - that is either poorly designed, operates beyond reasonable hours or is simply not necessary can lead to glare, light spillage and sky glow. It can affect adversely the quality of life of neighbouring residents, be damaging to wildlife and waste energy. Common causes of complaint concerns exterior security lights, illuminated advertising and flood lighting.
- Contamination - The Council has a duty under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to investigate land for possible contamination and, if necessary, use legislative powers to ensure that risks associated with a piece of land are minimised to an acceptable level. The possibility of contamination should therefore always be a consideration, with the responsibility for securing a safe development that does not pose a risk to people or the environment lying with the developer/landowner.

Employment and the economy

Hart falls within a Functional Economic Area (FEA) that also comprises Rushmoor and Surrey Heath boroughs. The FEA has a successful economy that has generated over 10,000 additional jobs between 2009 and 2015. However, self-containment within the FEA is low, at 53%, reflecting opportunities for residents to commute into London and other economic centres.
The FEA has a relatively balanced mix of employment floorspace that can support a range of sectors, although it has a significantly higher proportion of office floorspace when compared to other competing economic centres. There is a good supply of office floorspace available for occupation, with over 117,000 sqm of office space being marketed in November 2016. In contrast, only 14,175 sqm of industrial floorspace was being marketed in November 2016 and available for immediate occupation.

A significant quantity of large-footprint office accommodation has been developed across the FEA, and the wider Blackwater Valley, over the past two decades, although it is widely acknowledged that occupier demand has never kept pace with this supply and the post 2007 economic downturn exacerbated this. However, the office market has started to recover with the amount of floorspace let in the FEA increasing by 42% between 2013 and 2015.

Maintaining a supply of employment land and premises is crucial to enhance the economic competitiveness of the District. Strategic Employment Sites are particularly valuable, although other employment sites in the District play an important role in servicing the local economy. These smaller employment sites provide important business locations and in some instances provide a location for valuable bad neighbour activities. They include uses which are visually unattractive such as those involving large areas of open storage.

The District itself has a diverse and thriving economy accommodating a range of sectors with over 5,000 businesses being registered in 2016 of which 91% are categorised as micro firms. The District is also home to some large corporate headquarters including Virgin Media, Serco and Surface Technology International. Furthermore, there is a strong rural economy, albeit mobile phone signal coverage and broadband speeds are a constraint. However, 62% of those who work commute out of the District.

Residents have access to a good range of retail and other town centre services but it is recognised that people will travel to higher order centres outside of the district for comparison shopping, and that it is unrealistic to try to compete with those centres. To do so would require the provision of a significant amount of new retail floorspace to attract larger units when there has been little developer interest in such schemes in the recent past.

The promotion of accessible, attractive and vibrant town, district and local centres is sought through development that reflects the role that each performs. Fleet Town Centre is the main town centre, with retail focused along the High Street and within the Hart Centre, and a range of food and drink premises and entertainment facilities, including the Harlington a multipurpose arts and entertainment venue. Fleet has an active local and business community involved in activities promoting the town centre. This includes the implementation of a Fleet Business Improvement District (BID).

Three centres in the District (Blackwater, Hook, Yateley) have been identified as District Centres that form the focal point for services and facilities that serve the immediate communities and the surrounding population. Two centres in the District (Hartley Wintney and Odiham) are defined as Local Centres based on the size of centre and range of facilities.

**Flood risk and other climate change adaptation issues**

The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment (2017) endorses more action across the UK on water, heat, flooding, biodiversity and pests and diseases. Flood risk is a particular concern for the Local Plan.

National planning policy and guidance seeks to ensure that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding are avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, by making it safe without increasing flood risk. There is also a need to take into account the likely impacts of climate change and in considering the approach to development apply a sequential test to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.

A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) (SFRA) has been undertaken to provide robust evidence of areas of flood risk from various sources in the district. This should be used alongside the Environment Agency’s flood risk maps and recently updated Climate Change Allowances.

The District has a large number of watercourses (over 30, including three main rivers) and a large proportion of the District lies within ‘Flood Zone 3’ (areas identified as being subject to a high probability of flooding). Also, certain areas within Hart are at risk of flooding from surface water, groundwater and/or sewers. The District is also at risk from flooding from artificial sources such as the Fleet Pond Reservoir.
The top four urban areas at risk of fluvial and surface water flooding are Fleet, Yateley, Blackwater/Hawley and Crondall. These areas along with Hook, Eversley and North Warnborough make up the majority of the area at risk of groundwater flooding. External sewer flooding is concentrated in the northern half of Hart, with northern Fleet being the worst affected.

Housing

The Prime Ministerial Foreword to the Housing White Paper (2017) states -

“Our broken housing market is one of the greatest barriers to progress in Britain today. Whether buying or renting, the fact is that housing is increasingly unaffordable – particularly for ordinary working class people who are struggling to get by.

Today the average house costs almost eight times average earnings – an all-time record. As a result it is difficult to get on the housing ladder, and the proportion of people living in the private rented sector has doubled since 2000.

These high housing costs hurt ordinary working people the most. In total more than 2.2 million working households with below-average incomes spend a third or more of their disposable income on housing...

... I want to fix this broken market so that housing is more affordable and people have the security they need to plan for the future.

The starting point is to build more homes. This will slow the rise in housing costs so that more ordinary working families can afford to buy a home and it will also bring the cost of renting down.

We need to build many more houses, of the type people want to live in, in the places they want to live.”

The average price of houses in Hart (£405,600)\(^{38}\) is over 40% higher than the national average (£232,885), and house prices over 11 times workplace earnings, and a significant need for affordable housing.

There is a need to provide for objectively assessed housing needs, and also to provide for a mix of new homes in terms of size and tenure. There is also a need to provide for the needs of various groups within the community including those requiring specialist accommodation. Considerations include -

- Local evidence suggests that there is a need for smaller homes, which would enable people to down-size where they are under-occupying their current homes.
- There is a significant need for additional affordable housing within the District. Affordable housing includes social rented / affordable rented and intermediate housing that is available to households in the District whose needs are not met by the market.
- The ageing population (see Figure D) is also likely to create a need for additional specialist housing, to meet the healthcare requirements of older people. Over the plan period there is likely to be a very substantial increase in the number of older people residing within the District. The projected increase for the number of people aged 75+ years is relatively large, compared to the South East as a whole or to the national average. Housing for older persons covers a spectrum of needs, from sheltered housing (where residents live mainly independent lives whilst sharing some communal facilities) through to extra care housing and care homes, where a level of personal health care is typically provided.
- The Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (August 2016) shows that there is currently no need to make any additional pitch provision for gypsies and travellers and that no additional plots are required for travelling showpeople. There is also no proven need to consider any new transit provision at this time.

Historic environment

The District contains over 1,000 Listed Buildings, 10 Scheduled Monuments, 8 registered Historic Parks and Gardens, 32 Conservation Areas, 329 locally-listed buildings and 16 locally-listed parks and gardens. Together, these features provide an attractive environment for residents, businesses and visitors.

Some of Hart’s main settlements have more historical constraints than others. For example, Hartley Wintney, Odiham and North Warnborough, and some of Hart’s smaller settlements have a high density of historic features, with large areas designated as Conservation Areas, and many listed buildings.

The historic landscape character has been mapped as part of the Hampshire’s Historic Landscape Assessment. The historic landscape of Eversley is of particular interest. Eversley lies on the northern edge of Hampshire and is situated within what once was the Royal Forest of Eversley. It contains a wide variety of Historic Landscape Types. Features include the detailed patchwork of small irregular fields and thick hedges amongst dense woodland and copses and, the former deer park marked by its sinuous wooded boundary forming a large ring, and the scattered pattern of settlement with numerous greens.
Landscape

Three national character areas cover the District: North East Hampshire Plantations and Heath (covering the north and east of the District); Loddon Valley and Forest of Eversley West (covering the middle section of the District); and North East Hampshire Open Downs (covering the south of the District).

- The North East Hampshire Plantations and Heath character area - has a gently undulating landscape of plateau areas dissected by river valleys. It has predominantly well-drained sandy soils over clays and sands giving rise to acidic conditions and some areas of local waterlogging. The area includes internationally-important habitats such as dry and wet heaths, bogs, scrub and woodland. Land uses in this character area consist of a mosaic of woodland, blocks of remnant open heathland and medium-scaled pasture fields. The character area includes large urban areas such as Fleet and numerous transport corridors as well as a high density of dispersed settlements and smallholdings.

- The Loddon Valley and Western Forest of Eversley character area - tends to be low-lying with a gently undulating landscape, divided on a north-south axis by the shallow, broad valley of the River Loddon. The soil tends to have poor drainage and is dissected by a network of often wooded streams and minor tributaries. There are distant views of continuous plantation woodland on elevated sand and gravel plateaux in adjoining character areas to the east and west. There is a high density of public rights of way in this character area and has a secluded feel, and a sense the landscape has had a long history of small settlements and farms by the presence of timber-framed and old brick small farm buildings.

- The North East Hampshire Downs character area - has a rolling chalk landform with broad sweeping hills and ridges and dry valleys. The northern areas slope northwards towards the lower lying heaths while southern areas form a gently undulating plateau. There are extensive tracts of intensive arable cultivation defined by well-trimmed hedgerows. It has scattered blocks of woodland, and springs occur along the northern fringe of the landscape where the chalk meets the clay. The landscape is remote and quite lightly populated with dispersed nucleated villages and occasional farmsteads.

The Hart Landscape Capacity Study (2016) considers the capacity of smaller landscape areas to accommodate new development - see Figure E.

**Figure E: Outcomes of the Hart Landscape Capacity Study**
Transport and accessibility

The Hampshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2031) produced by Hampshire County Council provides the long term framework for transport policies within the District. The plan seeks to improve accessibility through the three initiatives to: reduce, manage and invest.

Hampshire County Council has also published a Transport Statement to set out the transport objectives and delivery priorities for the District. The Hart District Transport Statement builds upon existing transport related documents covering the District, notably the Local Transport Plan 3, and, the Fleet Town Access Plan (TAP) to:

- Promote economic growth by providing a well-maintained, safe and efficient highway network.
- Improve access to jobs, facilities and services by all types of transport.
- Facilitate and enable new developments to come forward.
- Reduce carbon emissions and minimise the impacts of transport on the environment.

Through the provision of services and facilities locally, it is possible to help to minimise the need to travel, and provide greater scope for people to have a choice of modes of transport, including non-car modes. For example, the provision of convenience retail within close proximity to residential developments can encourage walking and cycling and reduce trips by car.

Transport provision varies considerably across the District, with the larger town centres and some of the larger settlements having some accessibility by all modes of transport (including, walking, cycling, public transport and cars), to very limited or no levels of accessibility other than by car in much of the rural areas. The Hart Health Profile highlights that the rate of those killed or injured in road accidents is 51.8 per 100,000 compared to 39.3% per 100,000 nationally.

More generally, Hart benefits from good strategic road and rail links to London, the Midlands and the south coast. Fleet and Hook stations both provide high frequency services to London Waterloo (arrival time within one hour); Winchfield station provides less frequent stopping services to London Waterloo; and Blackwater station provides regular services to Guildford, Gatwick Airport and Reading.

Water

Development should be planned to support the attainment of the environmental objectives of the Water Framework Directive, by supporting actions in the Thames River Basin Management Plan. Where the achievement of water quality objectives is likely to be compromised by the effects of new development, intervention measures (e.g. improvements to wastewater drainage and treatment infrastructure) may need to be implemented prior to any new construction.

The, Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Water Cycle Study includes a particular focus on capacity issues at the wastewater treatment facilities, finding there to be some capacity issues at Eversley WWTW and Camberley WWTW. Whilst capacity issues at Eversley could be resolved by improvements to the WWTW, it remains unclear whether the required improvements at Camberley could be made using conventional treatment technologies, in order to meet river quality targets.

When planning for wastewater infrastructure, there is need to recognise the water company’s Asset Management Plan (AMP) cycle. We are currently in AMP6 (2015-2020) and there needs to be assurance from the water company that any planned development planned before 2020 has been considered and funded within this AMP cycle. The timescales of development should be in line with the water companies AMP period to ensure development does not occur before necessary upgrades.

In terms of water supply, South East Water and Affinity Water have suggested that there will be a surplus relative to the envisaged level of development across the housing market area; however, the Water Cycle Study implies that water efficiency measures should be considered, in order to safeguard future water resources against the potential impacts of climate change. The Environment Agency report ‘Water Stressed Areas: Final Classification’ (2013) identifies that the area is characterised by serious water stress. This is based on current and future water usage and climate change scenarios.
APPENDIX III - NEW SETTLEMENT AREA OF SEARCH ALTERNATIVES

Introduction

As explained within ‘Part 1’ above, in late 2017, as a stand-alone piece of work to inform development of the Proposed Submission Plan (as opposed to a piece of work deemed strictly necessary as part of the SA process, in order to discharge the requirement to appraise ‘reasonable alternatives’), the decision was taken to appraise alternatives in relation to the matter of identifying a broad area of search for a new settlement.

 Undertaking work on planning a new settlement now is a pragmatic step, recognising that: A) additional land for housing and infrastructure is likely to be needed in the longer term; and B) much work has already been completed to establish broad support for a new settlement, in preference to further expansion of settlements.

As explained within Section 6.3, by late 2017 there was a clear preferred area of search - namely the Murrell Green/Winchfield Area of Search (MG/W AoS). Indeed, the Council resolved to support a new settlement in the Winchfield area in November 2014. However, it was nonetheless deemed appropriate to undertake an exercise to compare and contrast the merits of the MG/W AoS to one or more alternatives.

Establishing the reasonable alternatives

As explained within Section 6.3, by late 2017 the only alternative new settlement being actively promoted in the District was Rye Common, on the A287 east of Odiham. Another new settlement option - namely Lodge Farm, a short distance south west of the MG/W AoS - has been promoted in the past, but was not promoted through the Draft Plan consultation in 2017, and is known to be highly constrained.

Consideration was given as to whether a new settlement at Rye Common can be considered a ‘reasonable alternative’ to a new settlement in the MG/W AoS. Consideration was given to the following set of principles established by the Council to guide planning for a new settlement in Hart -

- Highly connected – electronically and physically, internally and externally, creating sociable neighbourhoods with walkable access to services, facilities and recreation assets, as well as innovative sustainable transport solutions.
- Community focussed - a comprehensive range of social, educational, retail and recreational facilities for the community, along with developing community pride through the stewardship and ownership of land, assets and facilities to ensure their management and maintenance for the long-term.
- Inclusive – the provision of a full range of housing needs, including for genuinely affordable social and market lifetime homes for a mixed and thriving community that respond to the needs of families, children and older generations.
- Forward thinking – through the innovative use of technology and design solutions.
- Sensitive – to the existing landscape character, important natural and built assets and the surrounding environment.
- Quality Infrastructure – includes a wide range of local and wider infrastructure needs including significant provision of green and blue infrastructure, and provision of a secondary school.

These principles do call into question the ‘reasonableness’ of Rye Common as an option; however, it was deemed appropriate to progress the option to appraisal nonetheless. It was recognised that, at this early stage in the process of planning a new settlement, there is a need to maintain an open mind regarding the priority issues and opportunities, and how these might be addressed.
Appraisal methodology

For each of the options, the assessment examines likely significant effects on the baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Table 4.1) as a methodological framework. Green is used to indicate significant positive effects, whilst red is used to indicate significant negative effects. Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high level nature of the policy approaches under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline (now and in the future under a ‘no plan’ scenario). In light of this, there is a need to make considerable assumptions regarding how scenarios will be implemented ‘on the ground’ and what the effect on particular receptors would be. Where there is a need to rely on assumptions in order to reach a conclusion on a ‘significant effect’ this is made explicit in the appraisal text.

Where it is not possible to predict likely significant effects on the basis of reasonable assumptions, efforts are made to comment on the relative merits of the alternatives in more general terms and to indicate a rank of preference. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between the alternatives even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

Finally, it is important to note that effects are predicted taking into account the criteria presented within Regulations. So, for example, account is taken of the duration, frequency and reversibility of effects. Cumulative effects are also considered (i.e. where the effects of the plan in combination with the effects of other planned or on-going activity that is outside the control of the Hart Local Plan).

Evidence-base

Evidence is referenced within the appraisal text as appropriate; however, it is helpful to present a key constraint map for each of the options here - see Figures A and B.

---

39 Conclusions reached on significant effects in relation to Option 4 - the Council’s preferred option - are supplemented within Chapter 10 of this report, which presents an appraisal of the draft plan - i.e. the preferred spatial strategy plus supporting policies.

Appraisal findings

Appraisal findings are presented below within 12 separate tables (each table dealing with a specific sustainability objective) with a final table drawing conclusions.

The appraisal methodology is explained above, but to reiterate: For each sustainability topic the performance of each scenario is categorised in terms of ‘significant effects (using red / green) and also ranked in order of preference. Also, ‘=’ is used to denote instances of all alternatives performing on a par.

### Sustainability Topic: Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

At a new settlement in the MG/W AoS there would be there will be good potential to achieve the necessary critical mass to deliver supporting services, facilities and infrastructure, to include a new secondary school at an optimum location (such that it will also be accessible to children from other settlements), and as part of an early phase of development. However, the degree of ‘self-containment’ achieved at the new settlement will be limited. Residents will need to travel to access many community services/facilities in Hart, and beyond (notably Basingstoke). In this respect, residents will benefit from access to Winchfield train station. It may also be fair to say that residents will benefit from good road and walking/cycling links; however, there is uncertainty at this stage / a need for further work.

A smaller new settlement of up to 1,900 homes has been proposed at Rye Common, with no proposal to deliver a secondary school (although the possibility of further expansion in the long term has been suggested; plus it is noted that Robert Mays Secondary School in Odiham is programmed to expand to 270 places per year group in 2018). As such, there will be a need for a notably higher proportion of trips to be offsite. Furthermore, the site is located in a more rural area, c.2.5km east of Odiham, and 10km west of Farnham. The site is located on, or just off, the A287; however, there is no existing bus route along this road, and no footpath or cycle path. It is difficult to envisage a scheme of this scale delivering significant transport infrastructure upgrades (beyond those necessary to access the site by car), or indeed support a new bus service. One primary access point is proposed (although the possibility of a second is suggested), which could necessitate any bus route having to make a ‘loop’ from the A287, to the local centre and then back to the A287.

In conclusion, a new settlement within the MG/W AoS is the preferable option, given: A) the potential to achieve a critical mass sufficient to deliver ‘strategic infrastructure’ in the form a secondary school, to the benefit of residents of the new settlement and existing residents; and B) the potential for the new settlement to be quite well linked to higher order centres.

Significant positive effects are predicted, given the secondary school capacity issues that exist (or at least which can be anticipated in the long term; see discussion in Appendix II), whilst significant negative effects are predicted for the Rye Common option, given the isolation of this site and no certainty regarding the potential to achieve a regular (let alone ‘fast and frequent’) bus service.
Sustainability Topic: Biodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key consideration is the need to avoid significant adverse effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), which in practice involves: A) directing growth to less sensitive locations, i.e. locations beyond the 5km and 7km buffers that have been defined; and B) ensuring that there is potential to deliver sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to mitigate increased recreational pressure. There is a need to ensure avoidance and mitigation in-line with South East Plan Policy NRM6 and the TBHSPA Delivery Framework.

Both the Winchfield / Murrell Green and Rye Common areas benefit from being relatively distant from the SPA, in the Hart context (recognising that the only part of the District beyond the 7km buffer is the far south, which is very rural and hence not be suited to a new settlement). However, the MG/W AoS is still comfortably within the 5km buffer (the nearest part of the SPA is found to the north of Hartley Wintney), and Rye Common is right on the edge of the 5km buffer (the proposed scheme involves delivering the majority of housing beyond the buffer).

SANG would be required as part of a new settlement at either location, and there would seemingly be good potential to deliver sufficient - and suitably high quality - SANG at either.

- MG/W AoS - there is an opportunity to deliver effective SANG. For example, depending on the preferred locations for development, there is the potential to include a ‘riverside parkland’ within the Whitewater Valley east of Hook, which is a designated Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA), and potentially to connect with other existing or proposed SANG.
- Rye Common - there is the opportunity to deliver a parkland SANG in very close proximity to a local centre.

Aside from the TBHSPA, there are a range of other constraints to consider. Within the MG/W AoS there are two primary considerations. Firstly, there is a very high density of woodland close to Winchfield Station, most of which is ancient woodland locally designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Focusing on the ancient woodland only, there can be seen to be 7 to 10 blocks (one is dissected into three parts by the M3 and railway), which will clearly function together as an ‘ecological network’ to some extent, especially recognising that each woodland is buffered by non-ancient woodland designated as a SINC, plus further non-designated woodland. Secondly, there is a risk of impacts to Odiham Common SSSI to the south, the northern-most part of which is in ‘part destroyed’ condition (albeit the vast majority is in favourable condition). The SSSI would be easily accessed from the new settlement, with increased traffic through the SSSI likely; however, SANG could act as a buffer.

As for Rye Common, there are fewer on-site and nearby constraints; however, the site is nonetheless constrained by its adjacency to Rye Common, which is a designated SINC, and the presence of three small ancient woodland SINCs adjacent to the site. Small isolated woodland blocks are typical of this part of the District, so it might be that there is a need to consider the matter of maintaining/enhancing ecological connectivity at the landscape scale.

In conclusion, Rye Common is the preferable location, from a biodiversity perspective. The MG/W AoS is quite highly constrained; however, there is good potential to avoid/mitigate effects - and potentially also deliver targeted enhancements (e.g. within the Whitewater BOA) - through careful masterplanning and landscaping (to include targeted habitat creation). On this basis, significant negative effects are not predicted; however, this is quite a marginal call.
**Sustainability Topic: Climate change mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

A key climate change mitigation consideration relates to the potential to affect average per capita transport-related CO₂ emissions, which are relatively high in Hart, reflecting the District's rural character; however, this is considered under 'Transport' below. Instead, the discussion here focuses on the potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, and hence minimise per capita CO₂ emissions from the *built environment*. In practice, this means supporting larger scale developments, as development at scale enables delivery of the necessary infrastructure.

A new settlement at either area might be able to achieve the necessary critical mass, and mix of uses, to enable combined heat and power generation (potentially even fuelled by biomass, which might even be locally sourced), with a network of piping to provide ‘district heating’.

It seems likely that there would be greater potential at a new settlement in the MG/W AoS, as A) the scheme would be of a greater scale (albeit the need for a ‘polycentric’ layout could reduce efficiencies); and B) there would be a new secondary school and potentially two employment areas, which could be supportive of district heating, on the basis of there being demand for heat across the day. However, it is noted that proposals received from site promoters to date have been non-committal, at best, with the promoter of land to the east suggesting that the “unconstrained nature of the site means further opportunities for renewable energy will be provided as additional homes are provided, if required”; and the proposal received from the promoter of land to the west not referencing any infrastructure (or design) opportunities.

In **conclusion**, either option could potentially support low per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment, but there would appear to be a greater opportunity associated with the MG/W AoS. With regard to effect significance, no significant effects are predicted. Climate change mitigation is a global issue, and hence it is not possible to conclude on the significance of local actions.
### Sustainability Topic: Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aside from implications for ‘accessibility’, which are discussed above, there are a number of further points to make regarding key issues for new and existing communities, in relation to the MG/W AoS in particular -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise pollution - associated with the M3, A30 and the railway is a constraint to the location of residential uses and a secondary school; however, there is always good potential to mitigate noise pollution through attenuation and design measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gas pipeline - a gas main passes through the west of the area, which will necessitate either a considerable ‘buffer’ of open land either side, or major work to re-route the pipe. The representation received from the site promoter in 2017 states that the preferred approach is to “divert and at the same time upgrade the Bramshill/Foyle pipe. One option is to divert and upgrade the pipeline to the east of its current route, on an alignment that follows the [proposed] main north-south street. The current pipe was laid in the 1960s and is of a thin walled steel construction. A replacement thicker walled pipe will very significantly reduce the risk and the hazard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pylons - high voltage power line that runs through the east of the area, which can feasibly be run underground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road safety - two notable issues are A) the narrow railway underpass, to the east of Winchfield station; and B) question-marks regarding the suitability of the footpath access to Hook. It might be that neither route is suited to use by school children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, there are some notable constraints within the MG/W AoS; however, there will be good potential to avoid/mitigate any risks, and so significant negative effects are not predicted. Rye Common appears to be less constrained; however, there is currently a lack of detailed evidence.
Sustainability Topic: Employment and the economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

There is an opportunity to deliver significant new employment land, potentially in the region of 7ha, as part of a new settlement in the MG/W AoS. Specifically, going by past proposals received from site promoters, there is the potential to deliver a c.3.5 ha extension to the existing Murrell Green Business Park at the area’s western extent, and also c.3.5 ha of new employment close to Winchfield station, as part of a mixed use local centre. Both proposals are strongly supported, in light of the following key findings of the Employment Land Review (ELR, 2017)–

“Consider the identification of additional employment land, particularly for industrial and warehousing uses, given the relatively tight supply of such land, and the need to provide opportunities for choice.”

“There appears to be strong demand from small flexible businesses / light industrial premises to support rural enterprises and SMEs. The types of premises vary significantly from basic converted agricultural barns providing storage/workshop space, to purpose-built light industrial / storage units, such as those at Murrell Green Business Park located on the A30 between Hook and Hartley Witney. Occupancy rates at such accommodation are high demonstrating that there is demand for such accommodation.”

“It is also important that the FEA [Functional Economic Area] provides a range of affordable floorspace for small high growth start-up businesses, by… [seeking to resist the loss of premises that provide suitable accommodation for SMEs… [and seeking] to provide smaller units within larger employment sites, residential or mixed-use schemes that come forward.”

There has been no proposals relating to delivering of new ‘B8’ (warehousing and logistics) employment uses, although this might be something to examine in the future, given that supply of this type of employment land is ‘light’ (having accounted for Hartland Park delivering housing rather than employment), and given that Greater London Authority (GLA) wrote to Hart during the recent Draft Plan consultation ‘seeking clarity’ on Hart’s ambitions in respect of meeting needs for “industry/warehousing/freight/logistics”.

Also, residents of a new settlement centred on Winchfield station would be able to commute by train to Fleet and Hook (where there is a significant employment cluster at the town’s southeastern extent, potentially within walking distance of a new settlement); as well as to employment centres further afield, e.g. Farnborough and Basingstoke.

As for Rye Common, the proposal is to deliver c.4 ha of “rural employment space, providing opportunity to provide for small-scale rural businesses and thereby meeting the greatest need in the district.” This proposal is also supported, in light of the ELR statements presented above; however, the deliverability of such a scheme (i.e. the take-up of the land) is perhaps less certain, given the unquantified nature of demand for ‘rural employment space’.

In conclusion, it seems fair to conclude that there is a greater opportunity to support economic/employment growth objectives through a new settlement in the MG/W AoS, although that is not to downplay the importance of delivering new employment space suited to small rural businesses.

With regards to effect significance, significant positive effects are not predicted. The ELR does not conclude strongly on the need for new employment land within the District (or, more specifically, the sub-regional Functional Economic Area comprising Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath), with the overall supply of employment land being approximately in balance with demand (in total quantitative terms, i.e. before account is taken of qualitative considerations).
### Sustainability Topic: Flood risk and other climate change adaptation issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) identifies a range of flood risk related issues / constraints across the District. The study shows there to be fluvial flood risk along rivers and streams, as well as flood risk from surface water flows and groundwater.

Fluvial flood risk constrains the very western extremity (River Whitewater), and very eastern extremity (River Hart), of the MG/W AoS; however, the constrained areas of land might lend themselves to use as SANG. There are also numerous surface water flood risk channels, with a higher concentration in the eastern half of the area; however, there would be good potential to avoid these areas through careful masterplanning, and mitigate through implementation of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). There may also be an element of groundwater flood risk, but this is less of an issue in this part of Hart, reflecting the geology.

A final consideration is the matter of increased surface-water run-off leading to increased off-site flood risk. In this respect, it is important to note that severe flooding has occurred at Phoenix Green in recent times, and that as a result the current proposal is to safeguard an area of land immediately south of Phoenix Green, through the Local Plan, so that it might be used to deliver a flood alleviation scheme. The scheme is looking to reduce surface water and ordinary watercourse flooding to 80 properties. The project is currently in its developmental stage but is anticipated to be in place by the end of financial year 2021/2022. Implications of developing the higher ground to the south of this scheme would need careful examination.

Rye Common is entirely unconstrained by fluvial flood risk; however, the lowest part of the site, to the north, is associated with a degree of groundwater flood risk, reflecting the geology (this is the junction of the chalk bedrock associated with the Hampshire Downs, and superficial deposits associated with the north of Hart), and there is also a surface water flood risk channel that passes south to north, through the centre of the site.

In conclusion, it is not clear that flood risk would be a major constraint to development at either location, although the matter of off-site flood risk at Phoenix Green needs further detailed examination. There will be good potential to avoid/mitigate any risk that exists, and hence significant negative effects are not predicted.
Dealing first with the MG/W AoS:

- Land to the west of the train station is subject to a number of constraints. A primary consideration is the ‘corridor’ of the B3016 Odiham road, which passes directly north from Winchfield train station, under the motorway and then on to Hartley Wintney. This is a historic route (as indicated by a listed milestone) from which Winchfield House (Grade 2* listed; associated with a locally listed parkland garden) is accessed (via a listed entrance lodge), and which leads to an area of Common Land at the southern extent of Hartley Wintney (Phoenix Green) and then the Hartley Wintney Conservation Area (specifically, the cluster of listed buildings at Phoenix Green). Impacts to Winchfield House seem unlikely, given that it is well screened by its surrounding parkland gardens, with perhaps a greater concern relating to impacts to the historic route, and approach to the Hartley Wintney Conservation Area.

- Other key constraints are: ‘The Murrell’ Grade 2 listed building close to the A30, west of Totters Lane, which is associated with a significant landscape setting; historic routes (Totters Lane, Old Potbridge Road and Brenda Parker Way) associated with two identified short lengths of Holloway, and two historic bridges; parkland and overgrown former parkland areas in the eastern part of the site, associated with Winchfield Lodge and Shapley; water meadow earthworks in the north-western part of the site, which would likely need to be preserved in situ; and a concentration of WWII features associated with a ‘stop line’.

- Less detailed evidence is available in relation to the sensitives associated with land to the east of the station, but it is apparent that this area is constrained by: Grade 1 listed St. Mary’s Church close to the eastern extremity; the Basingstoke Canal at the very eastern extremity; and two or three isolated listed buildings. Focusing on the Church, this stands alone in the landscape (as opposed to being associated with a settlement), and hence a rural setting will clearly contribute to its significance. However, it is noted that the latest proposal from the site promoter is to reduce the extent of built development within this area, with a view to preserving the rural setting of the church, and also the Basingstoke Canal beyond.

At Rye Common there are relatively few concerns regarding impacts to a conservation area, on the basis that the Crondall Conservation Area is located at least 1km to the east, with intervening vegetation and no direct road or walking links between the site and Crondall (albeit the site promoter has suggested the possibility of further expanding the site to the east). However, there are significant concerns regarding impacts to the string of nine listed buildings at the site’s northern extent, associated with Great and Little Rye Farms, and Rye Common itself, which is a large designated common land (albeit not as large as Odiham or Hook Commons).

In conclusion, the MG/W AoS is more constrained; however, given the size of the AoS, there will be very good potential to address constraints/avoid impacts to assets, through careful masterplanning, landscaping and design. On balance, it is difficult to differentiate the alternatives, and significant negative effects are not thought likely. Main impacts will be to the setting of a relatively small number of listed buildings (although the significance of the cluster at Rye Common would need further examination).
Planning for a new settlement in Hart is strongly supported from a ‘housing perspective’, albeit current understanding (on the basis of the Government’s recent draft nationally standardised methodology for calculating local housing needs) is that a new settlement is not needed in order to deliver sufficient housing to meet needs within the current plan period (2016 to 2032), on the assumption that Hartland Park delivers as anticipated.

Specifically, planning for a new settlement is supported as: 1) there is always a risk that local housing need for Hart will be revised upwards; 2) there will continue to be a need to build significant numbers of new homes beyond 2032; 3) there is a risk that at some point, under the duty to cooperate, Hart may need to provide for unmet housing needs from elsewhere within the Housing Market Area (which comprises Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath), and 4) there will be excellent potential to deliver a good housing mix, including specialist accommodation, self/custom build plots and a high proportion of affordable housing.

In short, planning now for a new settlement in the future is supported as: there may be a need to build significant additional homes; Hart’s preferred approach to delivering significant additional homes is to deliver a new settlement; and new settlements have a long ‘lead in time’.

Planning for a new settlement in the long term is also supported on the basis that there will be the potential to deliver an optimum scheme in respect of housing mix, including at least 40% affordable housing and delivery of specialist accommodation, including older persons accommodation. In particular, the intention is that, through careful planning, the need to fund costly infrastructure upgrades can be minimised, thereby ensuring funds are available for affordable housing and specialist accommodation.

It might also feasibly transpire that there is a need to allocate a site, or sites, for Gypsy and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople (there is currently understood, on the basis of the 2016 GTAA, to be no such need), in which case there might be merit to the option of allocating within / along-side a new settlement.

Focusing on the two competing sites / areas, the first point to note is that there is likely to be the potential to allocate land for a larger scheme in the MG/W AoS (the Rye Common site promoters have identified the potential for site expansion in the long term; however, any such expansion would clearly have implications for landscape etc). It is not always appropriate to conclude that a larger site is preferable to a smaller site in respect of meeting housing needs (because the smaller site might be delivered in combination with other sites, to good effect); however, in this instance - recognising that the forthcoming DPD will focus on allocating land for a new settlement only - it is appropriate to conclude that allocation of a larger site performs best.

The MG/W AoS is also notable for its relative proximity to existing towns (Fleet, Hook, Hartley Wintney), from where housing needs will arise. Rye Common is more distant from existing towns, albeit still quite well linked to Fleet, and with Farnham (a constrained town, albeit one that is proposed to be a focus of growth through the Waverley Local Plan) 10km to the east.

In conclusion, any new settlement is strongly supported and would likely lead to significant positive effects, with the MG/W AoS supported given the potential to deliver a larger scheme.
Sustainability Topic: Land and other resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murrell Green / Winchfield (area of search)</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a need to avoid loss of higher quality ('best and most versatile'; BMV) agricultural land. In this respect, all undeveloped land in Hart is either Grade 2 (very good quality), Grade 3 (good to moderate quality) or Grade 4 (moderate quality) in the Agricultural Land Classification, according to the nationally available 'Provisional Agricultural Land Quality' dataset. The data-set shows there to be three patches of Grade 2 agricultural land, in the south of the district.

The national data-set is of very low resolution, which means that it is difficult to apply it to the appraisal of individual sites; however, it is noted that the dataset shows there to be a concentration of Grade 4 land in MG/W AoS, broadly associated with the centre of the site (where there is a high density of woodland, potentially indicative of poorer soils). The dataset shows the majority of land to the east and west, namely that land that is currently mainly in agricultural use, to be Grade 3. As for Rye Common, the dataset shows the site to comprise mostly Grade 3, with a finger of Grade 2 stretching into the eastern part.

The other available dataset is known as the ‘Post 1988’ dataset. This dataset is an accurate reflection of agricultural land quality, on the basis that the methodology involves field surveys. This dataset also differentiates between grade 3a and 3b, whilst the national dataset does not (an important consideration, as the NPPF defines BMV land as that which is Grade 1 to 3a). However, the data-set is very patchy, with data only being available for a small proportion of the District. No data is available for Rye Common; however, some data is available for the MG/W AoS, which potentially serves to indicate that agricultural land may be higher quality than is indicated by the nationally available, low resolution dataset. Specifically: the western part of the area, around Totters Farm (west of the Brenda Parker Way) is largely Grade 2 (with the remaining land Grade 3a, i.e. also BMV). The only other land that has been surveyed is a relatively small parcel directly north of Winchfield station, which is found to comprise Grade 3a.

In conclusion, it is difficult to differentiate between the alternatives with any confidence, but it seems likely that both would lead to significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (and it is worth bearing in mind that even land used for SANG would probably not be kept in agricultural use; although it might feasibly be reverted to agricultural use in the future), and hence would lead to significant negative effects.

N.B. Another consideration relates to the sterilisation of known mineral resources, taking account of areas safeguarded by the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan 2013. In this respect, it is noted that: the eastern part of the MG/W AoS falls within a sharp sand and gravel safeguarding area (this is primarily land at risk of flooding, which would be used for SANG); whilst the northern part of the Rye Common site falls within a clay safeguarding area (it is noted that the OS map shows several disused pits in the area). It is difficult to conclude that these safeguarded areas represent a significant constraint to development, given that there will be alternative locations within the safeguarding areas that can be quarried, and also given the possibility of extracting the mineral resource prior to developing the site for housing.
SA of the Hart Local Plan

**Sustainability Topic: Landscape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MG/W AoS</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>![Star]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MG/W AoS**

The Hart Landscape Capacity Study (2016) finds the majority of land in Hart has ‘low’ capacity; however, in the vicinity of Winchfield station: land to the east, between the railway and motorway, has ‘medium/high’ capacity; land to the west has ‘medium’ capacity; and land to the east, south of the railway, has ‘medium/low’ capacity.

The more sensitive land (east of the station, south of the railway) has a strongly rural character, particularly the eastern part in the vicinity of Winchfield Hurst, St. Mary’s Church and the Basingstoke Canal. There would also be a need for significant re-modelling of the rural road network, with attendant landscape / character implications. However, the topography of the site is suited to development, insofar as it may prevent long views into developed areas. There are also some urbanising influences, including a high-voltage power line. The Three Castles Path long-distance trail passes through this area, although mostly along a road.

As for the landscape to the west of the station, there are ‘urbanising influences’ in the form of the railway, the A30 and some built development; however, this is gently sloping land, rising from the west / northwest to a ridgeline in the vicinity of the woodland and housing (and the motorway) at Shapley Heath. For this reason, this parcel of land is less ‘contained’ within the landscape, and there is the potential for some longer distance views into the site, notably from the recently permitted housing development (550 homes) at North East Hook, and there would also be some views from the A30, which runs along the west / northwestern boundary (i.e. the low point), given hedgerow gaps. There is also something of a remnant parkland character to parts of the landscape, in the vicinity of Winchfield Lodge, which potentially increases sensitivity. Finally, there is a concern regarding visual coalescence with Hartley Wintney (Hook would be well-buffered by the Whitewater Valley); however, there is existing woodland to the south of Hartley Wintney (Phoenix Green) which would help to ensure some visual separation, as experienced from the A30. Overall, there is some uncertainty regarding the ‘medium’ capacity rating assigned to this land, with the conclusion having been criticised through a Landscape and Visual Assessment completed by the site promoters of land to the east of the station.

In conclusion, it is fair to say that there is good landscape capacity in the centre of the area, around the railway station, given urbanising influences (most notably the railway and M3) and extensive woodland, but that sensitivities increase markedly further to the west and east.

**Rye Common**

Falls at the northern edge of the ‘Hampshire Downs’ National Character Area, which stretches south from the A287, to encompass the southern part of Hart District, and beyond - south to Winchester and west to Salisbury Plain. As a rolling chalk landscape, the southern part of Hart District is valued in the local context. The Hart Landscape Capacity Study (2016) assigns ‘low’ capacity to a landscape parcel comprising the Rye Common site and surrounding land (stretching as far east as Crondall), discussing: a complex geology at the northern edge of the chalk; typical chalk scenery, with rolling land forms and large scale field patterns; extensive views from high locations; a rural village fringe to Crondall; and a good PRoW network.

However, the Study does also note that linear copses along the A287 provide some enclosure, which would be to the benefit of the proposed scheme. The site itself rises to the south, to a high point of 120m, with Horsedown Hill - a prominent and accessible high point in the wider landscape (165m) - a further 1km to the south. The proposed masterplan refers to dense vegetation and “4-5m high hedgerows” screening views, but no detailed analysis is available.

**Conclusion**

Both areas are constrained, but Rye Common is seemingly more constrained. It is not possible to predict significant negative effects, as there would be no impacts to designated landscapes.
## Sustainability Topic: Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MG/W AoS</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

There are a range of issues to raise in respect of the MG/W AoS -

- **Self-containment** - would be *relatively* high, given the potential to deliver a sizeable new settlement, with a secondary school, more than one primary school and local centre, and employment on-site (see discussion under ‘Economy and employment’).

- **Polycentric** - there might be a need for such a layout, given constraints in the form of the M3 motorway, the railway, woodland, existing housing, and land ownership issues. Moreover, these constraints would act as a barrier to movement between component neighbourhoods. For example, a resident travelling from the eastern part of the area (near Winchfield Hurst) to the western part of the area (e.g. to the Business Park) would need to pass under a narrow railway underpass, east of Winchfield Station, which is a notable constraint to safe movement.

- **Winchfield station** - residents would have good access to a rail service, where peak time services are currently at capacity in the direction of Fleet and London, but with capacity in the direction of Basingstoke, Winchester, Southampton and Portsmouth.\(^{41}\) TFL highlighted (through 2017 Draft Plan consultation) that “Crossrail 2 would release capacity on rail corridors that are used by trains to/from Fleet and Hook”, and site promoters suggest that improvements to the service are ‘anticipated’ following the recent awarding of the South Western franchise. However, there can be little certainty, with South Western Railway currently consulting on a new timetable.\(^{42}\) The original consultation document (see pg. 10) proposed a reduced AM peak service from Winchfield; however, the consultation webpage suggests that this proposal was rescinded subsequently (“Reduction in AM peak calls at Hook and Winchfield. We have looked at this and propose providing three additional AM peak calls at both stations. This will reduce Farnborough and Fleet from 6tp to 4tp…”).

- **Strategic road network** - the A30 is in proximity, as is Junction 5 of the M3; however, there are existing traffic issues, and technical barriers to overcome, potentially leading to a need for costly road infrastructure upgrades. It is not clear that development would give rise to any particular opportunities to deliver new strategic road infrastructure to improve the current situation; however, this is a matter that might warrant further exploration.

- **Traffic** - there are particular concerns regarding traffic through Hook town centre (A30) and through Odiham Common SSSI (B3016). Minimising increased traffic on the congested A30 through Hook would necessitate increased reliance on the B3016.

- **Rural roads** - land to the east of the railway station is further from the strategic road network, and associated with a network of notably rural roads. Access to Fleet and Farnham could well involve ‘rat-running’ through rural villages, e.g. Dogmersfield.

- **Walking / cycling** - there is the potential for walking and cycling access to Hook and Hartley Wintney; however, the Whitewater Valley is a barrier to movement towards Hook, with the alternative route being along the A30. There is uncertainty regarding the suitability of the A30 route for walking/cycling (including for school children), and the potential for upgrades.

- **Bus services** - There is currently a limited bus service along the A30, with three routes offering either one and two services per day between Monday and Friday. Stagecoach, the main bus operator, supports “sufficient critical mass to restore bus services within the wider A30 corridor between Basingstoke, Hook and Fleet, when looked at in combination with demands arising from the development strategy elsewhere.”

---

\(^{41}\) This message was reported to the Murrell Green site promoters during a meeting with Network Rail and South Western Trains in August 2016; see the Murrell Green Garden community Feasibility and Deliverability Document, July 2017.

\(^{42}\) See [www.southwesternrailway.com/contact-and-help/timetable-consultation](http://www.southwesternrailway.com/contact-and-help/timetable-consultation)
In respect of **Rye Common**, a smaller new settlement of up to 1,900 homes has been proposed, with no proposal to deliver a secondary school (although the possibility of further expansion in the long term has been suggested). As such, there will be a need for a notably higher proportion of trips to be offsite. Furthermore, the site is located in a rural area, c.2.5km east of Odiham, and 10km west of Farnham. The site is located on, or just off, the A287 between Odiham and Farnham; however, there is no existing bus route along this road, and no footpath or cycle path. It is difficult to envisage a scheme of this scale delivering significant offsite transport infrastructure upgrades, or indeed supporting a new bus service. One primary access point is proposed (although the possibility of a second is suggested), which could necessitate a bus loop from the A287, to the local centre and then back to the A287.

In **conclusion**, Rye Common performs very poorly, from a transport perspective. There would be a very high degree of car dependency amongst, and so it appropriate to conclude the likelihood of ‘significant negative effects’. Conversely, there are significant opportunities associated with a new settlement in the MG/W AoS, with the potential to achieve a fairly good degree of self-containment, and levels of walking, cycling and public transport use amongst residents that are high, in the Hart context. There may also be the potential to deliver transport upgrades that benefit existing communities / the wider District. However, it is not possible to go as far as to suggest ‘significant positive effects’, ahead of further work. There are numerous constraints and issues to be over-come in relation to movement within the site, and from the site to surrounding towns and other destinations (notably the M4 motorway junctions).

### Sustainability Topic: Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>MG/W AoS</th>
<th>Rye Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant effects?**

No

**Discussion**

The Water Cycle Study (WCS) has highlighted that capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW) in the north of the district is a potential issue for housing growth, but highlights relatively little concern regarding capacity in the centre and south of Hart.

- **MG/W AoS** - a new settlement would either need to provide its own WwTW, or transfer wastewater to Fleet via new/improved infrastructure. For developers, the former may prove to be a preferable option, although there will be cost implications under either option; and there is also a need to explore the potential environmental impacts carefully (working with the Environment Agency), given that the rivers Whitewater and Hart in this area have relatively low flow, i.e. a level of flow that may not be suitable to receiving discharges from a WWTW. The WCS only considers growth options associated with a new settlement at Murrell Green, but the quantum of development in the catchment area for Fleet WwTW is likely to be very similar under an alternative scenario involving a new settlement centred further east.

- **Rye Common** - there is some uncertainty, as the WCS did not examine this option; however, the WCS does note that nearby Crondall WwTW has capacity headroom. The WCS also suggests the presence of a WwTW at Rye Common itself; however, this is not immediately apparent from the OS map or satellite imagery.

N.B. there are groundwater sensitivities in the south of the district, associated with the chalk geology, and in particular Rye Common falls within the outer zone of a groundwater source protection zone, due to the presence of a pumping station at Mill Lane; however, this is not likely to be a major constraint to non-polluting (e.g. residential) development.

In **conclusion**, there is some reason to suggest that Rye Common is preferable; however, this is marginal and uncertain. Significant effects are unlikely, given that any new settlement would deliver investment in waste water and drainage infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Categorisation and rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td><strong>MG/W AoS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rye Common</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and the economy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk / climate change adaptation</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and other resources</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary and conclusions

Whilst it is not the aim of this appraisal to conclude on the overall performance / sustainability of either option, the appraisal does serve to indicate that Option 1 (MG/W AoS) performs relatively well, with limited draw-backs having been highlighted relative to Option 2 (Rye Common). Taking each topic in turn –

- **Accessibility** – a new settlement within the MG/W AoS is the preferable option, given: A) the potential to achieve a critical mass sufficient to deliver ‘strategic infrastructure’ in the form a secondary school, to the benefit of new and existing residents; and B) the potential for the new settlement to be quite well linked to higher order centres. Significant positive effects are predicted, given the secondary school capacity issues that exist (or at least which can be anticipated in the long term), whilst significant negative effects are predicted for the Rye Common option, given the isolation of this site and no certainty regarding the potential to achieve a regular (let alone ‘fast and frequent’) bus service.

- **Biodiversity** - Rye common is the preferable location, from a biodiversity perspective. The MG/W AoS is constrained; however, there is good potential to avoid/mitigate effects - and potentially also deliver targeted enhancements (e.g. within the Whitewater BOA) - through careful masterplanning and landscaping (to include targeted habitat creation).

- **Climate change mitigation** – either option could potentially support low per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment, through delivery of low carbon heat/ electricity generation infrastructure, but there would appear to be a greater opportunity associated with the MG/W AoS, given the potential to deliver a larger scheme, and one involving a greater mix of uses.

- **Communities** – there are some notable constraints within the MG/W AoS, relating to noise pollution, a gas pipeline, high voltage pylons, and road safety; however, there will be good potential to avoid/mitigate any risks, and so significant negative effects are not predicted.

- **Employment and the economy** – there is a greater opportunity to support economic/employment growth objectives through a new settlement in the MG/W AoS, given the potential to deliver an extension to the existing Murrell Green Business Park, and also new employment close to Winchfield station; however, there is also a notable opportunity at Rye Common to deliver new employment space for rural businesses.

- **Flood risk / climate change adaptation** – parts of the MG/W AoS are subject to flood risk, although there should be good potential to avoid/mitigate risks. This matter would need to be the focus of detailed consideration through work to explore masterplanning and design options.

- **Historic environment** – the MG/W AoS is more constrained; however, given the size of the AoS, there will be very good potential to address constraints / avoid impacts to assets, through careful masterplanning, landscaping and design. On balance, it is difficult to differentiate the alternatives. Main impacts at both locations would be to the setting of a relatively small number of listed buildings (although the significance of the cluster at Rye Common would need further examination), which probably does not amount to ‘significant’ impacts, when viewed strategically.

- **Housing** – planning strategically new settlement is strongly supported as: there may be a need to build significant additional homes; Hart’s preferred approach to delivering such homes is to deliver a new settlement; and new settlements have a very long ‘lead in time’, if they are to be planned well.

- **Land and other resources** – it is difficult to differentiate between the alternatives with any confidence, but it seems likely that both would lead to significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

- **Landscape** - both areas are constrained, but Rye Common is seemingly more constrained, given its location at the northern extent of the Hampshire Downs National Character Area.

- **Transport** – Rye Common performs poorly, from a transport perspective. There would be a very high degree of car dependency amongst, and so it appropriate to conclude the likelihood of ‘significant negative effects’. Conversely, there are significant opportunities associated with a new settlement in the MG/W AoS, with the potential to achieve levels of walking, cycling and public transport use that are high, in the Hart context. There may also be the potential to deliver transport upgrades that benefit existing communities / the wider District. However, there are numerous constraints and issues to be over-come in relation to movement within the site, and from the site to surrounding towns and other destinations.

- **Water** - there is a degree of uncertainty regarding the infrastructure upgrades needed to deal with wastewater arising from a new settlement in the MG/W AoS; however, the likelihood is that any new settlement would enable sufficient investment in water infrastructure.
APPENDIX IV - SITE OPTIONS

Introduction
Site options were subjected to analysis using a Geographical Information System (GIS), as a means of gathering additional data to inform the discussion of site options presented in Section 6.4, and ultimately inform the selection of reasonable alternatives for appraisal (Section 6.5).

The aim of this appendix is to

1) explain the appraisal methodology; and then

2) present the outcomes of the GIS analysis in two ways -

Firstly, a discussion is presented under each of the SA topic headings. Secondly, a large table presents summary findings of the analysis for each site option.

Developing the site options appraisal methodology
It was not possible to simply appraise site options using the SA framework (i.e. the list of SA topics/objectives presented in Table 4.1, above), in the manner of the alternatives appraisal presented in Appendix III (above) and Appendix V (below).

This is on the basis of site options being so numerous (183 in number, in comparison to two alternatives subjected to appraisal in Appendix III, and seven alternatives subjected to appraisal in Appendix V) and limited data availability (i.e. we do not have a sufficiently fine grained understanding of how baseline issues/opportunities vary across the District, to enable the merits of competing site options to be differentiated with confidence).

As such, work was undertaken to develop a GIS methodology suited to site options appraisal. The methodology essentially involves measuring the spatial relationship (in terms of distance and/or percentage overlap) between all site options and features within the landscape (both constraint features, e.g. SSSIs, and opportunity features, e.g. train stations) for which mapped data (i.e. a GIS ‘layer’) is available. N.B. all distances are measured as a straight line, i.e. ‘as the crow flies’.

The aim was to develop a methodology that reflects the SA framework as closely as possible; however, there are inevitably data gaps, and therefore limitations to the methodology. These limitations are discussed further below, under each of the SA framework headings.

Accessibility
Several GIS datasets ('layers') for the District as a whole are available to enable analysis of the 183 site options. Specifically, the available data enables the site options to be analysed in respect of: distance to the nearest Town, District or Local Centre; distance to the nearest train station; and distance to the nearest bus route operated by Stagecoach. N.B. all distances are measured as a straight line, i.e. ‘as the crow flies’.

However, additional layers would ideally be available, e.g. layers showing the location of schools and GP surgeries within the District. Also, ideally distances would have been calculated using driving and/or walking and/or cycling routes.

Table A (see below) presents summary findings of the analysis, categorising the performance of sites on a red/amber/green scale reflecting the spread of the data. The following bullet points give further consideration to the summary findings presented in Table A -

- Distance to the nearest Town, District or Local Centre - the average distance is 1,945, but this masks considerable variation, with 31 sites within 500m (categorised as dark green) and 79 sites beyond 2km (categorized as red). Sites at Crondall are notably distant, at between c.4 and 5.5km. All sites at Long Sutton and South Warnborough are between c.3.3 and 4.1 km distant.

- Distance to the nearest train station - the average distance is 2781m, with 28 sites within 1km (dark green), a further 48 sites within 2km (light green). At the other end of the scale, 24 sites are beyond 4km (red). It is again notable that all sites at Crondall, Long Sutton and South Warnborough are notably distant. Sites at Eversley and sites to the south of Fleet/Church Crookham are also quite distant, at c. 3 to 4km.
• Distance (straight line) to the nearest bus route operated by Stagecoach - the average distance is 1169m, with 60 sites within 500m (dark green) and a further 26 sites within 1km (light green). At the other end of the scale, 37 sites are beyond 2km (red). It is again the case that sites at Crondall, Long Sutton and South Warnborough are all distant, at c.3 to 4km. N.B. the available data is limited, in that the available layer does not show all available bus routes. Another layer is available that shows the location of bus stops; however, this dataset was not used for the analysis, as it is thought to be unreliable, in that numerous of the bus stops shown on the layer have no service, or only a very limited service (e.g. less than one service per day).

Biodiversity

Several GIS layers for the District as a whole are available to enable analysis of the 183 site options. Specifically, the available data enables the site options to be analysed in respect of: distance to nearest Special Protection Area (SPA); distance to nearest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); distance to nearest Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SINC); distance to nearest ancient woodland; and percent overlap with a woodland/forest listed in the National Forest Inventory. N.B. all distances are measured as a straight line, i.e. ‘as the crow flies’.

Table A (see below) presents summary findings of the analysis, categorising the performance of sites on a red/amber/green scale reflecting the spread of the data (and also an understanding that there are certain well established distance thresholds). The following bullet points give further consideration to the summary findings presented in Table A -

• Distance to nearest SPA - the average distance is 2899m, with 12 sites beyond 7km (dark green) and a further 22 sites beyond 5km (light green). At the other end of the scale, 19 sites are within 400m (red). Sites that beyond the important 7km buffer, as defined by Natural England, are found at Long Sutton and South Warnborough, whilst additional sites at Odham and North Warnborough are beyond the 5km buffer defined by Natural England. Sites to the west of Hook are also notable for falling right on the edge of the 5km buffer.

• Distance to nearest SSSI - the average distance is 890m, with 6 sites beyond 3km (dark green) and a further 22 sites beyond 5km (light green). At the other end of the scale, 64 sites are within 400m (red). Sites to the west of Hook are in notably close proximity to Hook Common SSSI, whilst sites at Crondall, Long Sutton and South Warnborough are notably distant from a SSSI.

• Distance to nearest SINC - the average distance is 252m, with 13 sites beyond 800m (dark green) and a further 34 sites beyond 400m (light green). At the other end of the scale, 46 sites are within 10m (red). Again, sites to the west of Hook are in notably close proximity, with College Copse, Owens Farm Meadow and ‘the Strings’ adjacent or in close proximity, whilst sites to at Crondall, Long Sutton and South Warnborough are notably distant from a SINC.

• Distance to nearest ancient woodland - the average distance is 567m, with 55 sites beyond 800m (dark green) and a further 41 sites beyond 400m (light green). At the other end of the scale, 27 sites are within 10m (red). Notable sites intersecting an ancient woodland include the CEMEX site at Eversley (34%), Land north west of Hook (18%) and Brook House, Fleet (14%). Notable sites that are adjacent to an ancient woodland include Owens Farm, to the west of Hook, and Land north west of Crondall and Rye Common.

• Percent overlap with other woodland/forest - the average percentage overlap is 11%, with 26 sites overlapping by more than 25% (red). Land at Reading Road, Yateley, is one site with a notably high percentage overlap (84%).

Climate change mitigation

No data is available to enable GIS analysis of the site options. Whilst some site options may well have greater potential to incorporate on-site low carbon and renewable energy technologies (including on account of the scale and density of development or the terrain and aspect of the site), or link to a decentralised source of low carbon / renewable energy, there is insufficient evidence to enable robust analysis.

Communities

No data is available to enable GIS analysis of the site options. Ideally layers would be available showing the location of features within the landscape that represent a health or safety risk, e.g. sources of noise pollution.
Employment and the economy

GIS layers for the District as a whole are available to enable analysis of the 183 site options. Specifically, the available data enables the site options to be analysed in respect of: distance to nearest Locally Important Employment Site; and distance to nearest Strategic Employment Site.

N.B. a weakness of the analysis is that data was not available to show the location of employment sites in neighbouring local authority areas.

The following bullet points give further consideration to the summary findings presented in Table A -

- Distance to nearest Locally Important Employment Site - the average distance is 1641m, with 45 sites within 1km (dark green) and a further 91 sites within 2km (light green). At the other end of the scale, one site overlaps (red) and a further five are adjacent (amber); eight sites are beyond 5km (red) and a further nine sites are beyond 4km (amber). Sites notably distant include all sites at Long Sutton and South Warnborough.

- Distance to nearest distance to nearest Strategic Employment Site - the average distance is 3290m, with 55 sites within 2km (dark green) and a further 60 sites within 4km (light green). At the other end of the scale, one site overlaps (red) and another one is adjacent (amber); 21 sites are beyond 6km (red) and a further 18 sites are beyond 5km (amber). Sites notably distant include all sites at Long Sutton, South Warnborough, Crondall and Eversley.

Flood risk / climate change adaptation

One GIS layers for the District as a whole is available to enable analysis of the 183 site options. Specifically, the available data enables the site options to be analysed in respect of: percent overlap with a flood risk zone, as defined by the Environment Agencies national dataset.

Focusing on Flood Zone 3 (highest risk), the average overlap is 6.6%. 18 sites overlap by more than 25% (red) and a further 31 by less than 25% (amber). Sites with a notably high intersect include: Land at Brook House (61%), Hook Garden Centre (30%), Land between Eversley Road and Figrove Road, Yateley (24%) and Land at Reading Road, Yateley (22%).

Housing

No data is available to enable GIS analysis of the site options. It would not be appropriate to suggest that a large site performs better than a small site simply because there is the potential to deliver more homes. Housing objectives could be met through the delivery of numerous small sites, or through delivery of a smaller number of large sites (albeit it is recognised that financial viability, and hence the potential to deliver affordable housing, can be higher at large sites).

Historic environment

Several GIS layers for the District as a whole are available to enable analysis of the 183 site options. Specifically, the available data enables the site options to be analysed in respect of: distance to nearest Listed Building; distance to nearest Scheduled Monument; distance to nearest Conservation Area; and distance to nearest Registered Park and Garden.

Table A (see below) presents summary findings of the analysis, categorising the performance of sites on a red/amber/green scale reflecting the spread of the data. The following bullet points give further consideration to the summary findings presented in Table A -

- Distance to nearest Listed Building - the average distance is 187m, with 25 sites beyond 400m (dark green) and a further 31 sites beyond 200m (light green). At the other end of the scale, 61 sites are within 50m (red), and a further 34 within 100m (amber). Sites notably intersecting a listed building include Land north-west of Hook and Bramshill Police College; however, both are large sites (over 100ha) such that there would be good potential to avoid/mitigate through layout and landscaping.

- Distance to nearest Scheduled Monument - the average distance is 2606m, with just two sites within 100m (red) and a further two sites within 200m (amber).

- Distance to nearest Conservation Area - the average distance is 361m, with 26 sites beyond 1km (dark green) and a further 27 sites beyond 500m (light green). At the other end of the scale, 91 sites are within 50m (red), and a further 19 are within 200m (amber). Sites in notably close proximity include all sites at Long Sutton and South Warnborough.
• Distance to nearest Registered Park and Garden - the average distance is 1526m, with 70 sites beyond 2km (dark green) and a further 49 sites beyond 1km (light green). At the other end of the scale, 17 sites are within 50m (red), and a further 25 are within 500m (amber). Notable sites in close proximity include Land north-west of Hook (0m), Land adj to Causeway Farm, Hartley Wintney (0m), Land adjacent to Warbrook House, Eversley (0m), Bramshill Police College (0m), Fermoy, Farnham Road, Odiham (0m), Brook House, Fleet (1m) and Owens Farm, Hook (13m).

Land and other resources

The nationally available agricultural land quality map (see magic.gov.uk) is of a very low resolution and so not suited to the analysis of site options. The main point to note is that the nationally available map shows there to be areas of better quality agricultural land in the south of the District, in the area between Odiham and Long Sutton, and in the vicinity of Crondall.

Landscape

No data is available to enable GIS analysis of the site options, given no designated landscapes within the District. The Hart Landscape Capacity Study (2016; available at https://www.hart.gov.uk/Evidence-base) provides a useful overview, but is not suited to comparing and contrasting the merits of site options.

Transport

See discussion above, under ‘accessibility’. No datasets are available

Water

No data is available to enable GIS analysis of the site options in terms of water quality. Whilst water pollution sensitivity may vary spatially (including relating to issues associated with the capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works), there is limited available mapped data. It is also the case that issues can often be appropriately addressed through masterplanning/design measures, and so are appropriately considered at the planning application stage. The same can be said for drainage issues.

In terms of water resource availability, this does not vary significantly within the District, and hence need not be a consideration here. It is also not possible to appraise site options in terms of the potential to support water efficiency. Whilst it might be suggested that larger development schemes might be more able to deliver higher standards of sustainable design (including water efficiency measures) this assumption will not always hold true.

Finally, it is unnecessary to appraise site options in terms of groundwater ‘source protection zones’ and ‘primary aquifers’. The presence of a groundwater source protection zone or aquifer does not represent a major constraint for most (non-polluting) types of development.

Summary findings of the GIS analysis for each site option

Table A includes a row for each of the site options, categorising performance against each of the GIS criteria introduced above using a red/amber/green scale (with categorisation primarily reflecting the spread of the data, more so than any understanding of effect thresholds). N.B. The spreadsheet containing the underlying data is available upon request.

The following are further points to note -

• Sites are presented in order according to the settlement hierarchy.
• Sites that are a ‘variable’ across the reasonable spatial strategy alternatives (as introduced in Section 6.5) are highlighted in yellow (or light yellow where the sites are at Long Sutton or South Warnborough, as these two villages are considered as an area of search)
• Sites that fall within the Murrell Green / Winchfield Area of Search are highlighted in orange.
### Table A: Summary findings of the GIS analysis

<p>| SHLAA ref. | Name                                          | Settlement      | Area (ha) | Town / Local Centre | Train Station | Bus Route | SPA | SSSI | SINC | Ancient Woodland | Other Woodland/Forest | Local Employment Site | Strategic Employment Site | Flood Zone 3 | Listed Building | Scheduled Monument Area | Conservation Area | Registered Park / Garden |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|-----|------|------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 028       | 26-32 Bowenhurst Road, Fleet                  | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.4       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 036       | Dachs Copse, Church Crookham                 | Fleet &amp;CC       | 1.2       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 041       | Imac Systems, Fleet                           | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.1       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 042       | Camden Walk, Fleet                            | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.2       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 044       | Land at The Millmede and The Oakmede, Minley Road, Fleet | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.4       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 050       | Waterfront Business Park                     | Fleet &amp;CC       | 1.5       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 052       | Land adj. to Pale Lane Farm, Fleet           | Fleet &amp;CC       | 60.8      |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 081       | Vertu                                         | Fleet &amp;CC       | 1.8       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 090       | Stillers Farm                                | Fleet &amp;CC       | 4.7       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 104       | Park &amp; Ride area, Elvetham Heath             | Fleet &amp;CC       | 2.3       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 113       | Thurlston House                              | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.7       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 166       | Land west of Ewshot Lane                     | Fleet &amp;CC       | 6.6       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 192       | 140-150 Fleet Road, Fleet                    | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.2       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 195       | Lismoyne Hotel, 45 Church Road, Fleet        | Fleet &amp;CC       | 1.0       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 197       | Hartland Park                                | Fleet &amp;CC       | 55.1      |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 208       | Admiral House, Fleet                         | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.5       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 245       | 154-158 Albert St &amp; Fleet Road               | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.2       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 275       | Land at Little Mead, Fleet                   | Fleet &amp;CC       | 1.1       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 320       | Fleet Town Centre Zone 2                     | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.6       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| 322       | Fleet Town Centre Zone 4                     | Fleet &amp;CC       | 0.2       |                     |               |           |     |      |      |                 |                        |                       |                        |                |                 |                        |                       |
| SHLAA ref. | Name                                      | Settlement     | Area (ha) | Town/Local Centre | Train Station | Bus Route | SPA | SSSI | SINC | Ancient Woodland | Other Woodland/Forest | Local Employment Site | Strategic Employment Site | Flood Zone 3 | Listed Building | Scheduled Monument | Conservation Area | Registered Park | Garden |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|-----------|-----|------|------|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 354       | Plot 1, Redfields Court                   | Fleet &amp;CC      | 2.3       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 001 &amp; 2   | Land NE of Hook                           | Hook           | 6.7       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 005       | Land north-west of Hook                   | Hook           | 107       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 006       | Land at Holt Lane, Hook                   | Hook           | 1.0       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 009       | Land off Hop Garden Road                  | Hook           | 1.8       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 038       | Rawlings, Hook                            | Hook           | 1.1       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 130       | West of Varndell Road                     | Hook           | 1.9       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 037       | Land at Reading Road, Yateley             | Yateley and Blackwater | 1.3 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 020       | Land at Reading Road, Yateley             | Yateley and Blackwater | 1.3 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 037       | Land at Reading Road, Yateley             | Yateley and Blackwater | 4.8 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 103       | Land adj Crosby Gdns, Yateley             | Yateley and Blackwater | 0.4 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 107       | Heath End, Reading Rd, Blackwater         | Yateley and Blackwater | 0.1 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 149       | Land east of Mill Lane, Yateley           | Yateley and Blackwater | 0.9 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 176       | Hawley Farm House                         | Yateley and Blackwater | 0.2 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| 194       | Land at Firgrove Road, Eversley          | Yateley and Blackwater | 4.6 |               |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                  |                 |                     |                     |
| SHLAA ref. | Name | Settlement                      | Area (ha) | Town/Local Centre | Train Station | Bus Route | SPA | SSSI | SINC | Ancient Woodland | Other Woodland/Forest | Local Employment Site | Strategic Employment Site | Flood Zone 3 | Listed Building | Scheduled Monument | Conservation Area | Registered Park/Garden |
|-----------|------|--------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|-----------|-----|------|------|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 199       | Land at Calcott Park, Yateley | Yateley and Blackwater           | 1.5       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 273       | Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road | Yateley and Blackwater           | 7.0       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 303       | Surplus Land at Frogmore Community College | Yateley and Blackwater           | 0.4       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 308       | Green Lane Car Park, Yateley    | Yateley and Blackwater           | 0.2       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 035       | Land south of Thackhams Lane, Hartley Wintney | Hartley Wintney                  | 1.5       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 089       | Land adj to Causeway Green      | Hartley Wintney                  | 4.2       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 093       | Land at Springfield Ave, Hartley Wintney | Hartley Wintney                  | 2.2       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 094       | Land adj to Causeway Farm, Hartley Wintney | Hartley Wintney                  | 0.9       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 095       | Nero Brewery, Hartley Wintney   | Hartley Wintney                  | 0.2       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 132       | Wintney Court                   | Hartley Wintney                  | 5.6       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 155       | Land at Hare's Farm, Hartley Wintney | Hartley Wintney                  | 9.4       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 177       | Land at Croft Lane, Hartley Wintney | Hartley Wintney                  | 0.4       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 029       | Land at Butts End               | Odiham &amp; North Warnborough       | 0.5       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 057       | Land adj. to Queen's Road, Nth Warnborough | Odiham &amp; North Warnborough       | 2.6       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 058       | Land at Hook Road/Bridge Road, North Warnborough | Odiham &amp; North Warnborough       | 1.6       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 059       | Land at Mill Corner, North Warnborough | Odiham &amp; North Warnborough       | 11.6      |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |
| 060       | Land adjoining Rough's Cottage, Bartley Heath | Odiham &amp; North Warnborough       | 0.4       |                   |               |           |     |      |      |                |                        |                      |                        |                     |                  |                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Town / Local Centre</th>
<th>Train Station</th>
<th>Bus Route</th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>SSSI</th>
<th>SINC</th>
<th>Ancient Woodland</th>
<th>Other Woodland/Forest</th>
<th>Local Employment Site</th>
<th>Strategic Employment Site</th>
<th>Flood Zone 3</th>
<th>Listed Building</th>
<th>Scheduled Monument</th>
<th>Conservation Area</th>
<th>Registered Park / Garden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>Land at Dunley's Hill, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>Rear garden of 4 Western Lane, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>Close Meadow, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Land north of Deptford Lane</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Land at the rear of Longwood, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Land off Firs Lane</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Land adjacent to A287</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Land rear of Albion Yard</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Land South of Crownfields, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Land to rear Buryfields Sch, TheMead &amp; NewHouse</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Land west of Adams Farm, The Street, Nth Warn</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Former Kitchen Garden, Odiham</td>
<td>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Town / Local Centre</td>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>Bus Route</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>SINC</td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Other woodland / Forest</td>
<td>Local Employment Site</td>
<td>Strategic Employment Site</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Registered Park / Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Land at Searl's Farm, Hook</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Land at Totters Farm, Hook</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Land opposite Church Rise, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Daegmarsfield Farm, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Land at Grange Farm, Hartley Wintney</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Linklater Cottages, Blackwater</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Warbrook House, Eversley</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Land at Eversley Cross</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Land at Brook House</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Land north of Reading Road, Eversley</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Land at Hyde Road</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>Land east of Copse Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>Plough Meadow, South Warnborough</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Land adjoining Winchfield Court</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Fermoy, Farnham Road, Odiham</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Riverside Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>Land at Stroud Lane, Crookham Village</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>Land adj. to Dogmersfield Primary School</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Land at Church Lane, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>Granary Field</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Stables at Lees Cottage, South Warnborough</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Town / Local Centre</td>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>Bus Route</td>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>SINC</td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Other woodland/Forest</td>
<td>Local Employment Site</td>
<td>Strategic Employment Site</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Registered Park / Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>Land adj. to Nash Meadows/Ridley's Piece, South</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>Land adj. to Four Acre Field, Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>Land west of Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>Land north west of Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>Land at Street Farmhouse</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>Parsonage Meadow, Croft Lane, Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>Land adj to Ewshot Hall, Ewshot</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>The Bagwell Fields</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>Land south of Hamilton House</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>Tanglewood, Ewshot</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>Shapley Heath, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>Land at Winfield Lodge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>Land east of The Barley Mow, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>Site of Old Brick Works, Rotherwick</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>Land Nth West of Rotherwick</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>Land adj. to 10 Rotten Green</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>Land south of Riseley</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>Land adj to Calthorpe Houses, Hartfordbridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>Land adj to the Orchard, Hartfordbridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Guillemont Park North</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Land adj to 11 Hulfords Lane, Hartfordbridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Town/Local Centre</td>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>Bus Route</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>SINC</td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Other Woodland/Forest</td>
<td>Local Employment Site</td>
<td>Strategic Employment Site</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Registered Park/Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Land at Bramshot Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Land &amp; Buildings at Hazeley Bottom, Nr. H / W</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Bramshill Police College</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Holdshott House, Reading Road, Heckfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Land at Lodge Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Hook Garden Centre, Reading Rd, Hook</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>CEMEX</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Trimmers Cottage, Winchfield Hurst</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Land at Green Lane, Rotherwick</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Cross Farm, CV</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Oakfield Farm, Hartley Wintney</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>The Stalle, Hulfords Lane, Hartfordbridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Land west of the Fielders</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Land at Murrell Green, Hook</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Land at Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Land at Murrell Green (2), London Road, Hook</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Land at Pauls Field</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Rose Court, Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Swan's Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Shapley Ranch</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Western edge of Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Town / Local Centre</td>
<td>Bus Route</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Other Woodland/Forest</td>
<td>Local Employment Site</td>
<td>Strategic Employment Site</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Registered Park / Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Land off Warbrook Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Brook House, Fleet</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Land at Chamberlains Meadow, Heckfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Crondall House, Fleet</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Land at Dippenhall Street, Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Land to the rear of ’Belee’</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Land between M3 and Railway</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Baileys Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Totters Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Granary Court, South Warnborough</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Peacocks Nursery garden Centre</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Broden Stables and Stable Yard</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Bowenhurst Lane, Crondall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Crondall Bee Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Rye Common</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Part of Potbridge Farm, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Winchfield Meadow, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Winchfield Park, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Winchfield Court Farm, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Shapley Lake &amp; surrounds, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Bridge Farm 1, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Bridge Farm 2, Winchfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Brookmeadow Farm, Pilcôt Road, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Scrappyard, Totters Lane, Potbridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Land rear of Taplins</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Land at Bears Green</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Winchfield Park B</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Land adj. to James Farm Cottages, Hartley Wintney</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Jenhams Field, Odiham</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Land east of Redfields Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Land at Willow Croft</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Land at Vicarage Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Strawberry Field</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Dorneys, Eversley</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Land north of Hollybush Lane</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Land north of New Inn</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Land north of the Cemetery</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Land south of Hungerford Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Busta Farm</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Land at Rosemary Cottage, Rotherwick</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Land south of Chaffers Close</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Land at Reading Road Close</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA ref.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Town / Local Centre</td>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>Bus Route</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>SINC</td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Other woodland/forest</td>
<td>Local Employment Site</td>
<td>Strategic Employment Site</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>Registered Park / Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Land adjacent Odiham Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Land opposite Old Laundry, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Land to the North West of Long Sutton</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Land to the West of Long Sutton</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Land at Great Bramshot Farm (Sth of A327)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Plot 2, Oaklands Farm, Ewshot</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Land opposite Thatched Cottage, Dogmersfield</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Industrial Yard, Sankey Lane, Fleet</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V - REASONABLE SPATIAL STRATEGY ALTERNATIVES

Introduction
As explained within ‘Part 1’ above, a focus of work has been on the development and appraisal of ‘reasonable’ spatial strategy alternatives, with a view to informing determination of the preferred strategy.

The reasonable alternatives are as follows –

- Option 1 - Do minimum (i.e. just commitments, including Hartland Park)
- Option 2 - Do minimum plus allocation of non-strategic sites package
- Option 3 - Do minimum plus allocation of Pale Lane
- Option 4 - Do minimum plus allocation of West of Hook
- Option 5 - Do minimum plus allocation of Pale Lane + non-strategic sites package
- Option 6 - Do minimum plus allocation of West of Hook + non-strategic sites package
- Option 7 - Do minimum plus allocation of Pale Lane + West of Hook

Appraisal methodology
For each of the options, the assessment examines likely significant effects on the baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Table 4.1) as a methodological framework. Green is used to indicate significant positive effects, whilst red is used to indicate significant negative effects. Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high level nature of the policy approaches under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline (now and in the future under a ‘no plan’ scenario). In light of this, there is a need to make considerable assumptions regarding how scenarios will be implemented ‘on the ground’ and what the effect on particular receptors would be. Where there is a need to rely on assumptions in order to reach a conclusion on a ‘significant effect’ this is made explicit in the appraisal text.53

Where it is not possible to predict likely significant effects on the basis of reasonable assumptions, efforts are made to comment on the relative merits of the alternatives in more general terms and to indicate a rank of preference. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between the alternatives even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

Finally, it is important to note that effects are predicted taking into account the criteria presented within Regulations.54 So, for example, account is taken of the duration, frequency and reversibility of effects. Cumulative effects are also considered (i.e. where the effects of the plan in combination with the effects of other planned or on-going activity that is outside the control of the Hart Local Plan).

Appraisal findings
Appraisal findings are presented below within 12 separate tables (each table dealing with a specific sustainability objective) with a final table drawing conclusions.

The appraisal methodology is explained above, but to reiterate: For each sustainability topic the performance of each scenario is categorised in terms of ‘significant effects’ (using red / green) and also ranked in order of preference. Also, ‘=’ is used to denote instances of all alternatives performing on a par.

53 Conclusions reached on significant effects in relation to Option 4 - the Council’s preferred option - are supplemented within Chapter 10 of this report, which presents an appraisal of the draft plan - i.e. the preferred spatial strategy plus supporting policies.
54 Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
## Sustainability Topic: Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane + non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

There is a need to support delivery of new community infrastructure, to the benefit of new and potentially also existing communities, plus there is a need to deliver housing in locations well linked to higher order centres (e.g. Fleet). Having made these initial points, the following bullet points consider each of the locations that are a ‘variable’ across the reasonable alternatives -

- **Pale Lane (Options 3, 5 and 7)** - distant from Fleet town centre (c.2.5km); however, the proposals include improved pedestrian links to services and facilities (including a supermarket) at nearby Elvetham Heath and a new community hub and primary school on-site.

- **West of Hook (Options 4, 6 and 7)** - there are some issues with the quality of pedestrian connections between the large, far west site (Owen’s Farm) and the centre of Hook, with the most direct road (Newnham Lane) lacking a footpath; however there is potential to establish new routes. Owen’s Farm is somewhat distant from the town centre (c.1.9km by road), but the proposed community facility and primary school helps to reduce concerns in this respect. Residents would also have relatively good access to services and facilities in Basingstoke.

- **Non-strategic sites (Options 2, 5 and 6)** - none would deliver a primary school, although it is noted that one of the sites previously considered in Long Sutton could feasibly support expansion of the primary school (which is also relied upon by residents of South Warnborough). It is also noted that Hampshire County Council were supportive of proposals for growth at Yateley, Eversley and Crondall, from a schools capacity perspective, when proposed through the Draft Plan in 2017, on the basis that there is existing schools capacity (Yateley and Eversley) or potential for expansion of the primary school (Crondall).

More generally, Crondall, Eversley and Long Sutton / South Warnborough are all ‘tier 4’ villages within the settlement hierarchy, which indicates very limited services/facilities available locally. Of these settlements, Crondall and Long Sutton are also notable for having a very limited (or nil) bus service. Focusing on ‘West of Yateley’, the proposed linked scheme would create new walking and cycling links between the Eversley and Yateley; however, the centre of Yateley is some way distant (c.1km), as is Eversley primary school (c.1km).

Finally, with regards to ‘South of Church Crookham’, whilst there is no district or local centre within the southern part of Fleet, certain new services and facilities are being delivered as part of the adjacent new Crookham Park scheme - including expansion of Church Crookham Junior School, in 2019, to 150 places per year group - which may have capacity.

Finally, it is recognised that, whilst maximising growth at Fleet (i.e. allocation of both Pale Lane and a non-strategic scheme at ‘South of Church Crookham’) is potentially appropriate in the sense that this is the District’s main town, a concentration of new development might create risks in terms of the capacity of community infrastructure. One notable risk with higher growth at Fleet relates to secondary school capacity, and whether there is sufficient scope for expansion, given that children from the 1,500 Hartland Park scheme would be within the catchment of Fleet secondary schools.

In conclusion, it is difficult to differentiate the alternatives, but on balance it is fair to conclude that Option 1 (do minimum, i.e. allocate Hartland Park only) is best performing, and Option 5 is worst performing, due to concerns regarding secondary school capacity at Fleet. Significant negative effects are not predicted, however, given the potential for a new secondary school to be delivered as part of a new settlement in the Murrell Green/Winchfield area, in the medium term.
### Sustainability Topic: Biodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane + non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**

| Rank | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

**Significant effects?**

| No | Yes |

**Discussion**

A key consideration is the need to avoid significant adverse effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), which in practice involves: A) directing growth to less sensitive locations, i.e. locations beyond the 5km and 7km buffers that have been defined; and B) ensuring that there is potential to deliver sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to mitigate increased recreational pressure. There is a need to ensure avoidance and mitigation in-line with South East Plan Policy NRM6 and the TBHSPA Delivery Framework.

The majority of sites in question could potentially adversely affect the TBHSPA, with Long Sutton / South Warnborough (Options 2, 5 and 6) the only settlements outside of the 7km buffer.

West of Hook (Options 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7) is also notable for the bulk of the site being located just outside of the 5km buffer (but still within the 7km buffer). With regards to SANG provision, there remains some uncertainty, but there may be potential to provide a strategic SANG, i.e. SANG that will have ‘spare capacity’ available for residents other than the residents of the new site in question. A SANG might also link with planned provision at an adjacent smaller permitted site (High Ridge Farm). There are also some onsite and nearby constraints, in the form of adjacent Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) and Hook Common SSSI a short distance to the south (seemingly with pedestrian access via a bridge over the motorway).

A strategic urban extension at Pale Lane (Options 3, 5 and 7) would deliver sufficient SANG to mitigate recreational impacts; however, the SANG would not link with the new Country Park SANG west of Fleet (or at least not link well, with the railway forming a barrier). The site is also notably constrained in ‘non-SPA’ terms, with two SINCs onsite; however, there is good potential to deliver on-site green infrastructure, in the form of a ‘green spine’ through the site.

A SANG proposal is also associated with one of the non-strategic sites (Options 2, 5 and 6), namely West of Yateley, whilst in close proximity to the SPA (c.1km), would deliver a large SANG comprising part of the gap between Yateley and Eversley.

However, other non-strategic sites (Options 2, 5 and 6) would not deliver SANG, namely North of Reading Road, Eversley (c.1.5km to the SPA; also adjacent to a SINC and comprising significant onsite vegetation), NW of Crondall (within the 5km buffer; plus an ancient woodland SINC is adjacent) and Hop Garden and W of Varnell Rd, Hook (just outside the 5km SPA buffer, plus there are onsite biodiversity constraints, as discussed above).

In conclusion, it is fair to conclude that lower growth is preferable, meaning that Option 1 (do minimum, i.e. allocate Hartland Park only) is best performing. It is very difficult to differentiate between the other alternatives, and so the ranking broadly reflects the total quantum of growth.

Taking a precautionary approach - e.g. one that takes account of the risk of SANG delivery/capacity issues - it is appropriate to highlight all options, other than Option 1, as the worst performing option as having the potential to result in significant negative effects, given the potential for impacts to the TBHSPA, the SSSIs and locally important habitats.
**Sustainability Topic: Climate change mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+</td>
<td>West of Hook+</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant effects?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key climate change mitigation consideration relates to the potential to affect average per capita transport-related CO₂ emissions, which are relatively high in Hart, reflecting the district’s rural character; however, this is considered under ‘Transport’ below.

Instead, the discussion here focuses on the potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, and hence minimise per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment. In practice, this means supporting larger scale developments, of several hundred homes (or clusters of smaller developments that can be developed in a coordinated way), as development at scale enables delivery of the necessary infrastructure.

In light of these points, options involving strategic extensions at West of Hook or Pale Lane (Options 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) potentially perform well. Both schemes would be in excess of 500 homes, which could potentially give rise to some (limited) opportunity to design-in low carbon infrastructure and/or achieve higher standards of sustainable design and construction.

However, there is little certainty in practice, going by what has been proposed recently through planning applications. The current application at Owen’s Farm (a large site that would comprise the bulk of a West of Hook strategic site) does not include any proposals related to minimising CO₂ emissions from the built environment, whilst the Sustainability Statement submitted as part of the current planning application for 700 homes at Pale Lane is somewhat non-committal, stating: “Various low-carbon and renewable technologies are considered appropriate including the possible use of solar hot water heating panels, photovoltaic panels, flue-gas and waste-water heat recovery system for the dwellings and air source heat pumps for the non-residential element. A combined heat and power unit will also be considered for the school building.”

In conclusion, Option 7 performs best as it would involve a concentration of growth at two strategic urban extensions; however, there is much uncertainty regarding what would be achieved in practice.

With regard to effect significance, no significant effects are predicted. Climate change mitigation is a global issue, and hence it is not possible to conclude on the significance of local actions.

N.B, this prediction is made recognising that all options would also involve development of a c.1,500 home new settlement at Hartland Park, which could give rise to opportunities.
### Sustainability Topic: Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**

| = | = | = | = | = | = | = |

**Significant effects?** No

Aside from implications for ‘accessibility’, which are discussed above, there are limited further points to make. The Pale Lane strategic site (Options 3, 5 and 7) is constrained by its proximity to the M3 and the railway line running west from Fleet; however, there should be good potential for mitigation, with the Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the current planning application proposing -

> “To reduce the noise associated with the M3, a suitably specified 3.5m high acoustic barrier located on the northern boundary of the Site, at the edge of the M3 carriageway, would be effective at reducing sound levels across the Site.

> To reduce the noise effects associated with passing trains along the railway line, dwellings are to be situated at least 60m away from noise source. By incorporating this buffer, groundborne vibration impacts are minimised and, as agreed with HDC, scoped out from requiring assessment.

> To reduce the internal noise effects on dwellings facing the main noise sources (i.e. the M3, Fleet Road and the railway line) it is likely that uprated acoustic glazing and alternative forms of ventilation may be required. If private amenity space is to be located in these areas the orientation of the dwellings should be used to acoustically shield the amenity space from the nearest dominant noise source. Avoiding building within the watermain presents an opportunity to provide a landscape buffer to Great Bog Copse, providing an attractive setting to homes along the Site’s eastern edge.”

Several of the sites in question are potentially also somewhat problematic from a road safety perspective, including Owen’s Farm (West of Hook; Options 4, 6 and 7). The Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the current planning application explains -

> “The main pedestrian access will be from Newnham Road. As no footway provisions currently exist, a footway will be provided to link with the existing footway at Seton Drive… Hook town centre is located approximately 1.2km east of the site… While there are no specific cycle facilities in the local area, the local highway network is considered to be of a suitable and safe standard to encourage cycle use… The nearest bus stop to the site is located approximately 800m to the east…”

Finally, it is noted that the North of Crondall site is not supported by Crondall Parish Council, who stated through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation that, amongst other things, development would: “ruin the site’s amenity value for Scouts from across the District (it is a central focus for activities)”. In conclusion, there are some specific concerns associated certain sites; however, these concerns are seemingly of limited significance, given potential for mitigation. On balance, the alternatives are judged to perform broadly on a par, and significant effects are not deemed likely.
### Sustainability Topic: Employment and the economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**<br>Significant effects?<br>No

**Discussion**<br>None of the sites in question would involve delivery of new employment land, and hence the alternatives are judged to perform broadly on a par, and significant effects are not predicted. There is little reason to suggest that higher growth housing growth is necessarily to be supported, given that Hart is not recognised a ‘hotspot’ of employment growth. The main factor that potentially enables some differentiation between the alternatives is need to concentrate housing growth in proximity to employment growth, which in practice means in proximity to Fleet and Hook. It might also be suggested that housing growth in the rural area is to be supported from a perspective of wishing to support rural business and the rural economy.

### Sustainability Topic: Flood risk and other climate change adaptation issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**<br>No

**Discussion**<br>The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) identifies a range of flood risk areas across the District. Taking each site in turn -<br>- Pale Lane, Fleet - the River Hart floodplain skirts the site, and encroaches to within a short distance of the railway underpass that would provide important access/egress. Perhaps more significantly, the underpass is at high risk of surface water flooding (1 in 30 year).<br>- West of Hook - Owen’s Farm is notable for having a relatively high area affected by surface water flood risk, however, much of this is within the lower risk zone (1 in 1000 year).<br>- South of Church Crookham - falls within a ‘Causal Area’ (as does the entirety of Fleet, and indeed the majority of the eastern half of the District). Surface water flood risk (albeit mainly low probability, 1 in 1000 year) is quite extensive to the west of Ewshot Road.<br>- West of Yateley - a tributary of the River Blackwater skirts the site. Also within a Causal Area.<br>- East of Yateley - within a Causal Area.<br>- North West of Crondall - groundwater flood risk is an issue in this part of the District, and Crondall also falls within a Causal Area.<br>- North of Reading Road, Eversley - groundwater flood risk is an issue in this part of the District.<br>- Long Sutton / South Warnborough - no major constraints.<br>In conclusion, as there are quite extensive issues relating to flood risk in the District, it is appropriate to conclude that Option 1 performs best, with Option 4 also performing well as West of Hook is a relatively unconstrained location. Option 5 is worst performing, as it would involve higher growth delivered without West of Hook. Significant negative effects are not predicted, as fluvial flood risk zones can be avoided, and there will be good potential to design-in SuDS.
Firstly, giving consideration to the two strategic urban extension options reflected across the alternatives (Owen’s Farm and Pale Lane), both sites are notably constrained.

The main constraint at Pale Lane is the listed farmhouse close to the eastern edge of the site, which could be enveloped by development. There might the potential for mitigation, through sensitive masterplanning; however, this is thought to be a challenge with a 700 home scheme, recognising the need to also find sufficient land within the site for other uses, including SANG.

The heritage issues at Owens Farm are quite different, in that they are more indirect. The main concern is that development would erode the landscape gap that currently separates the Newnham CA from the western edge of Hook. Also, the Rotherwick CA is a fairly short distance to the north, with Grade II* listed Tylney Hall at its southern extent (also classified as a historic park and garden); however there are intervening landscape features (woodland and mature trees). Site promoters argue that “there is no ‘sense’ of gap when driving between Hook and Newnham”. Site promoters also suggest that “development of this land will provide a significant benefit in terms of providing a link to Rotherwick and Newnham”; however, it is not clear that such a link is welcomed from a heritage (or landscape) perspective.

With regards to the package of smaller urban extension sites, the first point to make is that any development at Long Sutton or South Warnborough would likely have a bearing on the setting of a conservation area. Secondly, West of Yateley would involve development in close proximity to three CAs: Yateley, Up Green and Eversley Cross. Finally, it is noted that Stillers Farm is a listed building, the setting of which would, in all likelihood, be significant affected by a scheme to the South of Church Crookham.

In conclusion, as there are quite extensive heritage constraints to expansion of settlements in the District, it is appropriate to conclude that Option 1 performs well. It is difficult to differentiate between the other options. There is some reason to suggest that Option 3 performs well as Pale Lane would only impact on one listed building; however, there is no certainty in this respect, as there is the potential for the impact to that one listed building to be significant.

With regards to effect significance, it is difficult to draw conclusions. Under all options there will be good potential for mitigation through appropriate design, layout and landscaping. At this stage it is appropriate to ‘flag’ the potential for all options other than ‘do minimum’ to result in significant negative effects; however, there would be good potential to avoid/mitigate impacts.
### Sustainability Topic: Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Significant effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion

A key consideration is the need to deliver the housing target over the plan period, and maintain a robust ‘housing trajectory’, i.e. maintain a situation whereby there is a five year supply of deliverable sites. This is important, as in the absence of a five year land supply the housing policies of the Local Plan would be considered ‘out of date’ leaving the Council in a much weaker position to refuse speculative planning applications for housing in the countryside. The result would be a distribution of development that is not ‘plan led’, with implications for meeting specific housing needs (i.e. needs of particular communities and groups within the population).

On this basis, Options 5, 6 and 7 can be seen to perform very well. These options would involve providing for a very large contingency, or ‘buffer’, over-and-above local housing needs, as currently understood from the Government’s draft standardised methodology for calculating local housing needs. A sizeable contingency can be appropriate, given the risk of one or more sites not delivering as anticipated. Were all sites to deliver as anticipated, the outcome would be significantly more homes delivered in the District than are strictly needed; however, the outcome under such a scenario would be that affordable housing needs are more fully met locally. This is an important consideration, given the extent of affordable housing needs that exist (see discussion under ‘Housing quanta’ in Section 6.2). It could also transpire that the surplus land is made available to meet unmet needs arising from elsewhere; however, there is currently little or no reason to suggest that Hart will be asked to receive unmet needs.

Options 5 and 6 potentially perform best, as they would involve a diverse array of sites, leading to high confidence regarding the housing trajectory. Sites would also be spread geographically, which should mean that ‘very local’ housing needs are met. Just by way of an example, Lord Wandsworth College is a significant employer at Long Sutton, which might benefit from provision of nearby market and affordable housing, given the rural location.

**In conclusion**, all alternatives would lead to significant positive effects, as there would be a land supply in place sufficient to provide for local housing needs (as currently understood) plus a suitably large contingency. The ranking of the alternatives reflects the size of the, and the mix of sites proposed.

---

45 Within the Housing Market Area (HMA), the current understanding is that there is likely to be good potential to deliver local housing needs, although there remains a degree of uncertainty, given that the Rushmoor Local Plan is yet to be submitted, and the Surrey Heath Local Plan is at an early stage of preparation. As for authorities beyond the HMA, numerous consultees at the Draft Plan stage sought to highlight delivery problems (e.g. delivery in Basingstoke and Deane was 484 dpa over the first five years of the current plan period, against a target of 850 dpa); however, there is nothing to suggest that Councils with delivery problems won’t be able to rectify the problem through preparation of a new Local Plan / allocation of further sites. There is also the possibility of being asked - under the Duty to Cooperate - to provide for unmet needs arising from outside of the HMA, including from London. However, there is currently little precedent of such ‘beyond HMA’ arrangements nationally and the GLA has not approached Hart regarding unmet housing needs.
Sustainability Topic: Land and other resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant effects?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

There is a need to avoid loss of higher quality ('best and most versatile') agricultural land. In this respect, all undeveloped land in Hart is either Grade 2 (very good quality), Grade 3 (good to moderate quality) or Grade 4 (moderate quality) in the Agricultural Land Classification, according to the nationally available ‘Provisional Agricultural Land Quality’ dataset. The data-set shows there to be three patches of Grade 2 agricultural land, in the south of the district.

The national data-set is of very low resolution, which means that it is difficult to apply it to the appraisal of individual sites, and in turn difficult to apply it to the appraisal of the spatial strategy alternatives. However, it is possible to take from the dataset that sites at Long Sutton and South Warnborough, in the south of the District, are not likely to comprise lower quality Grade 4 land.

The other available dataset is known as the ‘Post 1988’ dataset. This dataset is an accurate reflection of agricultural land quality, on the basis that the methodology involves field surveys. However, the data-set is very patchy, with data only being available for a small proportion of the district. Of the sites that are a variable across the alternatives, data is available (either from magic.gov.uk or from information submitted as part of recent planning applications) for just three sites -

- Owen’s Farm and the two adjacent smaller West of Hook sites comprise grade 3b
- West of Yateley - comprises mainly grade 3a, with some grade 3b
- Pale Lane - comprises 41% grade 3a and 12% grade 2.

It is also important to note that two of the non-strategic site options - North of the Reading Road, Eversley and East of Yateley - are well vegetated, and seemingly not in agricultural use.

In conclusion, it is fair to conclude that lower growth (Option 1) is preferable. Option 4 is second best performing, as a strategic extension at West of Hook would not involve loss of BMV agricultural land. Option 5 is worst performing, as it would involve greatest loss of BMV agricultural land.

It is appropriate to highlight Option 1 as leading to significant positive effects, given the focus of growth at a brownfield site (Hartland Park), whilst Options involving development of Pale Lane and/or the package of smaller sites would lead to significant negative effects, due to the extent of BMV agricultural land lost.

N.B. Another consideration relates to the sterilisation of known mineral resources, taking account of areas safeguarded by the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan 2013. In this respect, it is noted that two of the non-strategic sites under consideration - North of Reading Road, Eversley and Northwest of Crondall - falls within a safeguarding area for either sharp sand and gravel or clay. However, it is difficult to conclude that these safeguarded areas represent a significant constraint to development, given that there will be alternative locations within the safeguarding areas that can be quarried, and also given the possibility of extracting the mineral resource prior to developing the site for housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant effects?** No

**Discussion**

Both of the strategic site options are associated with some landscape sensitivity, although there is notable variability. West of Hook is more constrained, as development would significantly reduce the landscape gap that currently exists between Hook and Newnham. Also, there are public rights of way running through the site and in close proximity, which are likely to be well used given their proximity to residential areas in Hook/Newnham, and which have an established ‘rural feel’ that could be negatively affected by new development. Pale Lane is relatively unconstrained, although it may be visible from the M3 and railway line, especially if there is built development on the higher part of the site, at its north-eastern extent.

With regards to the smaller urban extension site options, points to note are –

- Land West of Varnell Road & Land off Hop Garden Road, Hook – is associated with similar issues to the Owen’s Farm site, albeit on a much smaller scale. Development would have an urbanising effect on the gap that currently exists between Hook and Newnham.

- West of Yateley – would impact on the Yateley/Eversley gap; however, delivery of SANG could also help to secure the gap in the long term, and the two built elements of the proposed scheme both integrate relatively well with the existing built form.

- Land NW of Crondall would extend the linear form of the village north to a considerable extent; however, the site is screened from the road by a tree belt. The site is not supported by Crondall Parish Council, who stated through the 2017 Draft Local Plan consultation that amongst other things, development would: “constitute ribbon development linking Crondall to Bowling Alley and destroy the existing gap between these areas. It rises above the existing road and is very poorly screened by a thin row of trees”.

- North of Reading Road, Eversley - would extend the linear built form over Eversley Centre, and result in the loss of what is seemingly secondary (i.e. non-ancient) woodland in a prominent location directly opposite the primary school.

- East of Yateley - would erode the Yateley / Blackwater landscape gap; however, there is existing vegetation that could be used for effective screening.

- South of Church Crookham - falls within the current designated gap between Church Crookham and Ewshot, as defined by Saved Policy CON21 of the adopted Hart Local Plan; however, falls outside of the indicative gap proposed by the Draft Local Plan (2017). The proposed revised gap reflects the extent of recently designated SANG.

In **conclusion**, as there are quite extensive landscape constraints to expansion of settlements in the District, it is appropriate to conclude that Option 1 performs well, with Option 3 performing second best, as Pale Lane is a relatively unconstrained location. Option 6 is worst performing, as it would involve higher growth delivered without Pale Lane.

It is not possible to conclude the likelihood of significant negative effects, as there would be no impacts to designated landscapes.
### Sustainability Topic: Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Option 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do minimum</td>
<td>Non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane</td>
<td>West of Hook</td>
<td>Pale Lane+ non-strategic</td>
<td>West of Hook + non-strategic</td>
<td>Pale Lane + West of Hook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discussion

There is a need to minimise the need to travel, and support ‘modal shift’ away from the private car, and instead towards walking, cycling and use of public transport. Having made these initial points, there is a need to consider each of the locations that are a ‘variable’ across the reasonable alternatives -

- **Pale Lane (Options 3, 5 and 7)** - distant from Fleet town centre (c.2.5km); however, the proposals include improved pedestrian links to services and facilities (including a supermarket) at nearby Elvetham Heath and a new community hub and primary school on-site. The site is fairly well linked to the strategic road network; however, there are concerns regarding the cumulative effects of growth at locations along the A323 / A30 corridor, should Pale Lane come forward alongside a new settlement in central Hart. Finally, there is a need to consider the potential for development at Pale Lane to impact in combination with a future new settlement in the Murrell Green / Winchfield area and/or to foreclose potential options for strategic road upgrades necessary to support a new settlement.

- **West of Hook (Options 4, 6 and 7)** - there are some issues with the quality of pedestrian connections between the large, far west site (Owen’s Farm) and the centre of Hook, with the most direct road (Newnham Lane) lacking a footpath; however there is potential to establish new routes. Owen’s Farm is somewhat distant from the town centre (c.1.9km by road), but the proposed community facility and primary school helps to reduce concerns in this respect. Residents would also have relatively good access to services and facilities in Basingstoke. Well linked to the strategic road network; however, Hampshire CC has highlighted the potential for traffic congestion at the London Road / Old School Road junction, due to travel in the direction of M3 Junction 5, and on the motorway junction itself.

- **Non-strategic sites (Options 2, 5 and 6)** - Crondall, Eversley and Long Sutton / South Warnborough are all ‘tier 4’ villages within the settlement hierarchy, which indicates limited services/facilities available locally, which in turn indicates a likelihood of needing to travel regularly to a higher order centre. Of these settlements, Long Sutton and South Warnborough are notable for being particularly distant from a higher order centre; and Crondall and Long Sutton are notable for having a very limited (or nil) bus service. Focusing on ‘West of Yateley’, the proposed linked scheme would create new walking and cycling links between the Eversley and Yateley, and there is a bus service through Eversley to Yateley and beyond (also passing the East of Yateley site); however, the centre of Yateley is some way distant (c.1km), as is Eversley primary school (c.1km).

In conclusion, it is difficult to differentiate the alternatives, but on balance it is fair to conclude that lower growth (Option 1) is preferable. Option 4 is second best performing, as a strategic extension at West of Hook poses relatively few strategic transport concerns. Option 5 is worst performing, as it would involve higher growth without allocation of West of Hook.

It is not possible to conclude ‘significant’ negative effects as there is no robust evidence to show that ‘severe’ congestion will result for the reasonable options taken as a whole (this is the key policy test established by the NPPF). Modelling work is currently being completed.
The Water Cycle Study (WCS) has highlighted that capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works (WwTW) in the north of the district (Eversley WwTW) is a potential issue for housing growth, which serves to indicate an issue for Options 3, 5 and 6. However, upgrades to the works at Eversley could potentially be phased in line with housing growth and to the standard required to avoid deterioration in the status of the River Blackwater.

The Study also identifies “very high” sewer network constraints for Pale Lane (Options 3, 5 & 7), which could have ecological impacts and result in sewer flooding to properties. However, it is usually feasible and viable to upgrade the sewer network through development.

The emerging WCS also notes the risk of impacts to sensitive groundwater in the south of the district; however, in practice this is unlikely to be a constraint given that polluting development (e.g. industry) is unlikely. For proposed residential development in these areas (which is at a relatively small level for all options) SuDS would need to be designed to avoid polluting the groundwater sources, within identified protection zones.

In conclusion, there are few constraints to growth that would affect one option more than another, but the matter of constraints at Eversley WwTW enables some differentiation between the alternatives.

Significant effects are not predicted for any of the options at this early stage in the plan-making process, because it is possible that all of the potential impacts could be overcome through appropriate investment in waste water and drainage infrastructure.\(^46\)

\(^46\) This prediction is made recognising that all options would also involve development at a number of other sites (i.e. sites that are a ‘given’ across the alternatives), including Sun Park and Hartland Park, which are located in the catchment of the Camberley WwTW, which currently has capacity constraints. The potential for making suitable upgrades to this WwTW needs to be investigated further, but if these cannot be made in time to facilitate new development, the WCS identifies the potential to connect to Fleet WwTW.
## Summary findings and conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Categorisation and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 1: Do minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and the economy</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk / climate change adaptation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and other resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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### Summary findings and conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Categorisation and rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Do minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary and conclusions

The first point to note is that the appraisal shows Option 1 (“Do minimum”, i.e. allocate Hartland Park only) to perform well in terms of the majority of sustainability objectives, reflecting the identified constraints to growth within Hart. Higher growth options do perform better from a ‘Housing’ perspective; however, all options would result in significant positive effects as there would be a land supply in place to deliver the Government’s draft local housing needs figure in practice (i.e. with a sufficient ‘buffer’ for non-delivery, or delayed delivery, at one or more sites). Higher growth is supported because of the size of the buffer, with Options 5 and 6 also performing well in the sense that they would involve a good mix of sites, in terms of size and distribution. Option 1 could potentially give rise to a degree of risk, in respect of ensuring a housing supply (potentially with knock-on implications for other sustainability objectives), given the degree of reliance on one site (namely Hartland Park); however, the risk is considered small, and the Council’s support for allocating land for a new settlement through a subsequent DPD helps to allay any concerns (see further discussion of the Council’s response to the alternatives appraisal findings within Chapter 8).

Focusing on other objectives -

- **Accessibility** – there are a number of factors, but on balance it is fair to conclude that Option 6 is worst performing, due to concerns regarding secondary school capacity at Fleet, plus concerns regarding the distribution of growth amongst lower order villages, including several with limited or no bus service.
- **Biodiversity** - both strategic sites are associated with significant constraints, as are certain of the smaller sites under consideration; hence ‘do minimum’ is the preferred option. Significant negative effects are predicted, for options other than the ‘do minimum’.
- **Climate change mitigation** - Option 7 performs best as it would involve a concentration of growth at two strategic-scale schemes, giving rise to the potential to deliver innovative measures that enable per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment to be minimised. However, in practice, it is not clear that there are significant opportunities (going by the proposals submitted as part of current planning applications for these two sites), plus there is also a need to factor-in CO₂ emissions from transport.
- **Communities** – both of the strategic urban extension options (Pale Lane and West of Hook) give rise to certain concerns (e.g. in respect of noise pollution and safe walking/cycling) but issues are fairly limited.
- **Employment and the economy** – None of the sites in question would involve delivery of new employment land, and hence the alternatives are judged to perform broadly on a par.
- **Flood risk / climate change adaptation** – the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited flood risk concerns.
- **Historic environment** – both strategic sites are associated with significant constraints, as are certain of the smaller sites under consideration; hence ‘do minimum’ is the preferred option. Significant negative effects are predicted, for options other than the ‘do minimum’, albeit with some uncertainty.
- **Land and other resources** – the ranking of the alternatives, and the conclusion on ‘significant effects’, reflect an understanding that ‘West of Hook’ does not comprise ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land.
- **Landscape** - the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension at Pale Lane gives rise to relatively limited landscape concerns.
- **Transport** – the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited transport concerns.
- **Water** - the ranking of the alternatives reflects an understanding that a strategic extension West of Hook gives rise to relatively limited concerns in respect of water-related issues/objectives.

In conclusion, all alternatives are associated with certain ‘pros and cons’. The intention is for the Council and stakeholders to take this understanding into account when considering how best to ‘trade-off’ between competing objectives, and establish the ‘most sustainable’ option.