

Fleet Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group recommendations to FTC in response to the consultation exercise from the public and the statutory bodies.

No.	Policy																																																							
1	<p>Policy 1 -Fleet Civic Quarter</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. The majority were in favour of the policy with 256 (50.69%) of people supporting it and 228 (45.15%) voting against it with 21 (4.16%) expressing that they had no view. 150 comments were from those over 55 years of age, with 96 of those being over 65 years of age. It was disappointing that there were fewer responses from younger people.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>YES</th> <th>NO</th> <th>NO VIEW</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Under 18</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18-24</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-34</td> <td>12</td> <td>7</td> <td>0</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35-44</td> <td>24</td> <td>13</td> <td>0</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45-54</td> <td>31</td> <td>52</td> <td>1</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>55-64</td> <td>43</td> <td>45</td> <td>3</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65-74</td> <td>93</td> <td>49</td> <td>8</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 75</td> <td>42</td> <td>46</td> <td>8</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rather Not Say</td> <td>3</td> <td>11</td> <td>1</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>256</td> <td>228</td> <td>21</td> <td>505</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This policy received the highest numbers of comments by far. There were 226 440 comments from a total of 505 responses.</p> <p>A number of common themes emerged. Of the comments received 60 related to retaining the whole of the Views as open space. 39 comments referred to retaining the car park known as Gurkha Square (though most were tempered with the wish to retain the Square for public events and 2 comments refer to Gurkha Square being made a public square rather than a car park). 59 of the comments related to the Planning Application 18/00147/OUT.</p> <p>Hart District Council made a number of comments about this policy, all of which have been incorporated in final plan. The suggested wording is as follows:</p> <p>“2.23 This Policy sets the framework for the future redevelopment of the area defined as the Civic Quarter which includes the Hart District Council Offices, the Harlington and the Fleet Library buildings. It also includes two open spaces, Gurkha Square car park and Victoria Road car park. The area is adjacent to a public open space and recreation amenity known as The Views, which is proposed as Local Green Space in Policy 13.”</p> <p>“2.33 Although there is a large area of open space provided by The Views, it is currently not</p>	Age group	YES	NO	NO VIEW	TOTAL	Under 18	2	1	0	3	18-24	6	4	0	10	25-34	12	7	0	19	35-44	24	13	0	37	45-54	31	52	1	84	55-64	43	45	3	91	65-74	93	49	8	150	Over 75	42	46	8	96	Rather Not Say	3	11	1	15	TOTAL	256	228	21	505
Age group	YES	NO	NO VIEW	TOTAL																																																				
Under 18	2	1	0	3																																																				
18-24	6	4	0	10																																																				
25-34	12	7	0	19																																																				
35-44	24	13	0	37																																																				
45-54	31	52	1	84																																																				
55-64	43	45	3	91																																																				
65-74	93	49	8	150																																																				
Over 75	42	46	8	96																																																				
Rather Not Say	3	11	1	15																																																				
TOTAL	256	228	21	505																																																				

	<p>optimised for community benefit. The policy supports a commitment to retaining and improving play/activity facilities for children and young people on The Views, to provide opportunities for physical activities thus promoting mental and physical health.”</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation: Policy 13 of the Neighbourhood Plan defines the whole area of the Views as Local Green Open Space. As this conflicts with the inclusion of the upper part of the Views in the area defined within Policy 1, the recommendation is that the steering group asks Fleet Town Council to remove this section of land from within Policy 1.</p>
2	<p>Policy 2 - Land between Victoria Road and Gurkha Square</p> <p>The survey monkey questionnaire gave people the option of skipping this question if they had voted against or had no view on policy 1. There were 257 responses to this question, and 248 opted to skip it. The vast majority were in favour of the policy with 217 (84.44%) supporting it and 26 (10.12%) against it, with 14 (5.45%) expressing that they had no view, with 135 (more than half) of those who responded aged over 65 years of age</p> <p>There were 87 comments from a total of 257 responses. Of the comments received :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of comments related to a wish to retain the current businesses. These comments are supported by the statement that the "Policy acknowledges the active commercial frontage within the Policy area and seeks to sustain or enhance it". • 35 comments were received from those who expressed their views that a particular retailer should be retained. The owner of the retail unit is, of course, at liberty to retain or dispose of the business as he so wishes. The Policy acknowledges that the area is in multiple ownership which may prevent it coming forward as a single development within the regeneration plan. <p>Hart District Council made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The wording of this Policy would allow any use-class within this zone. This would conflict with Policy ED5, which looks to retain/promote the retail character of the area. Recommend that there is reference to suitable town centres uses, in line with ED5” • An addition comment recommended “confirming that suitable service provision for any new/existing units will need to be considered. <p>Steering Group Recommendation :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To confirm agreement to HDC’s comment to add an additional statement to the Policy that “This policy supports suitable town centre uses” • Add the wording to para. 2.35 “The rear areas of these properties are mainly given over to parking and services uses which may detract from the creation of the new Civic Quarter as set out in Policy 1. It is anticipated, however, that the regeneration set out in Policy 1 will provide a commercial incentive for the redevelopment of these service areas, providing that suitable service arrangements are provided”
3	<p>Policy 3 - Land on the corner of Reading Road North and Fleet Road</p> <p>The survey monkey questionnaire gave people the option of skipping this question if they had voted against or had no view on policy 1. There were 257 responses to this question, and 248 opted to skip it. The vast majority were in favour of the policy with 237 (92.22%) supporting it</p>

	<p>and 8 (3.11%) against it, with 12 (4.67%) expressing that they had no view. More than half (135) of those who responded were over 65 years of age.</p> <p>There were 59 comments from a total of 257 responses.. 5 comments referred to traffic congestion within this area and felt that the Neighbourhood Plan should reflect their concerns for pedestrian safety and the maintenance of traffic flow at the Oatsheaf Junction.</p> <p>Hart District Council commented that “References to commercial units at ground floor level would conflict with Policy ED5 which permits main town centre uses. Recommend rewording Policy”. Additional comment was that the reference to “the Town Square” in Policy 3 iii should be identified on a plan. As the location of the Town Square will be part of the regeneration plan, it is recommended that the reference is change to “a Town Square”</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation: Policy 3 ii be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses are compatible with Policy 1 and include retail at ground level (predominantly A1 and A2) with residential or commercial above <p>Policy 3 iii be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend to state that "The Policy supports a layout that improves pedestrian access and connections to a Town Square and the town centre, with consideration given to traffic flow and safe pedestrian crossings at road junctions." 										
4	<p>Policy 4 - Land off Harlington Way</p> <p>The survey monkey questionnaire gave people the option of skipping this question if they had voted against or had no view on policy 1. There were 257 responses to this question, and 248 opted to skip it. The vast majority were in favour of the policy with 232 (90.27%) supporting it and 6 (2.3%) against it, with 19 (7.39%) expressing that they had no view. Again, 135 of those who responded were over 65 years of age and all but 3 were in favour of the policy.</p> <p>There were 41 comments from a total of 257 responses. A number of common themes emerged. 6 comments refer to use being extended to encompass residential as well as business use and one comment pointed out that this precedent has already been set.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation Policy to be amended to incorporate residential as well as business use as follows: “Uses that are compatible with Policy 1 and include retail at ground floor level (predominantly A1 and A2) with residential or commercial above will be supported”</p>										
5	<p>Policy 5 - Leisure and Night time economy – Fleet Road between Upper Street and the Oatsheaf crossroads</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. The majority were in favour of the policy with 310 (61.39%) of people supporting it and 150(29.7%) voting against it with 45 (8.91%) expressing that they had no view. This time the number of respondents aged below 65 years of age rose to 224, with 246 respondents over 65 years of age. The under 45s supported the policy more than the over 45s.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="379 1877 1123 2000"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>YES</th> <th>NO</th> <th>NO VIEW</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Under 18</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age group	YES	NO	NO VIEW	TOTAL	Under 18	2	1	0	3
Age group	YES	NO	NO VIEW	TOTAL							
Under 18	2	1	0	3							

18-24	7	2	1	10
25-34	18	1	0	19
35-44	30	4	3	37
45-54	45	34	5	84
55-64	49	32	10	91
65-74	98	35	17	150
Over 75	55	33	8	96
Rather Not Say	6	8	1	15
TOTAL	310	150	45	505

There were 151 comments from a total of 505 responses. 53 comments state that Fleet has sufficient eating and drinking establishments.

- 15 comments refer to the need to create a "balance" of outlets within this zone so that it is not dominated by one class of use.
- 4 comments suggested that residential accommodation should not be supported in this area. 20 comments refer to the night time economy encouraging antisocial behaviour.

Hart District Council commented that the Policy would allow residential use on the ground floor which would conflict with the emerging Local Plan Policy ED5, which looks to retain/promote the retail character of the area. "Recommend that there is residential use on the first floor and above in line with ED5".

Steering Group Recommendation:

Policy 5 – final sentence to be changed, in line with emerging Local Plan Policy ED5 to read “Proposals for change of use to Use Class A3, A4 and A5 will be supported. Any change of use from Use Class A1 – 5 to other categories, except D1 and D2 which support the Civic Quarter proposals, will not be supported. Residential use may be appropriate above retail units provided that the active frontage is not compromised and that satisfactory residential amenity can be achieved”

6

Policy 6 - Fleet Primary Shopping Area

The question was answered by 505 respondents. The majority were in favour of the policy with 391 (77.43%) of people supporting it and 70 (13.86%) voting against it with 44 (8.71) expressing that they had no view.

There was a total of 505 responses, with 244 respondents being under 65 years of age and 246 respondents being over 65 years of age. There were 112 comments and the following themes emerged:

- 18 comments suggest that no further development is required as there are empty units in the core shopping zone.
- An additional 20 refer to the need for general improvements to the retail mix and the

	<p>appearance of the town centre.</p> <p>Both sets of comments will be passed to the Fleet Business Improvement District (BID).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One comment suggested that the area be exempt from "permitted development" restrictions to stop the loss of shop fronts at ground floor level in this zone and this will be passed to Hart District Council. • There is some confusion in respondents' minds as to the location of the vacant land referred to in the Policy <p>Hart District Council commented that "The Primary Shopping Area" in this Plan conflicts with "the Primary Shopping Area" in the emerging Local Plan and considered that this could have implications for retail applications. It was suggested the area be renamed "The Core Shopping Zone".</p> <p>Additional comments from Hart District Council stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "advising that 'proposals for uses other than Class A1 will only be supported where on-site parking to meet the District Council's Parking Guidelines is provided as part of the development' would result in, amongst others, changes of use between the A-classes requiring on-site parking. This would conflict with the existing Local Plan, draft Local Plan and NPPF. Recommend reference to the provision of on-site car parking is removed", • The Policy states at 2.55 that it "does not support an increase in food and drink outlets (A3-5) where these would disproportionately compromise this retail zone". The District Council has pointed out that this statement conflicts with the emerging Local Plan which does not contain a policy restricting A3-5 uses. <p>Comment from Hampshire County Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire County Council's Public Health Department commented that, whilst recognising "the importance to the vitality and sustainability of the area of promoting retail use (class A1 – A5) over non-retail use" ..- it would "encourage the Town Council to seek a balance of class A1 – A5 through the Neighbourhood Plan in order to avoid the proliferation of class A5 outlets (takeaways), which could be detrimental to both public health and town centre vitality". <p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Policy be renamed The Core Shopping Zone • That paragraph 2.55 of Policy 6 be amended to read: 2.55 Whilst recognising the importance to the vibrancy and sustainability of the area of promoting retail use (class A1 – A5) over non-retail use, the policy supports a balance of class A1 – A5 within the Core Shopping Zone in order to avoid the proliferation of class A5 outlets (takeaways), which could be detrimental to both public health and town centre vitality". • That a map be added to show the location of the vacant land
7	<p>Policy 7 - Fleet Road between 151 Fleet Road and Kings Road Junction</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 402 (79.60%) of respondents supporting the policy and 63 (12.48%) voting against it and 40 (7.92%) saying they had no view on the policy.</p> <p>107 comments were received from a total of 505. A big majority of these supported the policy with 75 in favour, 20 against and 12 with no view. A number of common themes</p>

	<p>emerged including parking and affordable housing.</p> <p>Revised Policy as a Result of Consultation Responses: Steering Group Recommendation Point i. of the Policy should be change to "it offers a varied mix of dwelling in line with the emerging Local Plan Policy H1 Housing Mix."</p> <p>The statement "comprising small family apartments and accommodation for first time buyers and elderly person wishing to downsize" to be move to paragraph 2.58 of the text beneath the Policy to read "This area provides the opportunity to expand the town centre to accommodate the needs of the ever increasing population, including the provision of small family apartments and accommodation for first time buyers and elderly persons wishing to downsize."</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation: It was recommended that "currently the Tackle Up Fishing Shop" be added to the title of the Policy for clarification i.e. Policy 7 - Fleet Road between No 151 Fleet Road (currently the Tackle Up Fishing Shop) and Kings Road junction.</p>
8	<p>Policy 8 - Land at Albert Street</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 390 77.23% of respondents supporting the policy and 53 (10.5%) voting against it, with 62(12.28%) saying they had no view on the policy.</p> <p>52 comments were received from a total of 505. A big majority of these supported the policy with 36 in favour, 10 against and 6 with no view. A number of common themes emerged including traffic (the biggest with 11 comments), pedestrian safety, and hope that current residents would not be adversely affected .</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation: No change to policy, but correct mapping errors as recommended by HDC and add a sentence in the text about better traffic management such as a formal shared space traffic scheme that would slow traffic and allow pedestrians to cross the road more safely along its length.</p>
9	<p>Policy 9 - Fleet Road Public Realm</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 442 (87.52%) of people supporting it and 35 (6.93%) voting against it with 28 (5.54%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>96 comments were received from a total of 505. A big majority (68 out of 96) supported the policy, with suggestions on how to improve it. Almost 20 of the comments related to cycling issues - some in favour and some against. These will be forwarded to the cycling group for consideration. Pedestrian issues were raised in approximately 20 of the responses. Some related to pedestrian safety others expressing views (for and against) pedestrianization of Fleet road and other concerned about access issues faced by pedestrians. Any changes to Fleet Road and the public realm will be consulted upon and local people will have the opportunity to express their views before decisions are taken. Parking, good design, and the expense of the scheme were also raised.</p> <p>Steering Group recommendation :</p>

	<p>The recommendation from the Steering Group to Fleet Town Council is for the policy to remain unchanged except that we accept HDC words in section iv as follows:</p> <p>iv) Green Fleet Road by the addition of street trees and soft landscaping as well as SUDS where possible.</p> <p>Another recommendation is to add the following sentence from HDC to the text within the document – SUDS can be an effective means of adding greenery, biodiversity and amenity into cramped urban areas and should be considered where possible.</p>
10	<p>Policy 10 - General Design Management Policy</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 321 (63.6%) of people supporting it and 56 (11.1%) voting against it with 128 (23.3%) expressing that they had no view. This was the largest ‘no view’ comment recorded in the survey.</p> <p>There were 68 comments of 505 responses and 15 gave their full support. Some respondents (22) expressed a lack of understanding, either because of the words used or because they could not find the Appendices referred to despite them being available on the Council’s web site or physically at the two exhibition sites. 3 respondents took the opportunity to use this as a vehicle to oppose the proposed Harlington Development.</p> <p>The majority of comments were neutral related to detailed planning issues, not specifically addressed by this Policy. There were a couple of comments including the Fleet and Church Crookham Society’s that the density of 100 units/Ha referred to in Area G of Ancells Farm was unacceptable. The point was missed that this number was derived from the fact that several commercial blocks on the Ancells Farm Business Park had used Permitted Development Rights to convert to residential flats. Each unit created 30 to 40 flats and with the commercial area having a developed density of 3 units per hectare this produced around 100 residential units per hectare. It was recommended therefore that there should not be any additional infill development within this area.</p> <p>One response made issue of a possible anomaly between Policy 10D development in the Pondtail Area and Policy 11 development of additional bungalows in the gardens of low density development areas. This is being review and clarified.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation</p> <p>Taking account of the proposed amendments from HDC endorsed by Oneill Homer the proposed amended policy, subject to the introduction of the character area characteristics from Appendix 3 is as follows:</p> <p>Policy 10 – General Design Management Policy</p> <p>Development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, will be supported, provided that it is in accordance, where relevant, with the detailed characteristic set out in the appendices relating to this policy, based upon the principal and subsidiary areas defined in the Hart Urban Characterisation Study 2010, the North Fleet Conservation Area Management Plan and all other statutory, local and Neighbourhood Plan policies and the following general design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Development shall complement and be well integrated with neighbouring properties in the immediate locality in terms of scale, density, massing, separation,

	<p>layout, materials and access;</p> <p>II. Architectural design shall reflect high quality local design references in both the natural and built environment and reflect and reinforce local distinctiveness;</p> <p>III. The height of new buildings shall be in keeping with neighbouring properties and roofscapes shall be well articulated to avoid bulky, featureless appearance. Applicants shall respect neighbouring buildings and demonstrate how heights of development will not be over-bearing or dominant in the existing street scene;</p> <p>IV. Strong building lines shall be respected and soft landscaped front gardens and landscaped front boundaries should be retained or enhanced;</p> <p>V. Development shall seek to retain existing mature hedging and established trees and to enhance landscaping including providing SUDS where appropriate to provide for biodiversity. Where loss of significant amenity trees or hedging is justified, compensation planting must be provided to mitigate their loss.</p> <p>VI. Development shall consider and where possible retain or enhance views both within settlements and out towards the countryside and proposals shall explain how this is achieved;</p> <p>VII. Development affecting the transitional edges between a settlement and countryside shall be softened by landscaping to complement the character of the adjacent or surrounding countryside;</p> <p>VIII. Parking on development sites shall be well integrated so as not to dominate the public realm and shall adhere to Hart District Council’s adopted parking standard or guidelines;</p> <p>IX. Development which affects any heritage asset shall preserve or enhance the heritage asset and its setting and shall demonstrate how local distinctiveness is reinforced;</p> <p>X. Development shall be designed to incorporate appropriate energy efficiency measures; and</p> <p>XI. Development shall integrate wherever possible with existing pathways and cycleways and should not restrict transit for cyclists or pedestrians, including those with limited mobility.</p> <p>XII. In relation to flooding, development shall create a safe environment for all uses and not increase off-site flood risk . In areas where surface water flooding is a problem “Finished Floor Levels” may need to be raised and/or Passive Property Level Protection “ measures installed to minimise the risk of internal flooding.</p>
11	<p>Policy 11 - Safeguarding bungalow stock for an ageing population</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 376 (74.5%) of people supporting it and 77(15.2) voting against it with 52(10.3%) expressing that they had no view.</p>

There were 101 responses to the policy. Of these, 50 were in favour, 42 against and 9 had no view. There was a significant variation in generational response:

Age group	YES	NO	TOTAL
18-24	2	2	4
25-34	0	4	4
35-44	0	4	4
45-54	4	16	20
55-64	18	7	25
65-74	20	5	25
Over 75	6	4	10
TOTAL	50	42	92

Perhaps not unsurprisingly the younger age group up to 54 were not in support of the policy believing that housing for families and more affordable housing for younger people was more important than protecting housing for the elderly or believed all housing should be left to market forces and no special status should be given to bungalows. There were several comments that bungalows made inefficient use of land.

The response was quite different for the 55-74 age group who strongly felt that bungalows should be given special protection with a number commenting that this policy may already be too late.

Perhaps slightly surprising 40% (but only 4/10) of the over 75 age group returns suggested that more attention should be given to younger home owners.

One valuable comment that should be given special attention was that bungalows should not be considered solely for an aging population, but for disabled or mobility impaired residents. This is another area where there is a marked shortage of appropriate properties in the Fleet Area.

The amalgamation of plots to produce more bungalow stock in existing low density residential areas was not fully understood or supported. This may need some additional clarification in the supporting text.

Steering group recommendation:

Policy 11 – Safeguarding building stock for persons of limited mobility including disabled and older residents

- I. **The conversion of bungalows (predominantly single storey dwellings) to two or two and half storey family houses will not be supported.**
- II. **The demolition of bungalows for replacement with higher rise development will not be supported**
- III. **Modification of bungalows to adaptable standards to support independent living will**

	<p>be supported.</p> <p>IV. The development of new bungalows through the amalgamation of plots to increase the built density in low density single storey development areas to make more efficient use of the land and create local sustainable communities will be supported</p> <p>Supporting text to be modified to accommodate change in headline policy</p>
12	<p>Policy 12 – Buildings of Heritage and Townscape Value</p> <p>There was overwhelming support for the Policy. Of the 505 respondents, 454 (89.9%), supported, 23 (4.6%), did not support, and 28 (5.5%), had no view.</p> <p>There were 71 respondents who provided additional comments. Of those 71, 50 (70.4%), supported the Policy, 13 (18.3%), did not support, and 8 (11.3%), had no view.</p> <p>Many of those who commented, particularly those with No View, clearly had not looked at the buildings listed with photographs in the Appendix. It is reasonably clear in the Policy that the buildings are listed therein, and this may be clearer now there has been some re-ordering of the wording. There were comments on the criteria being unclear, but these were listed and are based on the Historic England criteria for including buildings in a Local List. There was one comment to add a building of merit.</p> <p>In the statutory responses, Hart proposed that the criteria should be removed from the Policy wording, and included in the supporting paragraphs: this has been done. Historic England pointed out that All Saints Church is Grade II* listed, not Grade II.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <p>The recommendation from the Steering Group to Fleet Town Council is for the Policy to remain essentially unchanged except that the criteria are moved from the Policy itself into the supporting paragraphs. The reference to the Historic England Advice Note 7 has been updated.</p> <p>The supporting paragraphs also reflect that All Saints Church is Grade II* listed, and that the War Memorial in Ghurkha Square was listed by Historic England as Grade II on 24 July 2018.</p> <p>There have been minor changes to the Appendix to include the postcodes of the buildings so that they may be found more easily; to provide two better photographs, to include an additional building; and to credit the photographers.</p>
13	<p>Policy 13 - Local Green Space.</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 422 (83.56%) of people supporting it and 59(11.68%) voting against it with 24(4.75%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 152 comments submitted, the majority of which 98 (64.5%) were in support of the policy, 47 (31%) made negative comments and 7 (4.5%) had no view.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of objection was to the inclusion of what were termed “caveats” or “exceptions” and the majority view was no development under any circumstances and all exceptions should be removed. Almost the same reservations were made by supporters of the policy, that they favoured protection of green space without any exceptions. 23 comments made specific reference to not developing on the Views.</p>

	<p>It is regretted that the Newsletter that was distributed to notifying residents of the forthcoming consultation included an early version of the policy which stated: Policy 13 – Local Green Space "This policy supports the protection of 14 open green spaces identified on the map from development unless it can be demonstrated that the community would gain an equivalent benefit from the provision of suitable replacement green space or gain significant social, economic or environmental benefit from an alternative use."</p> <p>Residents who completed the survey on-line or a hard copy available at the exhibition sites responded to the revised wording; "The locations identified on the proposals map are designated as Local Green Spaces and proposals for housing or other inappropriate developments will not be supported other than in very special circumstances or if development is essential to meet necessary utility infrastructure needs and no alternative feasible site is available."</p> <p>It is very evident from the comments which version of the policy residents were relating to.</p> <p>Whether the respondents overall supported the policy or not the sentiment was very similar, that residents supported the protection of the town's green spaces, but without any conditions that appeared to hint at development.</p> <p>The other criticism made was the apparent anomaly between Policy 13 which identifies the whole of the Views as being protected by the Local Green Space designation and Policy 1 which includes the Upper part of the Views in the development area for the Civic Quarter. The other criticism made was the apparent anomaly between Policy 13 which identifies the whole of the Views as being protected by the Local Green Space designation and Policy 1 which includes the Upper part of the Views in the development area for the Civic Quarter.</p> <p>Based upon the strength of the comment it is accepted that the anomaly between Policy 1 and 13 needs resolution and the most acceptable solution would be: to maintain the whole of the Views in Policy 13 and remove the area of the Upper Views from Policy 1 which can be achieved by redefining the area of Policy 1.</p> <p>Based upon the strong views expressed by both supporters and non-supporters of the Policy that any form of development of the designated Local Green Spaces is unacceptable it is suggested that the policy be simplified to : The policy supports the designation of 14 open green spaces as Local Green Spaces and proposals for housing or other inappropriate development will not be supported.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation: Further incorporating the comments from HDC endorsed by O'Neil Homer, the recommended amended policy to read:</p> <p>Policy 13 – Local Green Space The locations identified on the proposals map below (sites 1 to 13 and C) are defined as areas of Local Green Space where proposals for housing or other inappropriate developments will not be supported</p>
14	<p>Policy 14 - Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 392 (77.62%) of</p>

	<p>people supporting it and 71(14.06%) voting against it with 42(8.32%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 68 responses to the policy. There were 3 comments from statutory consultees. The overwhelming verdict was a 95% support for the policy with few reservations ('cannot make people take down fences'), and all seeing the area as a major conservation amenity.</p> <p>The constructive comments suggest more leisure facilities -eg Boating (Cafe also mentioned) but all want to encourage more people to take advantage of the Canal. Not surprising several respondents commented that they would like to see more work undertaken to maintain the tow paths by the various responsible authorities.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <p>No Change of Policy regarding to the 68 comments from the survey monkey consultation. Regarding the three other consultees:</p> <p>HDC – Their first point is (i) is covered in our (v)</p> <p>Change (iv) to " All planting near to the canal should be regularly maintained to improve its leisure and amenity uses" This also covers a similar point made by Natural England.</p> <p>Historic England – These comments were addressed in the Plan (Grade II listed buildings).</p> <p>Natural England - Propose our 14iii to include "native evergreen hedging like yew and holly"</p> <p>Add a section in the main introductory section of the Neighbourhood Plan highlighting that the Canal is an SSSI.</p>
15	<p>Policy 15 - Residential gardens</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was well supported with 421 (83.37%) of people supporting it and 49(9.7%) voting against it with 35(6.93%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 75 responses to the policy. Of these, 40 were in favour, 27 against and 8 had no view. 17 of the comments thought that keeping soft landscaping at 50% was too high (10 of them voting Yes and 7 No). 17 of the comments related to parking issues, some respondents wanted more parking on front gardens, some suggesting the best building material to reduce flooding, two suggesting that future developments should include parking considerations at the planning stage and others saying that this policy smacked of 'political correctness'.</p> <p>HDC suggested some minor changes to the policy which are helpful and so recommended for inclusion.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <p>The following changes be made to the policy:</p> <p>Development will be supported provided that:</p>

	<p>iii. Permanent storage of waste bins and containers in front gardens are appropriately screened and contained within binsheds</p> <p>iv. Where the loss of significant trees is adequately justified, compensation planting must be provided to mitigate their loss</p> <p>The use of vehicle entrance gates, brick walls and timber fences over 1m high to front garden boundaries which are out of character with the surrounding area will not be supported</p> <p>In the supporting text section 3.31 HDC say there is no legislation to cover the final point unless trees are in conservation areas or covered by a TPO. We recommend that the following sentence be removed. ' No trees over 75mm diameter at 1.5m above ground level should therefore be removed for other than for safety reasons and in consultation with the District Council's Tree Officer'</p>
16	<p>Policy 16 – North Fleet Conservation Area</p> <p>There was overwhelming support for the Policy. Of the 505 respondents, 448 (88.7%), supported, 20 (4.0%), did not support, and 37 (7.3%), had No View.</p> <p>There were 68 respondents who provided additional comments. Of those 68, 47 (69.1%), supported the Policy, 12 (17.7%), did not support, and 9 (13.2%), had No View.</p> <p>No significant changes to Policy are proposed. There were comments about the importance of the trees, and the importance of housing density being maintained. Only two folk didn't think that trees are important, and only two folk think that housing density should be increased. The wording around the Article 4 restrictions has been changed as in the NFCA the restrictions apply only to boundary treatments.</p> <p>Clearly, some people do not know where the NFCA is, and a map should be added.</p> <p>In the statutory responses, Hart pointed out that there is no legislation that could be used to require tree owners to undertake proactive tree or hedge maintenance. The only circumstances where a tree in a Conservation Area must be replaced is where it is felled because it is immediately dangerous (known as an "exception"), or if it was removed in contravention (so illegally). Standard Conservation Area notices to fell trees cannot result in the tree owner being required to replace the tree. The wording around trees and hedges has been changed accordingly, but encouragement to maintain the sylvan nature of the Conservation Area is retained.</p> <p>Additionally, Hart pointed out that the use of 'significant' in the wording about development resulting in on-street parking conflicts with advice in the NPPF: the recommendation is to focus on the resulting impact i.e. highway safety. Hart also pointed out that Conservation Area Consent for demolition of a building within the Conservation Area has been superseded. Amendments have been made to address both these points.</p> <p>The Police and Crime Commissioner expressed concern that whilst a single development may only add one or two vehicles to the level of on-street parking, multiple developments each adding one or two vehicles might create a problem. He proposed that sufficient parking must be provided within the development, and that on street parking should be resisted. Whilst differing from the advice from Hart, this recommendation has been incorporated in the paragraph on development for non-residential uses.</p> <p>Historic England welcomed the reference to the North Fleet Conservation Area, but seemed unaware that there is the Character Appraisal and Management Plan from 2008. They offered no comments on Policy 12.</p>

	<p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <p>The recommendation from the Steering Group to Fleet Town Council is for the Policy to remain essentially unchanged except that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A map of the NFCA should be added; 2. To avoid confusion, the definition of the housing density areas within the NFCA is referenced to Hart’s Saved Policy URB 18 and the mapping associated therewith; 3. Changes have been made to the reference to the Article 4 Direction to reflect that it applies only to boundary treatments; 4. Changes have been made to the wording on the preservation of trees so that replacement applies only to trees felled by exception or felled illegally. Encouragement to maintain the sylvan nature of the Conservation Area is retained, but cannot be mandated; 5. Changes have been made to the wording on avoiding on-street parking to focus on the resulting impact, e.g. on highway safety. The preference for the provision of parking on-site is retained. 6. The reference to Conservation Area Consent as a pre-requirement for demolition has been removed in light of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.
17	<p>Policy 17 - Thames Basin Heath SPA Mitigation</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. The majority were in favour of the policy with 391(77.43%) of people supporting it and 10 (1.98%) voting against it with 104 (20.59%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 37 comments on the policy, none of them against the policy. 18 people wanted more information or did not understand the policy.</p> <p>HDC want us to include the words Suitable Alternate Natural Green Space (SANG) to explain what a SANG is.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation Accept the HDC recommendation and include the words Suitable Alternate Natural Green Space (SANG) to explain what a SANG is.</p>
18	<p>Policy 18 - Cycling Network</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. The majority were in favour of the policy with 410 (81.19%) of people supporting it and 45 (8.9%) voting against it with 50 (9.9%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 124 comments on the policy. Of those, a big majority, 97 supported the policy, 20 did not and 7 had no view. Approximately 25 responses offered specific routes that should be considered for inclusion in the cycling network. It is suggested that these comments be forwarded to the cycling group for consideration should funds become available.</p> <p>12 suggested that there should not be cycle routes on pavements sharing with pedestrians and 4 suggested that there should be shared cycle routes on pavements shared with</p>

	<p>pedestrians. Any new cycling route will be subject to consultation where people can express their opinion and any Health and safety concerns raised in this survey will be sent to the cycling group for information.</p> <p>Other issues covered included the cost of improving cycling routes, the behaviour of some cyclists who do not obey the highway code and need for investment in fixing potholes and other road markings.</p> <p>There were 2 comments from the statutory consultees – HDC and HCC.</p> <p>The recommendation is to accept the policy as is, with the addition of some words in bold suggested by HDC and make suggestions in the supporting text that the local cycling group (FTAP or whatever it is called) is invited to comment on cycling issues for new cycle routes and other cycling matters.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation:</p> <p>This policy will support proposals to connect cycle routes that connect Fleet Town Centre to community assets within the corridors shown on the map. It recommends that new cycleways should be created off the highway on either dedicated routes or routes shared with pedestrians when it is safe to do so. It supports any opportunity to broaden the local cycle network within Fleet, where such schemes have satisfactory engineering assessments at feasibility and detail design stages (suggested by HCC). Where appropriate, contributions will be sought from new developments to fully fund the design and delivery of the network. (suggested by Hart)</p>
19	<p>Policy 19 - Parking</p> <p>The question was answered by 505 respondents. It was very well supported with 464 (91.88%) of people supporting it and 10(1.98%) voting against it with 31(6.14%) expressing that they had no view.</p> <p>There were 101 comments submitted, the majority (85) were in support of the policy, 4 against and 12 had no view.</p> <p>Hart District Council made some comments on the policy as did the crime commissioner.</p> <p>Steering Group Recommendation</p> <p>The steering group recommends that the title is changed to Residential Parking. It now recommends that it reads:</p> <p>Development will be supported where it provides adequate car parking that does not impact on highway safety and accessibility and meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. adherence to the adopted Hart DC parking standards or guidelines for the number of spaces to be provided on site and, II. the availability of on-street parking where this would not create a significant traffic hazard. III. garages with a minimum internal dimension of 6 m by 3 m will be included in the

	<p>parking provision:</p> <p>And the Steering Group recommends an additional sentence be added to the text:</p> <p>This policy has been restricted to Residential Parking as the provision and control of on and off street parking is the responsibility of Hampshire CC and Hart DC</p>