

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
1	Chris Flynn	No mention of protection green space in Church View	Add to list.	The green space is within the Conservation area and next to protected land so is considered already satisfactorily protected.	Follow up on the specific status of ownership of this land.
2	James Renwick	overall i am supportive of the plan to retain the characteristics of Harley Whitney. Although not in control of the parish council i think more needs to be said around traffic and noise pollution and impacts of proposed developments at Murrel Green/Winchfied as these do not provide additional road infrastructure and will push more traffic onto the A30.	Page 30. Nero Brewery - this is a positive building but also provides professional employment in the village which should be retained Appendix 1, Page 62. The draft version had an aspiration to reduce the a30 south of the village to 30mph, this should be added back into the document	Employment in the village is considered important. However there is already an over-supply of office properties and the change of use from commercial to residential is supported by the SG as it provides the type of dwellings identified as needed in the village. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in the Neighbourhood Plan document. The Community Aspirations as outlined in Appendix 1 have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
3	Elliott Charles	To keep the village in the nature it currently resides for the years ahead and to provide some smaller accommodation for those in the village.	None	Noted	No action taken
4	Ian duckett	The roads are too busy and there are no cycle lanes. There is no Public funding for transport which leads to isolation with no private vehicle.		A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in the Neighbourhood Plan document. The Community Aspirations as outlined in Appendix 1 have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans. The Steering Group support the development additional cycle lanes within the village. However the prioritisation and funding of this is a Hampshire County Council responsibility and is currently subject to significant challenges. As a result this may	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				not be either practical or achievable.	
5	Vicky Charles	Hartley Wintney has evolved considerably the last 10 years which is understandable however this plan supports the protection of the environment and culture of our village	Not applicable	Noted	No action taken
6	P Robinso n	It represents my views on the future development of Hartley Wintney		Noted	No action taken
7	Peter Johnson	As an observation:- The plan should be better cross-referenced in particular ALL policies should explicitly name the objectives that they relate to. I broadly support objectives 8, 9, & 10 all of which relate to the open spaces and character of the village be it internal spaces or gaps and distant views. These are addressed by policies 7, 8 (and possibly policy 9 though this is less clear). Gaps between Hartley Wintney and its neighbouring settlements are of the utmost importance. Although in the short-term the gap to the west (between Hartley Wintney and Murrell Green may be seen as a threat there is the far larger longer term threat of a New Town at Winchfield. This development would almost swallow Hartley Wintney and produce a conurbation that linked Hartley Wintney via "WinchTown" to Fleet in the South and Murrell Green and Hook in the West. When considering Policy 7 - there should also be a presumption against developments that are too high and disturb the sky-line of the conservation area or the named views – here I think of the recent re-development at Dairy Walk as an example of a development which is one storey too high [similar should not be allowed in the future]. I applaud the recognition that lighting needs to be improved (Objective 10). I also agree in broad terms with Policy 10 (reducing light pollution). However, the Council needs to recognise that there is a conflict of interest here between the two of them. The number one factor when deciding on lighting levels should be PUBLIC SAFETY some residential roads are already inadequately lit or not lit at all and can be dangerous to walk on at night – Mount Pleasant being an obvious example. Objective 10 recognises the need to have more lighting at the eastern end of the High Street. The Nero Brewery site (HWS1) has been suggested for housing development – this is a dark corner of the village. To my mind Objective 10 is more important than Policy 10 which if not applied with care will negate Objective 10.	The Plan Policies section needs to be expanded to include the Objectives(s) that each Policy supports [not just some as in the current draft]. Policy 7 needs expanding to include: Developments should not be excessively high. There will be a presumption against any development that is higher than the immediate surrounding buildings and/or will have a negative impact on any of the distinctive gateway views listed in this policy and/or can be seen from the conservation area. Policy 8 – Should list three further strategic green gaps to be maintained: a) The gap between Winchfield and the south western arc ... St Mary's Church, Dilley Lane, the A30 at the ex-garden centre site. b) The gap along the A323 from Pale Lane to Rifle Range Farm and Mount Pleasant. c) The gap along the A30 from the parish boundary at Star Hill pasted the Golf Club to the eastern end of the High Street. Policy 10 needs the following added. "When considering light pollution concerns about public safety and the provision of sufficient light to guarantee safety (including from trips, falls, and bumping into objects) will ALWAYS be given higher priority than keeping light levels low.	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. With regard to the new HDC Local Plan the Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included. Lighting is the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and is decided by overall Government policy.	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.
8	Laura Shurvinton	I agree with the plan with it's focus on retaining the character of Hartley Wintney while providing an appropriate amount of new housing and retaining green spaces and areas of amenity.		The height of any new developments is decided on a site by site basis and will be related to surrounding buildings.	No action taken
9	Gordon Murray-	The proposal is clear and measured. I believe that it is essential that we avoid further large-scale development	I believe that the Transport section should specifically call out the improvements required to enable any further development in the	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from	Action has been taken thru the Community

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
	Smith	that will inevitably result in Hartley Wintney losing its village feel and characteristics. The village has already spread far enough towards Hook. Recent larger scale developments have taken place but further such developments will simply see the largescale loss of farmland and green space. The proposed approach of smaller developments and brownfield sites makes absolute sense.	village. The road infrastructure needs investment and improvements. South Western Trains is proposing reducing morning peak hour services from Winchfield station by at least 50%. If this service reduction takes place it will place even greater pressure on the roads as more commuters are forced to drive to work (or to Fleet station). Other forms of public transport are very limited, with a basic community bus service providing the core services for the village. This needs to be maintained and expanded to encourage more people to use public transport and reduce car journeys. If we do not have a comprehensive and sustainable plan for transport improvements the viability of further development of the village (and surrounding areas) needs to be questioned.	Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Ownership of the HW Community Bus is with the Parish Council and Hampshire County Council and it's future funding and usage is agreed by them. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in the Neighbourhood Plan document. The Community Aspirations as outlined in Appendix 1 have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
10	John Kirkpatrick	It is very welcome that the number of immediately approved sites is now reduced to three as a result of the estimate of the number of houses necessary having been reduced. However, it remains a concern that Rural Exemption Scheme sites still appear to be favoured regardless of specific objections to them and that no account appears to have been taken of the many reasoned representations objecting to the proposals for land at Grange Farm on environmental and transport grounds, or of the fact that the survey rated that proposal last among the suggested options. It would be entirely wrong if by claiming to fall under the Rural Exemption Scheme this proposal could be favoured despite those objections.	It would be preferable if the expressed preference for Rural Exemption Scheme proposal were removed - there seems no prospect of the Grange Farm scheme (the only one so designated following the previous call for sites) producing housing that is "affordable" in any sensible interpretation of that term. failing that, it should be made explicit that Rural Exemption Scheme proposals should enjoy no specific advantage but be considered on their merits, including their consistency with the objectives of the Plan and alongside other representations as to their desirability	The Steering Group did not propose the site at Grange Farm in the final proposals of the plan but still support the concept of Rural Exception Schemes as being beneficial to the community.	No action taken
11	DAVID TUNNEL	Need for safe route to Fleet	It is proposed to improve walk and cycleway along the A30. One is also desperately needed along the road to Fleet as there is no footpath at all.	The Steering Group support the development of a dedicated cycle way between Hartley Wintney and Fleet. The prioritisation and funding of this is a Hampshire County Council responsibility and is currently subject to significant challenges. As a result this may not be either practical or achievable.	No action taken
12	Cameron McInally	I support the need for 'green gaps' between Hartley Wintney and the development proposed at Murrell Green however the gap proposed in the plan covers only one side of the A30.	It would seem sensible to propose a similar gap on the other side of the A30. I support the rest of the plan.	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan.	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
13	Frances Chidley	I agree with proposal that developments should have maximum of 50 houses. However sites at Causeway Green have 89 houses plus houses at Causeway Farm and Hares Farm has proposal for 195 houses	Suggest that Causeway Green is not suitable site as it is within site of Fleet Road approaching Hartley Wintney. Hares Farm should have maximum of 50 houses as access from Hares Lane is poor and not suitable for significant numbers of houses. Also number of houses exceeds proposal for maximum of 50 houses only for one development.	The Steering Group did not propose the site at Causeway Green/Causeway Farm and there was significant objection to the potential development of these sites by village residents. The Hares Farm proposed development was rejected by Hart District Council during the development of the plan.	No action taken
14	ANNA TOKAR SKA	as a resident of winchfield, the proposed plan is allowing the least development to happen with minimum disturbance to current character of hartley Wintney and the areas surrounding. it is vital to us all to preserve the green areas, especially given that other areas with close proximity are in need of redevelopment (eg. fleet). futher, any redevelopment that is allowed to happen should only gain planning permission if designed in such a way as to not disturb the character of the area and be built with sympathetic materials.	NA	Noted	No action taken
15	Marcel James Vickers	Hartley Wintney and the surrounding area, including Winchfield, is both historic and beautiful. Given that there are brownfield sites at Fleet and other areas nearby, there is no reason to change the character or purpose of this historic town or countryside that surrounds it.	n/a	Noted	No action taken
16	Richard Horne	In general it provides a sustainable, maintenance of the character, green space, architectural design, and maintenance of the retail activity of the centre of the village together with planning for the future.		Noted	No action taken
17	Susan Bunting	I strongly support the proposal to develop small brown field sites as affordable housing rather than larger greenfield estates.	I have no objections to the plan but believe the best interests of the village and its residents would be better served if smaller pockets of housing development are pursued.	Noted	No action taken
18	Sarah Walker	I think this is a good plan for the village. The committee should be commended for this well thought through plan. I particularly support the focus on small brownfield developments. There should be no more large greenfield developments in and around Hartley Wintney.	No changes required.	Noted	No action taken
19	Adrian Bunting	I believe the plan is in the best interests of the village and its community, today and 30 years forward.	I have no objections to the plan. Further development in the village area should, I believe, be on brown field sites for which I would have no objection.	Noted	No action taken
20	Rebecca Wiggles worth	This seems to give a fair balanced approach for Hartley Wintney		Noted	No action taken
21	Kieron Gregson	We acknowledge that the Site received the majority of 1st choice votes, but we object to the stated comments with regards impacts on the doctor's surgery, parking and traffic. As part of the Heads of Terms (HOTs) submitted in support of the planning application, we have agreed a financial package with the doctor's surgery and as confirmed by HCC (the Highways Authority) not objecting to the proposal, the Transport Assessment (TA) demonstrates that the development is likely to have only a modest traffic impact on the local network.	We suggest reference to the development impacting on the Hartley Wintney village community infrastructure be removed as this is incorrect.	This is not to do with policy, it is a statement of fact as perceived and experienced by the residents. It is not a reflection on existing and new arrangements, it is a "caution" to be mindful of the possible effects of future development. It has no impact on any of the policy statements within this plan.	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
22	Adam Perryman	Given the amount of new dwellings that have been built over the last 10 years (I was unable to find a council supplied record of the number of dwellings in the Hartley Wintney Parish Boundary so I have used Royal Mail's PAF. According to it, using a recreation of the Hartley Wintney boundary map provided by yourselves, there are ~2636 households. If 400 (which is an approximate count, as I was unable to find an exact number of dwellings for St Mary's Park on their website I believe it's 328 but cannot state for certain, Rifle Range Farm consists of 95 homes according to VIVID) of those are from SMP and RRF that's an increase of approx 18% within 10 years!) I don't see why we're leaving ourselves open to more development than is necessary. 18% growth in 10 years is extremely high!	Reword point 2 to "Ensuring a maximum of 23 dwellings on any single development.". If we leave it as "...a maximum of 50 dwellings..." developers will keep try their hardest to hit 50 dwellings on a development. Whilst my proposed change won't prevent more than 23 dwellings being built in total, it will hopefully aim to reduce the number of additional dwellings built.	It is for this reason that the Steering Group have made recommendation for a limited number of dwellings. The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan indicating a maximum of 50 dwellings was a recommendation obtained from the initial village survey around types/sizes of developments that were considered acceptable and is not a reference to any of the specific proposed sites, all of which are for a significantly smaller number than the 50 maximum.	Actioned – Policy 5 wording amended to reflect comments
23	Kieron Gregson	Whilst we support the general presumption of improving traffic management through the village, it is often only through financial contributions associated with large scale development that these are delivered. The development of the Site will enable existing highway deficiencies in the immediate locality to be improved with this including widening work on A323 and the double roundabout junction on Fleet Road / Elvetham Heath Way in order to achieve 50m two lane entry, new crossing, two-lane exit on Reading Road North and further pedestrian improvements which would significantly improve safety, queuing and delay. These works has been assessed and approved by Hampshire County Council (HCC) and will assist with the Neighbourhood Plan's objective and the community's aspiration to improve traffic management through the village. Such works have a significant cost which is far above that which would be delivered by 23 dwellings. Therefore, without the development of Elvetham Chase, these desired traffic management improvements in the village would not be delivered.	The Neighbourhood Plan needs to include wording to recognise the potential for developer contributions from large scale developments such as Elvetham Chase to deliver the kind of local highways improvements that will deliver the Neighbourhood Plan's objective and the community's aspiration to improve traffic management through the village.	Noted – traffic management is an aspiration only and will be progressed by the Parish council in partnership with the appropriate stakeholders	No action taken
24	Kieron Gregson	Objective 2 is unduly restrictive by hampering the planning of large-scale developments which can deliver the supply of new homes and associated infrastructure that the country desperately needs. Furthermore, the Elvetham Chase ("the Site") is sustainably located to a range of facilities available in neighbouring Elvetham Heath. A 50 dwelling cap is arbitrary and would be contrary to the NPPF which seeks to "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes ... that the country needs". Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth" (paragraph 17). Furthermore, Objective 2 also does not accord with paragraph 52 of the NPPF which recognises that "the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale developments, such as new	Objective 2 should be deleted as it is inappropriate to put an arbitrary cap on the number of dwellings that can be delivered on a site that is able to deliver more in a sustainable manner and help contribute to the need for housing.	Noted. This is a key objective of the Plan as identified by the community at the engagement stage and subsequent site assessment consultations. Given Hartley Wintney has received no allocation of housing within the Local Plan it is not considered unreasonable to put a cap of 50 dwellings on any one site should development be required in the future	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities" (our emphasis) (paragraph 52). Finally, we consider large-scale developments assist with the provision of delivering infrastructure improvements as they provide the required economies of scale needed to fund and deliver them. Such infrastructure improvements will not be delivered through the development of smaller sites (those which have been draft allocated) as these often struggle on viability grounds thus will not provide the necessary financial contributions, the required amount of affordable housing and other appropriate community and social infrastructure. In summary, we suggest the development of sites adjacent to existing settlements is likely to be easier to deliver and make a full contribution to meeting the housing need in an effective and meaningful manner.			
25	Jocelyn Peat	By building only one and two bedroomed flats/houses on these sites will mean a higher density of development resulting in too many cars as well as been overdeveloped. Developers never allow for enough car parking spaces either outside the properties or separately (look at Elvetham Heath, where cars have to park on the pavements), this will create an overspill onto the Cricket Green and also cause too much traffic to the sites from either the Cricket Green or from the A30.	It would be better to build fewer houses, therefore less cars will need parking spaces and the sites won't be overdeveloped and overcrowmed with houses and cars.	The 2 village centre sites being proposed already have car parking availability and the associated traffic movement from their employees and the move from commercial to residential use is not considered likely to change this movement. Parking requirements are defined by HDC Parking Provision Standards (2008).	No action taken
26	Kieron Gregson	Objective 1 caps the level of housing to be provided in the Parish over the Plan period (2016 – 2032). This is contrary to national guidance which suggests housing targets in Development Plan Documents including Neighbourhood Plans are minimum targets and not a cap to prevent further housing development. The emerging Hart Local Plan does not set a specific target for new housing in the Parish therefore the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, either on its own or in partnership with Hart District Council, needs to calculate its objectively assessed housing need as a correct proportion of the overall target for the District of 6,208 new homes between 2016 and 2032 in order to accord with Planning Practice Guidance for preparing Neighbourhood Plans (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20160211).	In order to accord with Planning Practice Guidance for preparing Neighbourhood Plans (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20160211), the Objective should be reworded as follows, "Providing for a minimum of 23 new dwellings between 2016 and 2032 in accordance with Hart District Council's SHMA".	noted	No action taken
27	Carole Johnson	Consider this to be vital in preserving Hartley Wintney's separate identity. Other gaps (e.g. between Hartley Wintney and Winchfield) should therefore be included under this policy		Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan.	No action taken
28	James Renwick	I think there should be more focus on noise pollution. Hartley Wintney suffers from high levels of noise. See http://www.extrium.co.uk/noiseviewer.html	Comment only as I do not know what if anything the parish or district council can do, it recognition of problem should be documented.	The web site mentioned shows the level of noise pollution to be highest in Hartley Wintney next to the M3 and A30 major roads and is in line with similar other	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				environments.	
29	Trevor Dewberry	Efficient use of brownfield sites and small developments where justified are the right approach to building in sensitive rural villages.		Noted	No action taken
30	William Currie	I am not objecting to the plan	We need more street lighting at the Golf club end of the High Street	Noted	No action taken
31	A Walker	The neighbourhood plan provides a very welcome and positive vision for Hartley Wintney which the community will be able to align behind. As drafted, it will have a very positive impact on the community for many decades to come. Continuing to focus on small well thought through brownfield sights is very important. Any further development of large greenfield sites is unnecessary and would ruin Hartley Wintney which has contributed significant housing numbers in recent times.	No changes required.	Noted	No action taken
32	Mary Lou Warren	Support this plan, with its aims in all sections. Housing (as listed under Aim 1-7). Environment (8-12) Transport & accessibility (13-15) Economy (16-19) Infrastructure (20) The plan supports development on brownfield sites and protects the character of the village, our conservation areas, heritage, green sites and green gaps between neighbouring towns and Hartley Wintney.	Happy with current plan.	Noted	No action taken
33	Anne and Ashley Hallowes	This is a well prepared Plan and the team are to be commended. Our support is conditional upon Policy 8, Maintenance of Green Gaps, being enforced and not becoming a victim of Hart District Council's determination to develop Murrell Green (Hartley Winchook).	There needs to be a Policy for car parking to provide much needed additional parking bearing in mind the plan to develop retail and employment opportunities including tourism. Something specific needs to be done on the scale of a multi-storey carpark at the Monachus House Car Park or the creation of a car park in the area bounded by the High Street (A30), Fleet Road (A323) and Green Lane.	Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.
34	Joanne Massey	Supporting the plan overall including all objectives & policies. In particular, I wholeheartedly support the following policies: Policies 1 - TBHSPA; Policies 2-4 regarding the 3x sites identified as suitable for future development. I consider the remaining sites listed in table 1 on p.13 as unsuitable for future development. Policy 5 Design Guide; Policy 6 Protection of Local Green Space; Policy 7 Protection of Distinctive Views; Policy 8 Maintenance of Green Gaps; Policy 9	n/a	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		<p>Conservation Areas; Policy 14 Re use of Agricultural Buildings. Commenting on: 1) p.19 Objective 2: Ensuring max. 50 dwellings on any single development. I support a maximum per site, however, I personally consider 50 dwellings maximum on a single site to be too many for a small rural village, especially after the recent developments in Hartley Row & Rifle Range. Smaller developments with lower density housing should be encouraged to preserve the character of the village. 2) Policy 7 Protection of Distinctive Views. In light of a proposal for a new town in an area of search including Murrell Green, then I believe this policy should expand the field of the protected view coming from the West of the village to include the vista to the south of the A30. 3) Policy 8 Maintenance of green gaps. As no strategic gaps have been proposed by Hart DC around Hartley Wintney, then I would suggest we as a village should propose our own strategic gaps, particularly to protect against visual and physical coalescence with Murrell Green/Hook to the south west and Elvetham Heath/Pale Lane/Fleet to the south east.</p>		<p>Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included. Policy 8 will be updated to make the proposals as robust as possible but are limited by where the Hartley Wintney Parish Boundary lies.</p>	
35	Jacqueline Coster	<p>It has been long-awaited: I believe it has been thoroughly considered by the team working on it. Policies 1 to 5 - housing These indicate a good use of available land for building, whilst maintaining the character of Hartley Wintney. We have already produced much of the required housing through the building of St Mary's Park and Hartley Row Park, plus local infill and redevelopment. The new plan allows for more selected development, and contrives to prevent over-development. Policies 6 to 11- environment The protection set out for for trees and green spaces is very welcome, as it will prevent 'urban sprawl'. Policy 12 - Transport and Accountability I support the plan, but find it inadequate: public transport id very poor and constantly under threat. Policy 14 - The economy No comment.</p>			No action taken
36	Lynn Asghar	<p>I agree that no more than 23 new properties should be built during the stated period as the village has already grown hugely over the last few years. The views and look of the high street must be in keeping with the current shops, retaining a village look and feel.</p>	<p>I was confused by the statement that only 23 houses would be built, then that no more than 50 dwellings be built in any one development. More traffic management is necessary during peak times. Including Dilly Lane as this has become a busy road, losing its country lane feel.</p>	<p>The Steering Group have made recommendation for a limited number of dwellings. The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan indicating a maximum of 50 dwellings was a recommendation obtained from the initial village survey around types/sizes of developments that were considered acceptable and is not a reference to any of the specific proposed sites, all of which are for a significantly smaller number than the 50 maximum. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined</p>	<p>Clarified the statement related to maximum of 50 dwellings to ensure this is explained as relating to any future development rather than the current proposal.</p> <p>Also added new Policy 5 (maximum number of dwellings on one site)</p> <p>Ref transport, action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.</p>

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	
37	Rosalind Hutchison	Share the need to balance housing with preserving the essential character and feel of the village.		Noted	No action taken
38	Michael Hutchison	We now seem to have the right balance of development and the need to preserve the character of the village which is something worth preserving.		Noted	No action taken
39	Philip Groom	I am happy with the proposals stated in the plan.		Noted	No action taken
40	Robert Munson	Objectives are sound and pleasing. Preservation of HW character.	I do not wish to modify the plan. It has been sensibly and sensitively prepared.	Noted	No action taken
41	Mrs. Hilary Hedges	I agree with the proposed plan to build up to a maximum of 23 dwellings on brownfield sites within Hartley Wintney as this will ensure: brownfield sites do not fall into disrepair and become unsightly; the green countryside around Hartley Wintney will not be detrimentally impacted; and, providing there is appropriate oversight and requirement to guarantee the design and execution of such new dwellings are in accordance with the detailed guidelines included in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and hence are sympathetic to the historic aspects of Hartley Wintney this plan is more beneficial and appropriate than other potential alternatives.	I do not consider any changes necessary to the proposed Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan as it is very comprehensive and sensible.	Noted	No action taken
42	Juel	It seems to be measured in the way the mandatory extra housing has been drawn out. The village should remain unchanged to all intents and purposes.	I would strongly urge that there are far greater traffic calming measures put into place in Bracknell Lane near to the village center. It is supposed to be a 30mph limit, but fails dismally, cars and lorries travel down almost without fail at 50-60mph and like wise cars and lorries accelerate up the hill immediately after turning onto the road. It is both dangerous and noisy, which wouldn't happen if they drove at the correct speed. It is already very bad and would get worse with each and every new house built and with more traffic through the village.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
43	Andrew Hall	Support overall conclusion to protect character and identity of HW whilst managing sensible growth and development		Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
44	Joanna Chambers	The closure of banks is leading to inconvenience to local bodies eg schools no longer able to bank their large amounts of change in the village and having to go to Fleet. Warnings the bakers today cited the closure of banks, and poor transport links, among other reasons as causes of the closure of their Hartley Wintney shop today. Clearly, the Post Office is not sufficient - can the local plan do anything about this? Also, preventing new businesses like the Bed Shop, or the Timber Windows showroom, selling large ticket items to very few people and definitely not servicing regular local needs and wishes be planned against, can the local plan have a role here to try to ensure that businesses which service (or could service) the community are able to afford rents in the village. Parking and transport - usual gripes, parking on roads when there is space in the car parks (chicanes of cars in Hartford Road for example and parking going further north into Primrose Drive - causing some occasional issues for traffic at the south end). More yellow lines, planning for adequate parking in any office space?	See above.	The closure and use of businesses are commercial decisions which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot control. For parking and traffic management, a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This groups meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
45	Robert Lawrence	Retaining the views and character of the village while continuing to support affordable housing development.	Does this go far enough to meet government targets? Numbers of houses appears low?	Government targets are not set at the Parish Council level.	No action taken
46	David Hedges	I agree with proposals put forward in the plan for up to 23 houses because they utilise brown field sites and will add improve the centre of the village.	Plan is OK as it is.	Noted	No action taken
47	Adam Gratwick	Supports the views of the community rather than the wishes of developers.		Noted	No action taken
48	Shirley Sage	The HWNP will help to preserve the rural character of Hartley Wintney over the plan period and I support the views and policies as described.		Noted	No action taken
49	John Sage	Having been heavily involved in the development of the HWNP I believe it will represent significant value to the village over the next 15 years if approved and strongly support the views and policies as described.		Noted	No action taken
50	Steve Airton	Just a suggestion in supporting what is stated.	The plan talks about "promoting Hartley Wintney as a place to visit" and Tourism. However, to my knowledge since the demise of The Lamb, there is no hotel or B&B in Hartley Wintney. Do we need to be more explicit in encouraging such a development.	There was no evidence from the various community surveys/forums that the need for additional hotels or B&B locations existed. The proposal for development at Wintney Court has included conversion of the house to a wedding venue but this site was not part of the final proposal for developments due to it's size and location.	No action taken
51	Taylor Cherrett	Document Ref "Comm ref 51 Taylor Cherrett Reg 14 letter"	Please refer to letter submitted via email on 16/02/2018 to clerk@hartleywintney.org.uk and planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk.	Noted	No action taken
52	Steve Watling	The plan looks like a good piece of work that provides a good balance between the needs of various parts of the community	NA	Noted	No action taken
53	Craven	Lack of infrastructure	More precise map needed	We believe this comment relates to Fig 24 where the quality	Revision of Figure 24 to be made

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				needs to be improved	
54	Steven Brown	We are fully supportive of the allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan although we wish to comment on the precise wording of the policy and its requirements.	Please see the covering letter for more detail. We would recommend changes to the wording on the matters regarding building height and parking provision.	Noted	Wording of policy changed Policy 3 amended
55	John Holmes	I have viewed the Neighbourhood Plan and in general support it.		Noted	No action taken
56	Pauline Biggs	Both of these proposed sites will create the same problems, that of traffic emerging onto already dangerously overcrowded roads. As anyone in the village will know the A30 is busier than ever with traffic volumes apparently rising all the time. Alongside the increase in car traffic I am aware that lorry and other commercial through traffic has increased significantly creating more congestion and related pollution. I believe that more houses on the Pool site will create a lot more local traffic tipping out of the development directly onto the A30. With particular regard to the Brewery site the problem will be even worse as the access roads can only be the small lanes surrounding the site and leading to and from the A30. These roads are in a very poor condition made worse by the fact that they are becoming rat runs from the A30. From personal observation traffic is approaching the village from the Blackbushe direction and turning left at the Golf club, driving around either the duck pond or the cricket green and making it's way to the already very busy Mount Pleasant in order to reach the Fleet road and avoid going through the village and the aforementioned congestion that occurs every evening. In the same time period heavy traffic from the Grey House School makes the journey in the opposite direction. The consequences are obvious. These roads are tiny and never meant to carry volumes of traffic. These problems have been raised on many occasions by the resident on Mount Pleasant and around the cricket green but have always been ignored. If the Brewery site goes ahead then the traffic levels will be even more dangerous for the many pedestrians who walk the lanes and the ruination of the beautiful area of the Cricket Green and the adjoining common.	This may not be you want to hear and I assume you will think it negative but I don't believe that the plan, for the policies I have commented on, should proceed with the building of any more new developments within the core of the village. The village core is full and the facilities such as Doctors, Dentists, Car parks, Schools etc. are at, or near, capacity as well, whatever the developers may say. It is the Council's duty, as listed in it's "top priorities" to protect the core of the village from the negative effects that, I believe, either of these developments will bring.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. The 2 village centre sites being proposed already have car parking availability and the associated traffic movement from their employees and the move from commercial to residential use is not considered likely to change this movement. Parking requirements are defined by HDC - Parking Provision Standards (2008). Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
57	Geoffrey Thurston	Balanced proposal to meet the needs of the village.		Noted	No action taken
58	Lesley Parish	A Policy has to be put in place, and this is as good as it can get.	Much stricter controls on parking, to avoid pinch-points such as Green Lane (adjacent to church), Hartford Road and Cricket Green please!	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	
59	Cathy Kane	There is little evidence of Hart DC's attention to these principles in previous developments. Notably in the development of St Mary's Park many road improvements were abandoned and road traffic is massively heavier. Traffic through the village continues to grow and at times is unmanageable with little effort to provide proper solutions.	Hart should return to its commitment to improve traffic management, not just rely on developer contributions and then failing to police these. The current statement is weak and displays scant concern for the traffic problems caused by its approved developments to date. A greater commitment and stronger demonstration of proper solutions is absolutely essential.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
60	Anne Hartley	Practical planning guidelines for future development.	None.	Noted	No action taken
61	Stephen Hartley	The content looks entirely appropriate for the future development of the village.	None.	Noted	No action taken
62	Diana Harvey	In view of the inclusion of the Winchfield/Murrell Green site in the draft HDC Local Plan the HWNP should look more closely at whether, going forward, additional gaps need to be identified between HW and its surrounding areas/parishes.	I believe the HWNP is well put together and able to proceed if the green gap policy is reviewed in the light of the newly released HDC draft local plan.	Noted	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.
63	Andy Smerdon	The title is Cycleways and Footways, but only addresses footpaths, which by law are not usable by cyclists. Where possible, shared cycle/footpaths should be considered within the village. Given the lack of local transport to the nearest towns of Fleet and Hook, priority should be given to providing safe cycleways to reduce reliance on cars. The recent road narrowing of the A30 has had the opposite effect of forcing cars to drive closer to cyclists by placing obstacles in the original outer lane, and the pavement between Hook and HW is so poorly	See above	The Steering Group support the development of dedicated cycle ways and footpaths within the village. The prioritisation and funding of these is a Hampshire County Council responsibility and is currently subject to significant challenges. As a result new cycle ways or footpaths may not be either	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		maintained that it's barely safe for walkers and runners, and certainly not for sharing with cyclists.		practical or achievable.	
64	David Collins	In looking at the plan, with which I have no objections, I wonder if thought can be given for those who must access the railway station at Winchfield? There is no parking available at the station there most days. Can we operate a shuttle to and from at set times, perhaps using our community bus, to make vtye station more readily accessible for HW residents?		The Community Bus already provides a peak-time service to/from Winchfield station. The responsibility of the Community Bus is with the Parish Council and Hampshire County Council and it's future funding and usage is agreed by them.	No action taken
65	Diane Waskett	It is better to develop brown field sites rather than encroach into our valuable green fields which make Hartley Wintney such an attractive environment.		Noted	No action taken
66	Christine Hill	Building restriction and retaining green spaces.		Noted	No action taken
67	Mr and Mrs E Pearson	Supporting repurposing of brownfield sites to keep the character of the village and to be environmentally friendly and minimising impact on the environment.	Fully support brownfield site useage provided it keeps within the character of the area and sustainable methods are used where possible in achieving this objective. It is vital to retain community identity and keep Hartley Wintney thriving into the future.	Noted	No action taken
68	Chris Cornwell	I think that it is essential that new housing developments should not lead to there being no space between Hartley Wintney and the neighbouring towns and villages and so wherever possible boundaries for development should be maintained and brownfield sites used if additional housing is required. I think that this plan has identified 3 sites where these objectives are broadly met.		Noted	No action taken
69	Robert Waskett	It offers a balanced and realistic solution to the planning challenges facing our local community. It has been well thought out, thoroughly researched and intelligently written.	No changes required	Noted	No action taken
70	Sheila Turl	The plan captures my view of how the village should develop over time to allow for changing demographics		Noted	No action taken
71	Christine Watt	The village has increased in size by some 30% in the last 10 years. INfrastructure is insufficient for this increase and the village is in danger of becoming part of a ribbon development along the A30.	None. Get it published ASP.	Noted	No action taken
72	Ronald Watt	A detailed plan that has taken considerable effort to produce. it is based on the needs of the village and the desires of the parishioners.	None. It needs to go forward as quickly as possible.	Noted	No action taken
73	Major Rupert Catt	I agree in general but with reservations	New development at HW 2, 3, and 4 MUST provide adequate parking for a minimum of 1 car per house/apartment plus parking for at least one visitor per 3 houses apartments. Affordable housing for families with children must have large enough bedrooms for the children to sleep, play and do homework. HW policy 3: Access from West Green Rd on to A30 will need redesigning or there will be long delays and traffic jams at the mini roundabouts and village centre. If adequate parking is not provided with each new development all the village side streets will become impassable	The housing proposals made in the Neighbourhood Plan are minor compared to the current level in Hartley Wintney (< 1%) and will not themselves significantly impact on the current infrastructure services or levels of traffic. Parking requirements for any new development are defined by Hart District Council - Parking Provision Standard (2008)	No action taken
74	Dominic Wake	The vision for Hartley Wintney and supporting material is sympathetic to the needs (and I suspect wishes) of the inhabitants.	I can see no changes that would improve the plan. It looks to be a thoughtful plan.	Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
75	Mr J Cockburn	I feel the plan is well thought-out and a good representation of my family's views on how the village should expand into the future.	N/A	Noted	No action taken
76	George Floyd	As above in Item 3	Comments as above	Noted	No action taken
77	Clare Trimming	I think the proposed plan has been thoroughly well thought out and reflects the needs of all ages in the village. I am especially in support of the proposals to maintain the retail areas (policy 13) and to re-use agricultural buildings for commercial purposes (policy 14). I feel this is especially important to keep people coming and supporting the local economy. I also strongly support the aims to maintain the village's distinctive views, green gaps and conservation areas (policies 7,8, and 9). The proposals for new dwellings seem reasonable and in keeping with the village's character.		Noted	No action taken
78	Sarah Dillingham	I don't fully understand the proposals - seems to give the green light that we will allow 23 new dwellings in Hartley Wintney and then on top of that an additional 50 dwellings in the next 10 years? I'd be fine about the 23 as this is mostly on brown field sites, but I really don't think the additional 50 dwellings is appropriate given the substantive expansion of the village in the last few years especially with St Mary's Park. The infrastructure of the village just has not been expanded to keep up and Winchfield station is become over capacity with the additional influx of houses.	3 things: I am not sure why James' farm has been selected - surely this is green field space we should avoid development of ? Please can there be added that we need to ensure there remains a significant 'green belt' between Hook and Hartley Wintney to avoid the joining of these two (distinct) communities? With the development of what was Pool and Sons can we ensure that the original character is retained of the 'nice bits' - ie the curved entrance which is a real feature	The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan indicating a maximum of 50 dwellings was a recommendation obtained from the initial village survey around types/sizes of developments that were considered acceptable and is not a reference to any of the specific proposed sites, all of which are for a significantly smaller number than the 50 maximum. The James Farm site is for utilising land that has previously been built on and therefore classifies as a brownfield development.	Clarification given in policy that this relates to future development now re-worded as Policy 5
79	Graham Gynn	These policies are measured and appropriate to the modest growth required in the village and I am supporting them. More housing is needed at the affordable end of the market and also for people reaching the age where downsizing is a good option. There are a few opportunities to downsize resulting in larger houses being occupied by one or two people. With the recent growth in population it is clear that some infrastructure is overstretched. It is often impossible to park at Winchfield Station after 10am (Fleet is often full too).		Noted	No action taken
80	Alan Williams	Covers all areas of concern to maintain the village's character.		Noted	No action taken
81	Dawn Elborn	The plan is well thought through and sensible. I feel it is particularly important to ensure there are green gaps surrounding the village as Hart District Council's local plan seems to be set on delivering a new settlement at Murrell Green which could effectively join Hartley Wintney and Hook together. I also strongly agree with Objective 13 - improving traffic management throughout the village.		Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
82	Megan Shefford	I believe it needs to be a maintenance of the village boundary as greenfield space and utilisation of the brownfield sites. Significant lack of facilities are included in the plan, which is worrying.		The general item of leisure facilities is included as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
83	Ian Coster	I support this plan because I believe it has been well thought through by the team working on it. THE CHALLENGES FOR HARTLEY WINTNEY. These are well set out and if they could all be met then I believe the outcome would bode well for our future as it befits this sort-after area of Hart. HOUSING. I support the plan, namely Policies 1 to 5. In my opinion, it represents a good use of available land for future development whilst maintaining the character and distinctive nature of Hartley Wintney. There are always demands being made by local and national government for additional housing to be built, which is understandable, however, I suggest that we have, in recent years, fulfilled most of our responsibilities in this by the building of St. Mary's Park and more recently Hartley Row Park, plus local infill and redevelopment of brown spaces. This plan gives opportunities for more selected development, which I support, but it also guards against overdevelopment and cares for our precious existing green spaces. I imagine that housing and development will continue to be firmly on the agenda, however, wouldn't it be so much better if we could proceed in an agreed manner, without every proposal involving a contentious fight. ENVIRONMENT. Again, I support the plan in this regard, namely Policies 6 to 11. Our existing green spaces and the historic Conservation areas must be protected against unwarranted development or significant change. I have not met anyone who wants to see the character of the village changed. I particularly welcome the mention of trees and green spaces and of protecting views, which I know has been done in the past, and of maintaining the green gap between Hartley Wintney and other nearby built areas. TRANSPORT AND ACCOUNTABILITY. In many ways, although I support what is in the plan, namely Policy 12, I find this section to be inadequate. It may well be that the planning team was not asked to look at this - although it does feature in the Challenges for Hartley Wintney section at the beginning - but public transport through the village is poor and constantly under threat. Again, I realise that this is largely due to the withdrawal of government funding, but nevertheless, the net result is a poor public service, particularly east and westbound. Well done to the Parish Council for	As I have said, I support the Plan as presented to us by the consultation team and commend them for their work. I would welcome an additional comment or policy regarding public transport. As well as the excellent facilities we already have here in Hartley Wintney, and the carefully worded policies in the Plan document, I believe this local area would benefit greatly from an improvement in transport. Again, I understand that this would involve national as well as local government, but I wonder, as we're going through this process whether this would be a good time to raise the profile of this subject.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		providing a mini-bus to 'cover the gap'. The continued development of cycle paths is vital; we need to get cyclists away from the dangerous A30 and onto the relative safety of a nearby path. However, as far as is possible these paths need to interconnect. THE ECONOMY. I don't have a lot to comment on regarding this section, Policy14, other than to highlight the development at the eastern end of the village. This is a tricky one. It seems to me that it always has been the poor relation of the High Street. 'Revitalising the eastern end of the High Street...' will need careful thought, which the Plan has given, but it remains to be seen if it is possible to 'elevate' it to the status of the bulk of the High Street.			
84	Diane Bilbey	I would like the local plan to encourage greater architectural innovation within Hartley Wintney, and build an exciting new legacy for the village. Please see point 4 on the Housing policy document. It seems to me that all new development in Hartley Wintney looks exclusively to past styles, creating pastiche homes purporting to reflect the local styles and periods of architecture found elsewhere in the village. Too often the results are homes whose architectural styles are neither one thing or another. So whilst it seems like the heritage of the village is being retained, the reality is in fact, homes that will not contribute to a long term architectural legacy. As well as simply being a great place to live, Hartley Wintney has gained a reputation primarily as an old fashioned, somewhat quaint English village. But with vision, imagination and sensitivity, I believe it could be so much more than this. There is an opportunity for future planning to provide housing that better reflects the times we live in - just as the buildings from the past did when they were built. The village can preserve its history whilst also looking to the future. It's possible to do both. By encouraging genuinely sustainable developments from creative, high-quality developers (see Hab-Housing as one example) this could help to write a new chapter in Hartley Wintney's architectural heritage.	Please see points raised above.	An appendix to the Plan - Hartley Wintney Design Guidelines has been produced and endorsed by the Parish Council to be used in conjunction with future new developments. Maintaining the character of Hartley Wintney (and especially within the Conservation Areas) is considered a key requirement of this which has been communicated in the various surveys and village forums.	No action taken
85	Rob McLennan	Land at Taplins Cottage is readily available for a small residential development of 6 - 8 new homes. This is consistent with the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan in identifying a number of small housing sites to meet the requirement for new homes over the plan period. The development of land at Taplins Cottage is ideally placed to reduce pressure on less suitable or less appropriate land near the village being promoted by others. The land is almost completely unconstrained and is available and is readily capable of accommodating new housing. It should be included within the NP as an additional or alternative site for new homes and as such can become readily developed if any of the chosen sites do not come forward as expected. When originally considered as part of the NP site assessment process the site was wrongly	The neighbourhood Plan should include land at Taplins Cottage as an identified housing site for 6-8 new homes. It is considered that this allocation would deliver new homes within the plan period that may not be achieved from the presently identified alternative sites. As such this change will enable the Plan to meet its Housing Objective in terms of the number of units delivered within the plan period. Further details of this promotion were submitted to the District Council, Parish Council and NP steering Group under cover of letters dated 17th May and 21st July 2016. Additional copies of these can be provided on request.	Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		considered as being promoted for up to 40 new homes. This was never the intention. The site is suitable for 6-8 homes only in accordance with letters and representations submitted to the Steering Group on 21st July 2016.			
86	Jo Lockhart and Becky Wilkinson	N/A	Whilst there is mention of improving cycling path infrastructure, it is not clear how this would be financially underpinned as the CIL funding is only for footpaths (Policy 12). It's not clear whether the affordable housing will only be market affordable, we would recommend provision for socially affordable housing (i.e. not just smaller properties for lower prices). We could not see any provision for Lifetime housing which would cater for the aging population. We can provide further details if required.	None of the proposed sites would provide any socially affordable housing due to their limited size. No sites were nominated in the site selection process that were specifically related to later living but all new developments must meet the latest Government standards and legislation related to the needs of all ages. All 3 sites are of a size that any dwellings will be 1 or 2 bedrooms only which will be more affordable/appropriate to either first time buyers or people wanting to downsize.	No action taken
87	Joanna wright	Good and well thought out plan. Good use of brownfield sites and good proposed barriers to spoiling the views.		Noted	No action taken
88	David Wright	I support this plan on the basis that it clearly demonstrates the protection of the village and the sensible approach to using small brown field sites to achieve the 23 houses proposed.	I cannot make suggestions to improve it as I support it as it is.	Noted	No action taken
89	Caroline Winchurch	The plan is very comprehensive and has taken into account the need to preserve the parish boundaries and at the same time take into account the need for smaller sized dwellings.	None.	Noted	No action taken
90	Alistair Maclean	Very sensible infilling developments, by and large (policies 2 & 3) and no obvious developments which move towards coalescence. Policies 5 to 14 support the maintenance of the 'essence' of Hartley Wintney	The only change I would like to see would be to address the issue of public transport. As there is a significant % of 'older' residents, public transport will be increasingly important to them (and others) and any loss and/or reduction could make the village a relative backwater.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Public transport falls within this group. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
91	Nicola martin	I believe the plan is a good framework to allow development to meet housing needs of the village while		Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		maintaining the much valued character of the village and the precious green spaces within and surrounding the village.			
92	Joanne Westfoot	very impressed		Noted	No action taken
93	Sue Goodlud	Seems sensible!		Noted	No action taken
94	Susan Skinner	It appears that the suggested developments are appropriate for the area.	I consider the plan to be well prepared and have no objection.	Noted	No action taken
95	Susan Skinner	Small numbers of houses primarily on brown field sites	N/A	Noted	No action taken
96	Pam Andrews	We are very pleased that there has been a sensible decision made not to build unnecessary houses on greenfield sites	As everyone is aware in the village there needs to be better infrastructure particularly the trains, buses and parking	Noted	No action taken
97	Dorothy Harvey	It exactly reflects the needs of the village	No change	Noted	No action taken
98	Nicholas Stevens	I support the plan overall. It will help to protect the quality of life of residents from any further degradation. The housing plans are proportionate given the extensive developments in recent years at St Mary's Park and Rifle Range.	The aspirations regarding traffic mgt are too limited. Firstly, no mention is made of the B3011 (Bracknell Lane). The speed and volume of traffic is extensive and growing. Steps are required to ensure that traffic entering the village is within the 30mph speed limit, for safety reasons. Perhaps traffic calming further to the north of the village? Secondly, no proposals are included for reducing the volume of traffic, which is the key issue for health, safety and the environment.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
99	George Davey	I agree with the proposed plan. I particularly support the need to maintain a gap between HW and Hook at Murrell Green to avoid an unnecessary new town development, as well as improvements to roads and traffic flow through HW village and to foot and cycle paths between HW and Hook.	Even though it is unnecessary, if a new town is to be built at Winchfield or Murrell Green, proper 21st century infrastructure needs to be in place first. This must include road improvements, a new M3 motorway junction, railway station expansion (platform extension and car parking), medical facility expansion (GP and dentist), adequate school places, and carbon-neutral public transport to and from Hartley Wintney village centre.	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included. The infrastructure requirements to support any major new development will be fully	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				considered by all relevant authorities as part of the planning process.	
100	EA Woods	The plan is well thought trough and achievable. My only comment is that it is a pity that there appears to be no place for those who want to downsize and move to something similar to Care park Private Residencies. This would free up more three and four bedroomed houses		Noted	No action taken
101	Kate Shefford	I support the plan's objectives in maintaining green space around the village and continuing the character of the village, whilst providing brown space development of specified sites for housing, especially affordable housing. Whilst not wanting to be a NIMBY we have had significant developments at St Marys Park and Rifle Range Farm, all of which have added to the pressures on our local services. The plan does not address how this will be resolved (eg doctors, schools, traffic)	Improving services: doctors, schools, transport links, traffic management. Whilst this plan focuses on Hartley Wintney, I believe it needs to be seen in the context of surrounding habitations - eg Fleet, Yateley, Hook and villages to the north such as Heckfield, Mattingly and Rotherwick, and their ability to absorb some of the housing needs of our area, whilst maintaining the unique character of our village	The housing proposals made in the Neighbourhood Plan are minor compared to the current level in Hartley Wintney (< 1%) and will not themselves significantly impact on the current infrastructure services or levels of traffic.	No action taken
102	Helen Timpany	The proposed sites will be within easy reach of the village, are in attractive parts of the village and will not interfere or in any way dominate Hartley Wintney as it is now.		Noted	No action taken
103	Hamish Elvidge	I fully support the plan and, in particular, the proposal to build housing on brownfield sites in the first instance and if required on small sites.	No changes required.	Noted	No action taken
104	Lynda Ellis	The plan attempts to preserve the rural feeling of Hartley Wintney, and the open lands surrounding it.	Traffic on the A30through the village needs to be helped in some way. Crossing the A30 by Bracknell Lane, onto the common is dangerous.	A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
105	Graham Gillies	The document is well presented and coherent and provides a blue print for the future.	I am very happy with the vision and the whole plan and it provides the local input in a well considered fashion.	Noted	No action taken
106	Sarah Gibbons	Keeps Hartley Wintney as a separate village, keeps space between Hartley Wintney, Hook and Murrel Green, proposes development on brown field sites, protects existing green spaces in the village.		Noted	No action taken
107	R W Skinner	Restricted number of small developments	N/A	Noted	No action taken
108	Marian Duggan	If this is the ONLY plan for Hartley Wintney and immediate surroundings, I support		Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
109	Keith Crowcombe	With the amount of building already finished in the area the planned development seems quite small in comparison.		Noted	No action taken
110	Mr Gregory Gray	Representations Numbered 1 - 7 above concern the specification of a limit of 23 dwellings only over the life of the Plan. This is insufficiently narrow and inflexible and will not accord with the aim of the Hart Local Plan to provide for a target, rather than maximum or ceiling. Accordingly the paragraphs, Aims and Objectives should be amended to read '...at least 23 dwellings..' 8. An additional site is proposed for a small scale housing allocation at Taplins Farm.	Representations Numbered 1 - 7 above concern the specification of a limit of 23 dwellings only over the life of the Plan. This is insufficiently narrow and inflexible and will not accord with the aim of the Hart Local Plan to provide for a target, rather than maximum or ceiling. Accordingly the paragraphs, Aims and Objectives should be amended to read '...at least 23 dwellings..' 8. An additional site is proposed for a small scale housing allocation at Taplins Farm. The text is provided below. However as the website does not support the addition of plans, a separate email is being sent to the NP email address with the full text and plans comprising this representation: HW Policy X - Taplins Farm, Setting of Taplins Farm and Location of Site Figure X Existing Taplins Farm buildings and ancillary land Policy X – HWSX Taplins Farm • This site shall provide 2 dwellings fronting Taplins Farm Lane to reflect the existing character. • Site access will be from Taplins Lane as existing. • Development proposals are expected to retain boundary trees and hedgerows. • Where mitigation of tree removal is required, replacements are expected to be native species. • The maximum height of any new development is expected to reflect the surrounding buildings. • The site is not subject to groundwater flooding. A surface water drainage assessment will accompany a planning application. • Development proposals that include a planting scheme to attract fauna will be strongly supported. • The mix of dwellings expected will be 3-4 bedrooms to fit with existing dwellings on site in line with local need and Local Plan policies. • Development proposals will include provision for cycle storage. • Development proposals should maintain and enhance existing on-site biodiversity assets, delivering 'net gain' in line with the District Council's Local Plan, and provide for wildlife needs on site and/or a contribution to biodiversity enhancement elsewhere in the parish. • Contributions to existing SANGs are expected to provide appropriate mitigation alongside SAMM contributions. If a bespoke SANG solution comes forward, then this would need to meet the requirement of Policy 1 and be agreed with Natural England. • A planning obligation would be required to ensure that the SANG came into public ownership. X.X Evidence for Policy: X.1 Taplins Farm is a site of 0.1ha falling within the "zone of influence" of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and has been used previously for agricultural, commercial and residential purposes. The site adjoins Taplins Cottage on the north side, which is identified in the SHLAA (SHL205) as suitable for new housing. X.2 Former farm and farm dwellings were developed as independent housing many years ago. In addition there is business and storage uses on the Taplins Business Park immediately to the south, giving the locality a mixed land-use and substantially developed character. There is no agriculture carried on, nor is it high grade agricultural land. This site is available for residential development and is deliverable and constraint-free in environmental and amenity terms. X.3 The site is not in any flood risk zone and notwithstanding the wider designation the site is not subject to the acknowledged limited groundwater flooding. Any flood risk assessment would in any event include measures for the management of an accumulation of surface water were that to arise. X.4 The size of the available site is capable	Noted	Hartley Wintney received no allocation in the emerging Local Plan and is therefore entitled to put no allocations forward. No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
			of accommodating family units. X.5 The site has the capacity to contribute towards a housing quota for Hartley Wintney without detracting significantly from the rural character of the community. X.6 This site is suitable for 2 dwellings. The density reflects the Neighbourhood Plan Housing objectives to provide the required housing capacity, on sites that do not give rise to harm to amenity or environmental constraints. X.7 Development will not materially harm the setting of Taplins Farm of the adjacent barns as listed buildings. The Dilly Lane housing development and new cricket pitch open space frames and contains the site from the west as does established housing to the north and south. X.8 The site forms part of the wider Church Farm Conservation Area, along with its neighbours. The character of the Conservation Area in this locality is detached houses in generous plots. The site is not designated for any special characteristics or views. The public benefits of providing small-scale housing to meet Neighbourhood Plan needs outweighs the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.		
111	Nicholas Gibbons	Supporting due to the plan being based on small fill in developments around the village and the use of existing brownfield sites.	n/a	Noted	No action taken
112	Philippa Wilkes	I agree and support the vision set out in the plan	No changes necessary	Noted	No action taken
113	John Wilkes	Support plan as it sets out a clear and realistic vision for Hartley Wintney	No changes requested	Noted	No action taken
114	Karen Britton	Green spaces need to be maintained throughout the village and the surrounding areas in order to retain the 'village feel' and to preserve Hartley Wintney's character.		Noted	No action taken
115	samantha Murray-Smith	I like the idea of small developments rather than large developments. I like the idea of preserving the character of the village. That's what makes it such a great place to live. We should preserve the greenspace as much as possible.		Noted	No action taken
116	Reva Perryman	Housing - 23 new dwellings should be the MAXIMUM. Infrastructure and facilities already struggling. Traffic is worse than it has ever been. Doctors surgery and chemist are always overloaded. Schools are already full. Aim to convert existing buildings to new dwellings. I am assuming this is partially the case with policy 2 and 4. I object to Policy 3 - Arrow Lane has no pavement for pedestrians, nor does West Green Road where the development would be sited. Additional cars would be a danger to pedestrians and to the horses that use these lanes. In addition Arrow Lane is essentially a single track road. Environment- We don't want Hartley Wintney to become a suburb of Fleet. We need to prevent it merging with its neighbours. Transport and Accountability - I believe that if the traffic is managed appropriately, if parking is provided (at a reasonable price in the car park) and ideally with local transport eg community bus, then providing shop rents remain reasonable, the retail units will continue to prosper.		23 dwellings is the limit of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. The housing proposals made are minor compared to the current level in Hartley Wintney (< 1%) and will not themselves significantly impact on the current infrastructure services or levels of traffic.	No action taken
117	Jessica Bickerton	I support the plan and greatly appreciate the considerable work that has gone into it. I have a number of comments that I hope you will consider.	Policy 7 Views. The Hart Local Plan contains Policy SS3 which includes proposals for a new town in an area of search including Murrell Green. I believe you should expand the field of the protected	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
			<p>view coming from the West of the village to include the vista to the south of the A30. This might afford us some greater protection later down the line if we are unsuccessful in fending off the new town. Policy 8 Gaps. Related to the above, the Hart Local plan defines a number of strategic gaps around the district. It is notable that there are no strategic gaps proposed by Hart around Hartley Wintney. I would suggest that in the absence of such gaps being proposed by HDC, then we as a village should propose our own strategic gaps, particularly to protect against visual and physical coalescence with Murrell Green/Hook to the south west and Elvetham Heath/Pale Lane/Fleet to the south east. Village Parking, especially along Green Lane. The village has grown a lot in recent years, and the infrastructure has not grown with it. There are times of the day that Green Lane becomes impassable due to cars being parked and other cars wishing to travel in both directions along it. There is probably scope to widen the lane between the Church and the WI Hut to allow both parking and two-way traffic. Similarly, there is probably scope to add extra parking spaces along Church Lane between Fleet Road and Oakwood school. Extra parking capacity will help those people who need to drive to work in the village. Cycle paths: in order to reduce traffic congestion and to promote sustainable transport, the creation of cycle paths along roads leading into the village would be hugely beneficial. The B3011 from HW towards Heckfield, the Odiham Road ie to Winchfield Station and the Fleet Road should be priorities.</p>	<p>therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included. Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.</p>	<p>strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.</p> <p>Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.</p>
118	Priscilla Turver	<p>Please see comments in the following link: http://wehearhart.co.uk/2018/01/hartley-wintney-neighbourhood-plan-consultation/ Comments are below: Policy 7 Views. As you may know the Hart Local Plan is due to be published for consultation shortly. This contains Policy SS3 which includes proposals for a new town in an area of search including Murrell Green. I believe you should expand the field of the protected view coming from the West of the village to include the vista to the south of the A30. This might afford us some greater protection later down the line if we are unsuccessful in fending off the new town. Policy 8 Gaps. Related to the above, the Hart Local plan defines a number of strategic gaps around the district. These are shown as red hashing on the image below. It is notable that there are no strategic gaps proposed by Hart around Hartley Wintney. I would suggest that in the absence of such gaps being proposed by HDC, then we as a village should propose our own strategic gaps, particularly to protect against visual and physical</p>	<p>As above. Please follow the link. There is a strategic gap. Also parking on Green Lane is a problem . People park all day as they probably work on the high st.</p>	<p>The land to the south of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish Boundary and therefore cannot be referenced within the Neighbourhood Plan. Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations</p>	<p>Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.</p> <p>Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.</p>

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		coalescence with Murrell Green/Hook to the south west and Elvetham Heath/Pale Lane/Fleet to the south east. Village Parking. My final comment relates to parking in the village and along Green Lane in particular. The village has grown a lot in recent years, and the infrastructure has not grown with it. There are times of the day that Green Lane becomes impassable due to cars being parked and other cars wishing to travel in both directions along it. There is probably scope to widen the lane between the Church and the WI Hut to allow both parking and two-way traffic. Similarly, there is probably scope to add extra parking spaces along Church Lane between Fleet Road and Oakwood school. Extra parking capacity will help those people who need to drive to work in the village.		have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans. The Steering Group support the development of dedicated cycle ways and footpaths where identified. The prioritisation and funding of this poses significant challenges and as a result may not be either practical or achievable.	
119	Roger Field	Both of these proposed sites will create the same problems, that of traffic emerging onto already dangerously overcrowded roads. As anyone in the village will know the A30 is busier than ever with traffic volumes apparently rising all the time. Alongside the increase in car traffic I am aware that lorry, and other commercial through traffic has increased significantly creating more congestion and related pollution. I believe that more houses on the Pool site will create a lot more local traffic tipping out of the development directly onto the A30. With particular regard to the Brewery site the problem will be even worse as the access roads can only be the small lanes surrounding the site and leading to and from the A30. These roads are in a very poor condition made worse by the fact that they are becoming rat runs from the A30. From personal observation traffic is approaching the village from the Blackbushe direction and turning left at the Golf club, driving around either the duck pond or the cricket green and making it's way to the already very busy Mount Pleasant in order to reach the Fleet road and avoid going through the village and the aforementioned congestion that occurs every evening. In the same time period heavy traffic from the Grey House School makes the journey in the opposite direction. The consequences are obvious. These roads are tiny and never meant to carry volumes of traffic. These problems have been raised on many occasions by the resident on Mount Pleasant and around the cricket green but have always been ignored. If the Brewery site goes ahead then the traffic levels will be even more dangerous for the many pedestrians who walk the lanes and the ruination of the beautiful area of the Cricket Green and the adjoining common.	This may not be you want to hear and I assume you will think it negative but I don't believe that the plan, for the policies I have commented on, should proceed with the building of any more new developments within the core of the village. The village core is full and the facilities such as Doctors, Dentists, Car parks, Schools etc are at, or near, capacity as well, whatever the developers may say. It is the Council's duty, as listed in it's "top priorities" to protect the core of the village from the negative effects that, I believe, either of these developments will bring.	The housing proposals made in the Neighbourhood Plan are minor compared to the current level in Hartley Wintney (< 1%) and will not themselves significantly impact on the current infrastructure services or levels of traffic. Parking requirements for any new development are defined by Hart District Council - Parking Provision Standard (2008) Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
120	David Harte	Good plan		Noted	No action taken
121	Mrs Carolyn Marshall	I agree that there is a need for more housing in this area.		Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
122	Caroline Baylis	Approve	No changes	Noted	No action taken
123	Katharine Bishop	In broad terms I think this offers a sustainable way forward for the village in the light of the developments which have already happened, and which are in progress in this and neighbouring areas	However, I have serious concerns about the lack of provision for additional medical facilities and additionally for the lack of consideration for the burgeoning number of horse and pony riders in the area whilst consideration is given to walkers and cyclists. Riders have seen a serious reduction in access to off-road tracks since the destruction of the ford crossing at Springwell Lane. The numbers of riders locally have increased in line with the population and there has been a steep increase in road traffic which these plans will only exacerbate. The rider population includes a significant number of responsible children who are forced to carry out at least part of their leisure activities on increasingly busy roads. Consideration needs to be included for this group of road and off-road users.	The comments mentioned around horse and pony riding are matters which have already been considered by the Parish Council and additional comments should be communicated directly to them. A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly and the issue of horse/pony riding on public highways should be directed to them. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
124	Lisapye Ott	I trust the Hartley Wintney steering group decisions to protect the rural nature of HW by limiting development and to keep the village in the same state which attracted us to live here in the first place. I hope their hard work and effort will be rewarded with common sense from the decision makers. As a resident for the last 17 years, I've seen the negative impact of the increased population; pressure on schools, traffic, road safety, the surgery, parking, the environment.		Noted	No action taken
125	Philip Baylis	I agree with the plan		Noted	No action taken
126	Christopher Francis	Very sensible and minimising impact and severely limiting the opportunity for builders to take advantage to maximise profit.	No changes needed just additional caution that the village health service is already overwhelmed. Day time rat running and parking is a serious and growing problem. Residents of smaller dwellings now have two cars and yet the car space planning requirement for one car is inadequate for new build flats of houses.	Noted	No action taken
127	Julian Bishop	Subject to comments below the plan looks to achieve a degree of sustainable onward development particularly in the light of the recent residential development expansion at Rifle Range Farm and Dilly Lane whilst preserving Hartley Wintney as a village, distinct and protected from Fleet/Elvetham Heath and the expansion in Hook.	The plan makes no comment about ensuring that medical facilities are increased to match any increase in the population in the village.	The level of medical facilities and provision of service is constantly reviewed by the local Whitewater Health partnership which covers Hartley Wintney and Hook. Planning permission has recently been granted for a new consulting room at the	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				surgery and a Patient's Participation Group (volunteer patients/carers/members of the practice) meet on a regular basis to discuss the range, shape and quality of services provided.	
128	Suzanne Thurston	I feel strongly that use should be made of brown field sites . The village does not need an excess of homes.	I am happy with the hard work that has gone into the production of this plan and the wording there of.	Noted	No action taken
129	Wendy Williams	I am happy that the information collated by the steering group has ensured that Hartley Wintney will have sufficient housing, green space and amenities in the future.		Noted	No action taken
130	Jane Day	I support the whole document.	Prioritising brownfield sites and then small scale development, rather than large sites, is clearly the best way forward for the Village.	Noted	No action taken
131	JOHN DAY	I think that the best future for development in the Village is as laid out in the Plan - brownfield sites in the first instance, and then small-scale sites, rather than large developments.		Noted	No action taken
132	Mrs Jacqueline G Harding	The plan seems very acceptable.	0	Noted	No action taken
133	Gregory Gray Associates	1. These paragraphs do not satisfactorily reflect the requirements of national; policy guidance and the Local Plan to actively support the provision of developments that will contribute to the supply of affordable and self-build housing over the Plan period. Small-scale developments will fall below the thresholds necessary to secure the delivery of specialist and related forms of housing to meet the community's needs, including those set out in the Neighbourhood Plan objectives. Paragraph 5.1.16 in particular does not accurately reflect Draft Local Plan Policy SC9 (and NPPF para.54) to support mixed tenure developments outside of settlements 2. We have objected to Objective 1 elsewhere as inconsistent with the objectives of the Draft Local Plan and the Housing White Paper (February 2017) in that a Neighbourhood Plan should not be used as a tool to restrict or prescribe District Housing Targets. Objections to this and paragraphs 5.2.8 and 5.2.11 concern the inclusions of 23 dwellings as an allocations limit, in effect a self-importance maximum, for the Neighbourhood Plan. 3. We object to the exclusion of land at Oakfield Farm, West Green Road, for the provision of housing to help meet development plan housing need over the Plan period.	1. Amend para. 5.1. 14 by the deletion of the words: 'a limited amount of' and in bullet point 4 adding to the end: 'in accordance with the Local Plan and NPPF' Amend para. 5.1.15 to delete the words 'approximately 23' Delete para. 5.1.16 and substitute in its place: 'In addition, district planning policies and the NPPF can allow for the development of new sites which would not otherwise be allowed on the condition that a proportion of the new dwellings are, in perpetuity, affordable homes. Therefore, proposals for mixed tenure housing developments on sites outside the settlement area, which help to meet the Hart District Council criteria for rural affordable housing provision will be supported. 2. Delete the Objective and reference to a site allocation total, as a limitation, of 23 dwellings from these and other paragraphs referring to same. and replace with: "Provide for new dwellings between 2016 and 2032 in accordance with Hart District Council's SHMA and Local Plan" 3. Identify Oakfield Farm for development as set out below, which will be provided under separate cover as the plans will not transfer with the text: HW Policy X - Oakfield Farm, Setting of Oakfield Farm and Location of Site Figure X Proposals Map - Oakfield Farm (to be provided) Figure X Existing Oakfield Farm buildings and ancillary residential land (to be provided) Policy X – HWSX Oakfield Farm • This site shall provide up to 40 dwellings with associated open space. • Site access will be from West Green Road. • Development proposals are expected to retain boundary trees and hedgerows other than those requiring removal for site access. • Where mitigation of tree removal is required, replacements are expected to be native species. • The maximum height of any new development is expected to reflect the surrounding buildings. • The site is not subject to groundwater flooding, however a Flood Risk Assessment will accompany a planning application. • Development proposals that include a planting scheme to attract fauna will be strongly supported. • The mix of dwellings expected will be 1-4 bedrooms to	No allocation has been given to Hartley Wintney under the emerging Local Plan and therefore 23 is a generous allocation and a fifty house threshold is perfectly reasonable in these circumstances	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
			fit with existing dwellings on site unless there is compelling evidence at the time of application to demonstrate that a different mix is required. The dwelling mix will include the provision of affordable, market, starter, self-build, disabled and care, in line with local need and Local Plan policies. • Development proposals will include provision for cycle storage. • Development proposals should maintain and enhance existing on-site biodiversity assets, delivering 'net gain' in line with the District Council's Local Plan, and provide for wildlife needs on site and/or a contribution to biodiversity enhancement elsewhere in the parish. • Contributions to existing SANGs are expected to provide appropriate mitigation alongside SAMM contributions. If a bespoke SANG solution comes forward, then this would need to meet the requirement of Policy 1 and be agreed with Natural England. • A planning obligation would be required to ensure that the SANG came into public ownership. X.X Evidence for Policy: X.1 Oakfield Farm is a site of 2.7ha falling within the "zone of influence" of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and has been used previously for agricultural, commercial and residential purposes. X.2 The former farm and farm dwellings were developed as independent housing over 10 years ago. This site has become available for residential development and is available, deliverable and constraint-free. X.3 This size of the available space is capable of accommodating a mix of family units to include first time buyers or people wanting to downsize. X.4 The site has been submitted for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan and has the capacity to contribute towards a housing quota for Hartley Wintney without detracting significantly from the rural character of the community. X.5 This site is suitable for up to 40 dwellings. The density reflects the Neighbourhood Plan Housing objectives to provide the required housing capacity, and an appropriate mix capable of making a realistic contribution towards local need, including for older persons, on sites that do not give rise to harm to amenity or environmental constraints.		
134	Gregory Gray Associates	Paragraphs 1 and 2 are contradictory. Para. 1 should not be confined to a limitation of 23 dwellings over the Plan period. The Ministerial Statement (December 2016) and Housing White Paper (February 2017) both make clear the duty of Neighbourhood Plans to facilitate the delivery of District-wide housing targets, not prescribe or limit them.	Paragraph 1 be amended to read: 1. Providing for sufficient housing in the period 2016-2032 to assist in meeting the targets of the Hart Local Plan, including the sites identified in this Neighbourhood Plan.	No allocation has been given to Hartley Wintney under the emerging Local Plan and therefore 23 is a generous allocation and a fifty house threshold is perfectly reasonable in these circumstances	No action taken
135	Mark Perryman	West Green Road and Arrow Lane already suffers from too much traffic, which frequently exceeds the speed limit and poses a risk to the numerous pedestrians who have to walk in the road. More houses will add to the problem.	Scarp HW Policy 3. If more houses are required, then they should be built elsewhere in the village.	The housing proposals made in the Neighbourhood Plan are minor compared to the current level in Hartley Wintney (< 1%) and will not themselves significantly impact on the current infrastructure services or levels of traffic.	No action taken
136	Stephanie Shepherd	I support the plan as outlined on Saturday 20th Jan in Medodist Hall Hartley Wintney		Noted	No action taken
137	Juliet Lawrence	a) SUPPORTING: Overall Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan due to: • the focus to deliver any new development on brownfield sites in the first instance	While I support the overall plan, consider the following changes: a) Update the Neighbourhood Plan Figure 24 Conversation Area Map to ensure that it incorporates the recent extension to the	Noted	Conservation area map checked and revised

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approach to deliver any new houses across a selection of small-scale sites rather than one large site • the selection of sites to provide 23 new dwellings between 2016 and 2032 at Nero Brewery, James Farm and Pools Yard b) COMMENTING: Neighbourhood Plan Figure 24 Conservation Areas is not legible, consider updating to ensure it incorporates the recent extension to the Conservation Area and that the map is legible c) COMMENTING: Update the Strategic Environment Assessment Conservation Area Map on Page 56 which appears to be out of date and not encompassing the increased boundary changes to the conservation area.	conservation area and is legible b) Update the Strategic Environment Assessment Conservation Area Map on Page 56 which appears to be out of date and not encompassing the increased boundary changes to the conservation area.		
138	Peter Lawrence	a) COMMENTING: Neighbourhood Plan Figure 24 Conservation Areas is not legible, consider updating to ensure it incorporates the recent extension to the Conservation Area and that the map is legible b) COMMENTING: Policy 7 – Protection of Distinctive Views, consider adding an additional distinctive view “View F” in line with “Hartley Wintney Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals February 2008” c) COMMENTING: Update the Strategic Environment Assessment Conservation Area Map on Page 56 which appears to be out of date and not encompassing the increased boundary changes to the conservation area. d) SUPPORTING: Overall Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the focus to deliver any new development on brownfield sites in the first instance - approach to deliver any new houses across a selection of small-scale sites over one large site - the selection of sites to provide 23 new dwellings between 2016 and 2032 at Nero Brewery, James Farm and Pools Yard 	While I support the overall plan, suggest considering the following changes: a) Update the Neighbourhood Plan Figure 24 Conservation Area Map to ensure that it incorporates the recent extension to the conservation area and is legible b) Update the Strategic Environment Assessment Conservation Area Map on Page 56 which appears to be out of date and not encompassing the increased boundary changes to the conservation area. c) Consider adding an additional distinctive “View F” to Policy 7 in-line with the comments made in the Hartley Wintney Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposal regarding the views from Grange Lane and Thackhams Lane (section 9.7.2 vi). “Hartley Wintney Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals February 2008” Add a large swath of fields and woodland, interspersed with a number of important historic buildings, to the west of Hartley Wintney along Grange Lane, Thackhams Lane and as far south as Hartley Place. Views from Grange Lane and Thackhams Lane over these properties and their settings are particularly important. The most significant buildings are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hartley Grange – listed grade II, late 17th or early 18th century, divided into five houses in 1960; • Hartley Grange Farm, no designations but shown on the 1846 map; • Candle Cottage and West Cottage, Locally Listed; • Thackham House and Thackham Court, listed grade II, 17th and 19th century; • Hatch House, listed grade II, c1840; • Hartley Place, not on the 1846 map but shown on the 1900 map as ‘The Croft’ – an Arts and Crafts house. • Belswood House – listed grade II, early 19th century; Suggested additional text to Policy 7 View F: The view West from Grange Lane offers distinctive views over fields and a number of important historic buildings 6.14.1 View F is the view West across fields from Grange Lane and offers distinctive views of the conservation area and number of historic buildings of particular importance as highlighted in Hartley Wintney Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals November 2008 6.14.2 The unspoilt nature of this area, with very limited development has contributed to the preservation of the rural character and views to the surrounding countryside of this part of the conservation area. The historical integrity has remained largely intact. 6.14.3 This area creates a transition between the rural and countryside setting to the West and the village setting of Hartley Wintney to the East 6.14.4 The area is frequented regularly by walkers, dog walkers and horse riders enjoying the unspoilt rural character 6.14.5 Any proposals for development either in or behind these historic buildings would impact on the distinct views enjoyed by many and would be detrimental to	Figure 24 will be replaced with a more legible version. The Conservation Areas have not changed since 2008 and so the Steering Group do not think the map is out of date. (SEA P56 Cons map.) The view as identified does not have the same weight or importance when compared to the other views as included in the Plan document which all significantly contribute to give the village its unique character and structure.	Revision of Figure 24 made

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
			the amenity of the area and these listed buildings Photos can be provided as required and I'm happy to assist the Steering Group with this.		
139	John Lock	I attended the open day held recently at the Methodist Hall where I read the Plan Summary and discussed it with members of the Steering Group. I concluded that the Plan provided a very reasonable, balanced and sufficiently challenging plan for the future of the village. I support the Plan's vision, objectives and policies, and identification of housing needs and where new builds could occur. The Plan has correctly identified 5 'Distinctive Views' that need to be protected ' and stressed the importance of maintaining Green gaps.	One of the papers provided at the Open Day assessed air quality in Hart, and noted that HW has one of the highest readings of Nitrogen Dioxide. Perhaps the Plan could look at this and consider what measures need to be taken with respect to this, especially in the light of new research which has highlighted the impact of air quality on residents living in urban areas.	Relates to Nitrogen Dioxide levels - SEA document section 5.3 The SEA document states that nitrogen dioxide levels in HW are within the national air quality objective. However levels remain the second highest of all monitoring stations in Hart District. However Policy 12 (Cycleways and Footways) is considered to have positive effects on air quality and the level of housing proposed will have minor negative effects on air quality and these effects are likely to be negligible.	No action taken
140	Pam Andrews	Why the wider Hart plan has so much greenfield building is so sad when this is meant to be one of the loveliest places in the country to live and here there seem to be some decision makers trying to change all of that. Make Fleet prosperous without ruining so much of the countryside please	There will have to be some changes to the highways to cope with all the extra traffic from Murrell Green. Please get the powers that make the decisions to realise how my green fields will be unnecessarily ruined when there is so much brown field sites available. We are so irresponsible in ruining our children's future environment	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included.	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.
141	Charlotte	Very well put together	-	Noted	No action taken
142	Ruth Jarman	Thank you for your really excellent work on the neighbourhood plan! There is so much that I am in total support of. But I would like to see something on the environmental footprint of any proposed housing.	I would like to see a minimum building code standard for all proposed new housing. The Strategic Env Assessment mentions, in para 3.2.3, that any increase in built footprint increases overall greenhouse gas emissions but it suggests no remedy. The obvious solution is to mandate that all new buildings are zero carbon - i.e. generate as much energy as they use. This could be put into Principle 3, or maybe Principle 1 or 14.	Any new developments must follow Government policies with regard to environmental impacts and requirements	No action taken
143	John Spencer	Policy 7. In order to minimise the potential harm of a Murrell Green development the View E on entry to HW from the Phoenix Green side should be emphasized. Policy 8 As the Hart Local Plan does not include any gaps around HW we should include details of gaps around Murrell Green, The Cricket Green, Elvetham Heath and Pale Lane. A gap next to the Cricket Green would help protect this key site to HW.	No Objections as such	Noted	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
144	Eberhard Reay	It's a very comprehensive plan		Noted	No action taken
145	Lesley Reay (Mrs)	Very good plan		Noted	No action taken
146	Philip Missen	Sets out clearly plans and objectives for the village development in the future	Comments rather than changes. Objectives/Housing says - 23 new houses then - max of 50 in any one development. (i now understand what was meant, but think it hangs together a little strangely).	The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan indicating a maximum of 50 dwellings was a recommendation obtained from the initial village survey around types/sizes of developments that were considered acceptable and is not a reference to any of the specific proposed sites, all of which are for a significantly smaller number than the 50 maximum.	New policy 5 written to clarify "future" development
147	John Pendleton	The Plan shows a holistic approach for the village.future. Caring for people/community and environment.		Noted	No action taken
148	John Collman	Policy 1: The 6th, 7th and 8th bullet points in no way relate to any SANGS; they are good practice which should be followed regardless of the TBHSPA. Policy 2: There is no mention that Lyons + Sleeman + Hoare currently have a business on this site. Surely, putting residential property in the place of a viable business goes directly against Policy 17. Policy 6: It all sounds good, but should be put into the context of the other green spaces in the village. Figure 16 should also highlight the central commons. Policy 13: The Proposal map in Figure 27 shows a rather limited view of the retail area of Hartley Wintney. I believe that it could well be extended eastwards to include buildings on both sides of the A30 from the junction with Hunts Common. Appendix 1, on page 62: It's a good list but gloriously vague unless a set of dates are included. It may be asking too much to state a 'done by' date, but a 'start by' date for each item would make it look much more than an aspirational wish-list.		Whilst the current site at Nero Brewery is a commercial property the owner nominated the site for future residential development as part of the site selection process. The Community Aspirations as outlined in Appendix 1 have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans. Green spaces as shown in Fig 16 has not included areas of common land as these are already protected and described in section 6.1.5 - 6.1.7 The proposal map in Fig 27 was provided by HDC and although does not show all retail units is considered an appropriate reflection of the village centre retail area.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
149	Fleet Town Council	Fleet Town Council support the NP		Noted	No action taken
150	Robert Dafforn	I support these site for new builds because I feel they will supply needed housing stock without detracting from the village amenity.	No changes	Noted	No action taken
151	Lindsay Evans	One of these sites should include provision for a Youth Centre. There is no consideration for the needs of youths in the village generally and this Plan would be a	There is no mention of providing facilities for young people. This section of our community is not provided for and this is a shame. Hook, Fleet and Yateley have a Youth Club - we do not. For example	The general item of lack of leisure facilities such as "all-weather" space is documented	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		good opportunity to ensure this is addressed going forward.	those that are aged 10-18. Currently there is very little for them to do in the village. They need a social club. A place they can meet indoors, play sport and relax in a safe environment in the centre of the village. This need is not being met at all currently. Rather than use Neo Brewery or Pools Yard sites solely for housing, provision should be made for such a facility. If this addition were made I would be fully supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan.	in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan related to Community Aspirations. These Community Aspirations as outlined in Appendix 1 have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
152	Jane Roberts on	It seems a well researched plan.		Noted	No action taken
153	Ian Roberts on	I am in agreement with the objectives and policies of the plan because they are in accordance with my own views.	No changes necessary.	Noted	No action taken
154	Nicholas Cooper	Sensible infill proposals provided sympathetically done should enhance the village		Noted	No action taken
155	David Turver	p18. Vision, I strongly support the vision and objectives. There is nothing in particular I object to, but I would recommend the following improvements to the plan shown in the section below.	Policies 7 & 8 Views and Gaps. As you may know the Hart Local Plan is due to be published for consultation shortly. This contains Policy SS3 which includes proposals for a new town in an area of search including Murrell Green. I believe you should expand the field of the protected view coming from the West of the village to include the vista to the south of the A30. This might afford us some protection later down the line. Related to this the Hart Local plan defines a number of strategic gaps around the district. It is notable that there are no strategic gaps proposed by Hart around Hartley Wintney. I would suggest that in the absence of such gaps being proposed by HDC, then we as a village should propose our own strategic gaps, particularly to protect against visual and physical coalescence with Murrell Green/Hook to the west and Elvetham Heath/Pale Lane/Fleet to the South. My final comment relates to parking in the village and along Green Lane in particular. The village has grown a lot in recent years, and the infrastructure has not grown with it. There are times of the day that Green Lane becomes impassable due to cars being parked and other cars wishing to travel in both directions along it. There is probably scope to widen the Lane between the Church and the WI Hut to allow both parking and two-way traffic. Similarly, there is probably scope to add extra parking spaces along Church Lane between Fleet Road and Oakwood school. Extra parking capacity will help those people who need to drive to work in the village. I would welcome proposals along these lines being included in the final version of the plan.	Land on the south side of the A30 is not within the Hartley Wintney Parish boundary and therefore could not be proposed as a strategic gap within the Neighbourhood Plan. Hartley Wintney Parish Council is opposed to any new development in the area of Murrell Green/Winchfield and have formally written to object to Policy SS3 in the HDC Local Plan proposal. Any new development would need to have a strategic gap included. Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy. Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				Council website to communicate specific plans.	
156	William Coulten	Comments only as I don't think the proposed plan will encourage a wider age demographic to the village and remains retiree focused.	I have no objections per se, rather comments on the plan. Essentially, I don't see anything in the plan to encourage a wider age demographic to the village. For example, all the proposed property developments are for small dwellings eg. The brew house for 1/2 bed developments - this encourages more retirees and not families. The Center of the village is crying our for a good kids playground. We have a wonderful green expanse in the Center of the village, but the small children play grounds are banished to the outskirts. I think a wooden playground somewhere on the green would be a wonderful step forward. Second area of comment is the tip on the edge of the village - the access is difficult yet it causes significant traffic volume through the village - I don't know what Hampshire CC would not consider putting it closer to a larger population base.	Preference expressed by the community is for smaller dwellings rather than large developments. The village household recycling centre is managed by HCC and the use of this site is constantly under review by them. There are already 4 childrens playground within the village (Mitchell Avenue, Haywarden Place, St. Mary's Park and Springfield Avenue) with a fifth potentially to be provided in the new Hartley Row development. The playground at Haywarden Place is very close to the village centre.	No action taken
157	Julian Houghton	First, the proposed new town is not necessary. It will deliver houses we don't need from as early as 2024, adding perhaps 100-200 houses per year, resulting in 800-1,600 extra houses. Second, this additional rate of building will end up being carried forward and compounded in future plans because of the way that the ONS household projections are calculated. Adding gratuitous extra houses now will add extra building pressure on our green fields for decades to come. Third, the proposed new town will end up starving our urban centres in Fleet, Hook and Yateley of much needed investment in regeneration. The residents of Hart have not been consulted on any regeneration plans. But a sensible regeneration policy could gather widespread support and deliver necessary affordable housing and infrastructure investment where it is most needed. Fourth, the proposed 'area of search' is inappropriate, as we know it includes areas that essentially failed testing in the recent sustainability appraisal, and some land that is definitely not for sale. Finally, the proposed draft Local Plan is very light on its plans for infrastructure. There are no objectives set for infrastructure, just a set of vague and woolly policies. There is no acknowledgement of the £72m infrastructure funding gap; there are no specific tangible projects and no costings. I fear this is contrary to current NPPF guidance and may render the plan unsound at inspection. So, I would urge you to modify this draft Local Plan to remove the unnecessary new town proposals. You should also provide greater focus on the plans and objectives for infrastructure: road improvements, healthcare facilities, cultural amenities and allowing appropriate room for expansion of our secondary schools should extra capacity be shown to be required. I believe these modifications would achieve	First, the proposed new town is not necessary. It will deliver houses we don't need from as early as 2024, adding perhaps 100-200 houses per year, resulting in 800-1,600 extra houses. Second, this additional rate of building will end up being carried forward and compounded in future plans because of the way that the ONS household projections are calculated. Adding gratuitous extra houses now will add extra building pressure on our green fields for decades to come. Third, the proposed new town will end up starving our urban centres in Fleet, Hook and Yateley of much needed investment in regeneration. The residents of Hart have not been consulted on any regeneration plans. But a sensible regeneration policy could gather widespread support and deliver necessary affordable housing and infrastructure investment where it is most needed. Fourth, the proposed 'area of search' is inappropriate, as we know it includes areas that essentially failed testing in the recent sustainability appraisal, and some land that is definitely not for sale. Finally, the proposed draft Local Plan is very light on its plans for infrastructure. There are no objectives set for infrastructure, just a set of vague and woolly policies. There is no acknowledgement of the £72m infrastructure funding gap; there are no specific tangible projects and no costings. I fear this is contrary to current NPPF guidance and may render the plan unsound at inspection. So, I would urge you to modify this draft Local Plan to remove the unnecessary new town proposals. You should also provide greater focus on the plans and objectives for infrastructure: road improvements, healthcare facilities, cultural amenities and allowing appropriate room for expansion of our secondary schools should extra capacity be shown to be required. I believe these modifications would achieve	The comments outlined primarily relate to the Hart Local Plan and not the HW Neighbourhood Plan and therefore cannot be addressed here. The Parish Council have provided their own feedback to the Hart Local Plan which rejects the proposal for the new town settlement (Policy SS3) and are combining their efforts on this activity with Winchfield Parish Council who also oppose this proposal.	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		near unanimous support across the district.			
158	P & A Hornsby	Details of Neighbourhood Plan as set out in the Executive Summary are fair and comprehensive. It concentrates on Hartley Wintney not being changed to distort it's current feel of a Village.	Let's keep Hartley Wintney a Village and not turn it into a mini-town!!	Noted	No action taken
159	Kelvin Fay	The plan is needed		Noted	No action taken
160	John Burrell	It seems well thought out and endeavours to maintain the character of the area.	N/A	Noted	No action taken
161	chris farrance	This is a very structured way in which to make our views known about how we want the parish to be		Noted	No action taken
162	Robert Jones	I am very Pleased with the Plan, Especially the elements which seek to establish a settlement boundary curtilage around the existing built up areas in the parish to stop sprawl and protect the semi rural nature of Hartley Wintney - which is its essence.. This is an excellent move. I also approve of the brownfield development of three sites within that curtilage to boost Affordable, but particularly Downsizing homes for the aging population in the Village. Thereby allowing the village population the opportunity to stay in the village and for the property to flow through the generations. I also approve of the Preservation of the Local Greenspaces. and establishment of Conservation areas. Overall I believe this to be a well thought through plan to preserve the Character of Hartley Wintney, which allowing some sensitive development which will benefit the generations living in Hartley Wintney.	I would add regarding important views that the Paddock fields next to the protected fields of Church Farm should also be Protected as development here would "crowd" the Protected views proposed. although it would appear that the Settlement Boundary and conservation area would protect that??	The area mentioned (Paddock Fields) is already protected as it is within the Conservation Area.	No action taken
163	Sally Solomon	I have to support the plan with reservations as objecting will leave the way open to unrestricted developments around the village in the future	Small developments within the village ie Nero's brewery and Pools yard may have difficulty attracting a suitable developer with all the Plan's environmental and other restrictions being put in place also parking is a huge issue in the village and any additional housing adds to this pressure. HW has to find suitable land for additional public parking if it wishes to attract consumers to the village, this is not mentioned in the plan. 2 suitable sites obviously contentious are in front of St John's church and the war memorial and as the plan is for the next 16 years, it may be in the future, that the Golf Club land ie alongside Park Corner Road running from the first tee to the village pond, could become available from the Elvetham estate, the membership is most likely to fall off due to a decrease in popularity of the game and an ageing population. this could provide parking for 100 + cars	Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. The future of the HW Community Bus will be agreed by this group. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
164	Martin Tucker	The planners are very lax about the Conservation area. I do not think that gated development is suitable to a village or aggressive street lighting. I do not like too dominant rubbish bins on local roads. Some roads are virtually unusable because of parking.	I would like rubbish bins to be out on collection days onlt. I would like the planers to actually read the Conssrvation Area Policy statements and find gated developments unsuitable.	The comments here fall within the jurisdiction of Hart District Council and are therefore outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan activity as they relate to the enforcement of existing district policies.	No action taken
165	Susan Ford	To use brownfield sites in the first instance then smaller scale sites rather than large developments retaining a village environment	None	Noted	No action taken
166	Janine Kilroy	1. Questioning poor demographic detailed projections. 2. Objecting/questioning the proposed conversion of Nero's Brewery to housing – see attachment	More attention to needs of an inevitable aging population with specific proposals rather than general observations	The demograohic data used in the Neighbourhood Plan was provided by Hart District Council using census data from 2016. The needs of an aging population has been looked at as is practically possible.	No action taken
167	Mary Davidson	It'simportant that the Neighbourhood Plan protects the interests of the residents of the village and ensures that the curret infrastructure remains sufficient for the community as a whole.		Noted	No action taken
168	Ann Amor	The Neighbourhood Plan is to protect the interests of the people of the village to keep the current infrastructure to remain sufficient to the Community as a whole intact.		Noted	No action taken
169	Kevin Dineen	I am supporting the plan as it only involves 23 dwellings which will not subject Hartley Wintney to unnecessary expansion	No objections raised to this particular document. Hartley Wintney is a attractive village that people enjoy living in & visiting. It should not loose this identity – once lost can never be regained.	Noted	No action taken
170	Dione Johnson	The volumes of the plan seem to me 1. Very wordy and 2. to express just platitudes which no-one would contest about quality of life	One point in particular I notice is already out of date: Plan says that to 2023 no development will have more than 23 homes. Hartley Row Park will have 100. The final 5 are being built now. Further comment made – rediscussed with 1 resident – already committed to build.	Approval for Hartley Row Park had already been given prior to the Neighbourhood Plan being commenced and so was not in scope of the sites reviewed or proposals made.	No action taken
171	Miles Dorman	I agree with the content and policies as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan	None	Noted	No action taken
172	Norman Daves	We are delighted to note the detailed treatment given in the plan to 1. Housing – design, mix and affordability 2. Environment and Character – Green spaces and Heritage assets		Noted	No action taken
173	Mrs N. Daves	We are delighted to note the detailed treatment given in the plan to 1. Housing – design, mix and affordability 2. Environment and Character – Green spaces and Heritage assets		Noted	No action taken
174	Paul Miseroy	1. I did not find those paras clear. 2. Assume it means 23 houses on 3 sites that can take up to 50 dwellings. Is this an invitation for a further 150 dwellings? 3. Roads to all 3 sites tight. Heavy plant/vehicles will have difficulty in serving these sites	Is it possible to widen these roads before building starts?	The statement in the Neighbourhood Plan indicating a maximum of 50 dwellings was a recommendation obtained from the initial village survey around types/sizes of developments that were considered acceptable and is not a reference to any of the specific proposed sites, all of which are for a significantly smaller number than the 50	Clarified as new policy 5 ensuring it is clear that this relates to future development

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				maximum.	
175	Brenda Garside	More affordable homes desperately needed in the village. Also more consulting rooms at the surgery.		The level of medical facilities and provision of service is constantly reviewed by the local Whitewater Health partnership which covers Hartley Wintney and Hook. Planning permission has recently been granted for a new consulting room at the surgery and a Patient's Participation Group (volunteer patients/carers/members of the practice) meet on a regular basis to discuss the range, shape and quality of services provided.	No action taken
176	Daphne Weal	I feel the challenges and visions have totally thought about all the needs of a village. It is very encouraging as I personally would love to stay in the village as I get older. We desperately require a place for nursing care so I do hope land will become available soon.	Well done to everyone who have put so much time and effort into this Plan. Thank you.	Noted	No action taken
177	Mary Dineen	For any future development it should be brownfield sites first (small scale) and greenfield sites as an absolute last resort	No large developments. HW doesn't have infrastructure to cope with all associated problems and would completely alter village life.	Noted	No action taken
178	William Yorke	We support the plan because all of the policies that it sets out are sound and well considered. In particular the proposals for the 3 housing sites are reasonable and the Nero Brewery and Pools Yard sites will improve a somewhat run-down area and contribute to "revitalise the Eastern End of the High Street" (objective 19)	No objections	Noted	No action taken
179	Judith Yorke	We support the plan because all of the policies that it sets out are sound and well considered. In particular the proposals for the 3 housing sites are reasonable and the Nero Brewery and Pools Yard sites will improve a somewhat run-down area and contribute to "revitalise the Eastern End of the High Street" (objective 19)	No objections	Noted	No action taken
180	Eric Shimmin	The plan is well thought out, realistic and reflects the village development priorities	No changes necessary	Noted	No action taken
181	Louise Shimmin	The plan seems to give thought to retaining the character of the village		Noted	No action taken
182	Richard Peregrine	Much sensible thought has gone into the plan and it represents a sound baseline for moving forward.	I would comment that a satisfactory traffic management strategy should include 1. Road widening to allow two way traffic when cars are parked on one side of the road (eg in Green Lane) 2. The allocation of additional parking spaces even if this encroaches somewhat on current "green" areas.	Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
				Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	
183	Penelope Peregrine	Considerations collated by local residents need to be put forward to future planning	Lack of parking in Green Lane at school peak time raises difficulties. Suggest widening of road for 2 way traffic or one way system.	Parking within the village is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. However a traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.
184	Cecilia Dorman	I agree with the content of the policies as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan	None	Noted	No action taken
185	Wanda Tucker	It will help keep our rural identity and creeping suburbanisation and encourage the planners to follow the aims of the Conservation Area policies (this point needs strengthening). It will help to maintain HW in its landscape setting especially notable from the London side.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our younger people do have to move away to find affordable houses. 2. It would be good to see inovative new houses, inspired by the local vernacular (example the 1990s link building at the Victoria Hall). Also the local vernacular does not include gated developments - HW is traditionally an open fronted community. 3. Add "to keep rural" & "to heed the Conservation Area policy" which aims to "enhance". This has been ignored at Causeway Farm : clear glass window behind the huge barn doors; pale window frames not black; curb stones from the farm yard; suburban looking wall 33 Cricket Green back side of a wooden fence to replace a brick wall; New road suburban walls out of character with all the others; Wm Dyer deli has permission for "vinyl maniffistation" instead of timber or brick - totally igoring the HDC shop fronts guide. 4. Housing Policy 1 - why only 80 years/ lifetime of a development? 2. Nero Brewery - Maximum building height should be 2 storeys. 4 Pools Yard linked with Nero Brewery would be ideal for oldies housing. 5 "provide adequate screened storage for bins...." "Where appropriate and possible, traditional or innovative vernacular...." 5. Environment policy 7 - add view F across the commons. Policy 11 - as mentioned above Wm Dyer's shop has a plastic sheet stuck onto the glass shop window instead of timber. 	The comments here fall within the jurisdiction of Hart District Council and are therefore outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan activity as they relate to the enforcement of existing district policies. The Design Guide as developed as an Appendix to the Plan will help to ensure that future developments are made in line with village expectations and requirements.	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
			6. Economy Policy 14 - keep rural identity. Any landscaping should be native species. No curb stones.		
186	Jacqueline Vowles	I am supporting the use of fewer houses over a very large site of over 70 houses BUT No provision has been made for local villagers to be provided with affordable housing for local family members to require started homes or for old people wishing to down size and stay in the village. Additional information given via word document which has been scanned separately.	I want to see local people considered to be able to stay in HW close to their families and I sent in 4.2.15 call for sites which I enclose (attachment re Riverside Farm). I believe further assessment should be made for the local people listed above.	Noted - Riverside Farm was evaluated as part of the original site evaluations but was not considered an appropriate site for recommendation by the Steering Group	No action taken
187	Paula Downey Jones	Overall I think it's a good document. It aims to maintain the qualities of Hartley Wintney: ensuring it stays as a village (although see later note), maintains the green space both within the village and surrounding, and accommodates the needs of all ages especially young people wishing to stay in the village. The only point I would like to add is more protection to the west of the village particularly to protect against the impact of potential developments of Winchfield and Murrell Gree to ensure a satisfactory gap between these and the village and also to address the impact on infrastructure through/around the village.		Noted	Following feedback from Hart district Council, Policy 8 in relation to strategic gap has been removed, it is not possible at this stage with the emerging Local Plan to enforce this Policy.
188	Robert Hanington	Comments given via Bell Cornwell word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.		Noted	Noted
189	Gregory Gray	Additional information to Survey Monkey 6673485540 Gregory Grey Associates and 6684209557 Rob McLennan Planning. Document has been scanned separately for review.		Noted	Noted
190	Gregory Gray	Additional information to Survey Monkey 6659617300 Gregory Grey Associates. Document has been scanned separately for review.		Noted	Noted
191	Hook Town Council	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review. Hook PC	See document "Comm ref 191 Hook PC"	Noted	No action taken
192	Woolf Bond	Comments given via email related to Pools Yard. Document has been scanned separately for review. Steven Brown		Noted	No action taken
193	Odiham Parish Council	OPC considered Hartley Wintney parish council's request for feedback on it's draft NH Plan at the meeting on Monday 5th February. It was agreed by the majority vote to offer support to Hartley Wintney's objectives 3, 7 and 10 in their draft NH Plan and to also support the reduction in light pollution which results in improved views of the night sky mentioned under distinctive views.		Noted	No action taken
194	Reva Perryman	Regarding the HW Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2032 I would like to make the following comments. Housing - Infrastructure and facilities cannot cope with more housing. 23 dwellings to be the maximum. The traffic is far worse in and around Hartley Wintney than it has ever been before. The doctor's surgery and the chemist are always overloaded. The schools are already full. Parking is getting increasingly difficult. It should be		A traffic partnership group exists with representation from Hampshire County Council, Hart District Council and the Hartley Wintney Parish Council. This group meets quarterly to discuss these and similar issues. The future of the HW Community	Action has been taken thru the Community Aspirations action log. Appendix A will be reviewed and updated.

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
		<p>an aim to convert existing buildings to form new dwellings. I am assuming that Policy 2 and 4 partially included this.</p> <p>Environment - In order for Hartley Wintney to remain a village it is vital to prevent coalescence of its neighbours. Fleet is already getting "closer". We do not want Hartley Wintney to become a suburb of Fleet.</p> <p>Transport and Accountability - I believe that if traffic is managed appropriately in the village with sufficient parking (at a reasonable price in the car park) and ideally if there are connections to the local vicinity (eg Community bus) then providing shop rents are kept reasonable the retail units within Hartley Wintney will continue to prosper.</p>		<p>Bus will be agreed by this group. Transport and accessibility are covered in detail as part of the Community Aspirations defined in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan document. These Community Aspirations have been accepted by the Parish Council and are being turned into an action log which will be published on the Parish Council website to communicate specific plans.</p>	
195	Fleet Town Council	Just a quick note to say Fleet Town Council's Planning Committee looked at Hartley Wintney's Neighbourhood Plan at the meeting on Monday - they said they supported the plan and thought it was very well put together.		Noted	No action taken
196	Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council	Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council has asked me to pass on to you its expression of support for your Neighbourhood plan process.		Noted	No action taken
197	Geoffrey Lewis	The plan seems to make sense. One that the village can cope with.		Noted	No action taken
198	Hampshire County Council	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.	See document "Comm ref 198 HCC"	Noted	No action taken
199	Bell Cornwell re Wintney Court	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.	See document "Comm ref 199 Bell Cornwell"	Noted	No action taken
200	E. MacDonald re Wintney Court - prepared by G.Bell	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.	See document "Comm ref 200 E MacDonald"	Noted	No action taken
201	Barton Willmore re Winchfield Garden Community	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.	See document "Comm ref 201 Barton Willmore"	Noted	No action taken
202	Turley re Grange Farm	Comments given via Survey Monkey ref 6700096801 and word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review.	See document "Comm ref 202 Turley Grange"	Noted	No action taken

comm ref	Name	Please give details of the grounds why you are supporting or objecting to the plan. Please be as precise as possible.	changes considered necessary to make the plan able to proceed, related to any objections you have raised.	HWNP Steering Group Response	HWNP Steering Group Action
203	Hart District Council	Comments given via word doc. Document has been scanned separately for review. Added on March 6th 2018	See document "Comm ref 203 Hart DC"	Comments will be reviewed and updated as necessary.	Actioned – individual actions noted on separate document