

Fleet Submission Neighbourhood Plan 2017 - 2032

Summary of comments

Summary of representations received by Hart District Council (HDC) as part of Regulation 16 Submission Plan consultation and submitted to the independent Examiner.

Consultation period: 10am 28th January 2019 – 4pm March 11th 2019.

The table below is a summary of the comments – a copy of all representations have been provided to the Examiner in electronic and paper formats.

Ref No	Representor	Summary of Comments
001	Highways England	No comments to make.
002	Richard Rowley	<p>Policy 7: Support There is no reference to the ongoing conversion of offices to flats that does not attract any developer contribution to the infrastructure of Fleet and Church Crookham, which is a concern.</p> <p>Para 22: Support Reference made to the need to ensure that the height and scale of any new development fits within the surroundings is desirable.</p> <p>Para 3.71: Support with modifications Area H Dinorben Avenue Estate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No increase in the present scheme density - The increasing attempts to infill must be resisted - No increase in the number of plot access points, particularly the lower stretch of Dinorben Avenue towards Reading Road South, which is extremely busy at school arrival and departure times. </p> <p>Additional comments: Overall the draft Plan appears well thought out and considered. However the ongoing issues of inadequate infrastructure are not addressed. The present system where developer contributions are minimal is not fit for purpose. Local Authorities must be given the right to secure proper developer contributions to fund the additional infrastructure such development requires.</p>
003	Church Crookham Parish Council	Supports engagement in relation to public transport improvements and future cycle routes.
004	Waverley Borough Council	No comments to make.
005	Natural England	No comments to make.

006	Thames Water	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should seek to ensure that there is adequate wastewater [and water supply] infrastructure to serve all new developments. To this end, the following text is proposed:</p> <p>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.”</p> <p>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</p> <p>Flood risk sustainability objectives should make reference to ‘sewer flooding’ and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage, the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</p>
007	Stewart Gray	<p>Policies I-4: Support Project proposals have come and gone for decades – this needs to be a priority for both the District and Town Council.</p> <p>Policy I6: Support It is essential to the overall character of Fleet that this policy is vigorously and consistently pursued.</p> <p>Whole document: Support This Plan has taken an enormous amount of time and effort of councillors, officers and volunteers from the public to create. It is an excellent piece of work that provides clear guidance on the way forward. It is now time for it be 'made hard' so that everybody can get on with the job of implementation.</p>

008	Christopher Riley	<p>Appendix 3: Suggested modification The description of The Bailey should be updated: “The house was designed for a Mr Ogilvie by Arthur Stedman, a well respected Farnham architect, who designed also the extension to All Saints Church in the early 1930s. The builder was Sydney C Mardles, the stone masons responsible for several buildings in the Fleet area and the Grade II listed Fleet War Memorial. Building commenced in 1934.”</p>
009	Nigel Chapman	<p>Whole document: Support</p>
010	Philip Burton	<p>Appendix 3: Suggested modification The description of The Bailey should be updated: “The Bailey was designed by Arthur Stedman, the renowned Farnham architect, who also designed the 1930’s extension to the listed All Saints Church and the listed Mackintosh Almhouses in Farnham. The builder was Sydney C Mardles, the stone masons responsible for several buildings in the Fleet area including the war memorial outside the Civic Offices and the primary school in Crookham Village.”</p>
011	Thakeham Homes	<p>Promotion of a site at Land at Brook House, located outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area. The scheme proposes a mixed-used development including approximately 500 dwellings, 200 of which could be affordable.</p> <p>Reference is made to the benefits of the Brook House’s redevelopment in connection with each of the policies listed below, however no modifications are suggested. The representations confirm support for the following policies: Policy 10a, 13, 17 and 18</p>
012	Historic England	<p>Policy 1: Suggested modification Given the low scale development within Fleet and the potential impact of taller buildings, recommend establishing an upper limit for development, ideally based on the current precedent of four-storeys established by the civic offices.</p> <p>Policy 12: Suggested modification “Development proposals that affect buildings of Heritage and Townscape Value included in the gazeteer in Appendix 3 will be supported provided that: “1. Proposals conserve and, where practical, enhance the heritage asset and its contribution to townscape value and demonstrate the design contributes positively to the character of the building. “2. Extensions or modifications are sympathetic to the original building in scale, mass, style and palette of materials.</p>

		<p>“Proposals that restore original features lost from previous unsympathetic development will be strongly supported.”</p> <p>Policy I4: Suggested modification Development within the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and its setting, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, will be supported provided that it is in accordance with other statutory, Local and Neighbourhood Plan Policies and the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Development which affects the Conservation Area and its setting shall be of a scale and design to reinforce the locally distinctive character of the area, and should aim to preserve or enhance the heritage asset in a manner according to its significance, ii. Where planning permission is required, any boundary treatment adjoining the canal or its towpath shall reinforce the green character of the Conservation Area; and, iii. The replacement of close boarded fences facing the canal banks or towpath with native evergreen hedging, such as yew and holly, will be supported as appropriate; iv. regular maintenance of all planting near to the Canal provided through development shall be secured by an appropriate management plan; v. all development proposals that would affect the conservation area, either directly or indirectly (such as through effects to its setting) will be required to demonstrate how the recommendations of the Character Area Appraisal have been addressed, including the protection of the current open views from the Canal and towpath and proposals to preserve and enhance its heritage, landscape, ecological and recreational value. <p>Policy I6: Suggested modification Criteria could be rewritten to ensure consistency.</p>
013	Hartley Wintney Parish Council	<p>Supports the whole plan: Welcomes the potential development of Fleet High Street and in particular the retail and cultural area of the town centre. A revitalised community hub centred around this area and offering upgraded facilities as well as supporting the ‘night time’ economy could attract visitors from neighbouring parishes and bring revenue into the town.</p> <p>Notes that the population growth caused by new development exacerbates the need for infrastructure of all kinds which is neither in place nor planned which mirrors what is happening in many surrounding parishes.</p>
014	Hart District Council	Commends the Town Council on their progress.

		<p>A number of updates are suggested relating to the draft Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites (HLPSS) and the Hartland Village planning application.</p> <p>Comments are also made regarding the individual policies:</p> <p>Policy 1: Suggested redrafting the policy to ensure that it is suitability flexible to address the existing and future challenges facing the town centre and does not stifle development by being overly restrictive on potential future uses. Also suggested removing reference to open space, as The Views is not included within policy area. In addition, the requirement for no loss of public parking provision should apply across the town centre rather than just to Zone 1A, as this restricts potential redevelopment opportunities across this site. Suggested revised Policy wording provided.</p> <p>Policy 2: Suggested removing reference to 'suitable' and reference to Policy 1 to remove ambiguity from Policy 2.</p> <p>Policy 3: Suggested removing reference to a town square as its delivery is unclear/uncertain and removing reference to Policy 1 to remove ambiguity from Policy 3.</p> <p>Policy 4: Suggested including reference to draft HLPSS policy ED4 (Sequential Test).</p> <p>Policy 5: Suggested redrafting the policy to focus on redevelopment opportunities rather than just change of use.</p> <p>Policy 6: Suggested redrafting criterion ii to more closely reflect HLPSS draft Policy ED5.</p> <p>Policy 9: Suggested incorporating reference to surface water run-off and SUDS, as well as an equalities impact assessment in connection with the proposal for a shared surface/raised table on Fleet Road, following a recent letter from Minister of State for Housing and Planning and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport, which called for a halt to all further shared space schemes that feature a level surface because they are often not inclusive or accessible for all.</p> <p>Policy 10: Suggested incorporating reference to surface water run-off and SUDS.</p> <p>Policy 10 a-f: Suggested either repositioning a-f within a design appendix and renaming as 'Design Principles', or tightening up the wording of each part of the Policy so that it is clear to a decision maker as to how they should be used.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Policy 11: Queried the locally specific evidence supporting this Policy and suggested alternative wording to aid with understanding any definitions.</p> <p>Policies 12-14: Suggested changes to ensure consistency with NPPF, specifically reference to 'conserve or enhance'.</p> <p>Policy 15: Suggested incorporating reference to permeable paving to reduce surface water runoff.</p> <p>Policy 16: Suggested redrafting the policy to remove technical references regarding trees, in favour of shorter clearly requirements.</p> <p>Policy 18: Incorporating reference to the CIL Regulations and the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council, as a landowner, also supports the Neighbourhood Plan and makes several observations/comments particularly in relation to the civic quarter and Bramshot Farm SANG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Draws attention to the need to ensure that Policy 1A does not stifle development and that the identified uses are not too restrictive, particularly regarding options for a new theatre in the town.- It also draws attention to Policy 13, which lists Bramshot Farm SANG as Local Green Space. Whilst the policy as drafted would allow for the level of planned future development (such as a vehicle store and visitors centre), a drafting closer to para 76 of the NPPF would fetter the Council's ability to delivery longer-term management proposals. The Council as landowner would therefore object to Bramshot being included as LGS if amendments mean that the Policy is more restrictive.
--	--	--