

Summary of Consultation Response:

Hart Local Plan Housing Development Options Consultation Paper August 2014

Draft at 27th October 2014

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Summary of Consultation undertaken	1
3. Duty to Co-operate bodies:	2
4. Summary of results and key points raised	2
5. Next Steps	9
APPENDIX 1: Comments made in relation to Question 1: We would like you to rank the five options in order of preference, 1 being your favourite option and 5 being your least favourite option.	10
APPENDIX 2: Comments made in relation to Question 2: None of the options suggest housing in Hart's smallest villages and hamlets. Do you think even the smallest settlements should see some new housing?	24
APPENDIX 3: Comments made in relation to Question 3: If Option 4 (Focused Growth – New Settlement) were selected, where in Hart do you think the new settlement should be located and how large should it be? Please give reasons for your views.	28
APPENDIX 4: Comments made in relation to Question 4: Are there any other possible housing development options?	36
APPENDIX 5: Comments made in relation to Question 5: Any other comments on the Housing Development Options Paper or the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal?	40
APPENDIX 6: Summary of responses by email/letter	45
APPENDIX 7: Responses from the Duty to Co-operate Bodies	49
APPENDIX 8: Summary of responses from other Specific ¹ Consultees	57
APPENDIX 9: Summaries of responses from other interest groups	65
APPENDIX 10: Gender and age breakdown of respondents	71
APPENDIX 11: Response form / questionnaire	72

¹ That is those organisations listed as 'specific' consultees in Regulations

Summary of Consultation Response on the Hart Local Plan Housing Development Options Consultation Paper, August 2014.

1. Introduction

In August 2014 Hart District Council consulted on a Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites: Housing Development Options Paper. The consultation document was prepared to inform the preparation of a new Hart Local Plan and sought views on different options for delivering future housing growth. The options were:

Option 1 – Settlement Focus

Option 2 – Dispersal Strategy

Option 3 – Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extension)

Option 4 – Focused Growth (New Settlement)

Option 5 – Focusing development away from the Thames Basin Heaths Zone of Influence

The Options Paper also set out the main issues that the Local Plan needs to consider and address, and sought views on these. The consultation document was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal of the Options and a range of other evidence which was made available on the Council's website.

This document provides a **summary** of the responses received to the Housing Options consultation and Sustainability Appraisal. It will be updated and republished alongside the next version of the Local Plan to include detail as to how the Council has responded to the issues raised. The responses received can be viewed on the Council's website at www.hart.gov.uk/local-plan-consultation-responses

2. Summary of Consultation undertaken

The Council consulted on the Housing Development Options Consultation Paper between 14 August and 10th October 2014. Consultation included the following:

- Publication of the Options Consultation document, a summary leaflet and response form on the Council's website.
- Paper copies of the consultation documents and response forms were deposited at all town and Parish offices and libraries in the District.
- Four manned public exhibitions (drop in sessions) across the District (Fleet, Hook, Yateley, Odiham).
- An article in Hart News which is delivered to every household.
- Notification on Facebook and twitter.
- Notification to all those on the Local Plan database (approximately 800 groups and individuals).

- Specific letters to the duty to co-operate bodies.

This consultation is consistent with the consultation procedures set out in the Hart Statement of Community Involvement, July 2014.

3. Duty to Co-operate bodies:

As part of the preparation of the Local Plan the Council has a duty to co-operate with specific bodies (such as adjoining local authorities) in relation to cross boundary planning issues. The Council consulted Duty to Co-operate bodies on the Housing Options document, but also asked for views on the planning issues on which cross boundary working needed to take place. A summary of the responses received are set out in Appendix 7.

4. Summary of Results and Key Points raised

684 representations were received in response to the consultation. These were a mix of on-line responses, paper questionnaires, letters and emails. A detailed analysis of the responses is set out in the attached Appendices as set out above, and some points raised are set out below.

Question 1: Ranking of Development Options:

Respondents were asked to rank each of the five options, so that all options received a rank from 1 to 5. No two options should receive the same rank.

Table 1 shows the results for Q.1 from those questionnaires that were correctly completed. The darker the shading, the higher the number of times that rank and option were selected.

Table 1: Ranking of each option (from 550 correctly completed response forms)

Rank	Opt 1 Score Count	Opt 2 Score Count	Opt 3 Score Count	Opt 4 Score Count	Opt 5 Score Count
1st	128	64	103	202	53
2nd	141	86	148	88	87
3rd	127	165	133	46	79
4th	90	168	90	99	103
5th	64	67	76	115	228
Total	550	550	550	550	550

This table shows:

- That Option 4 was ranked first more than any other option
- That Option 5 was ranked fifth more than any other option
- That Option 1 tended to be ranked marginally higher than Option 3,
- That Option 2 was most frequently ranked 3rd or 4th.

On this basis, the emerging preference is as follows:

1. Option 4 (New Settlement)
2. Option 1 (Within settlements)
3. Option 3 (Strategic sites)
4. Option 2 (Dispersal)
5. Option 5 (SPA avoidance)

Table 2 uses a scoring system to produce an overall score for each option:

Rank	Score
1	5
2	4
3	3
4	2
5	1

Each time an option is ranked 1 it scores 5 points, each time it is ranked 2 it scores 4 points, and so on.

Table 2: Ranking of each option using a scoring system

	Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
	Score	Score	Score	Score	Score
Rank	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
1st	640	320	515	1010	265
2nd	564	344	592	352	348
3rd	381	495	399	138	237
4th	180	336	180	198	206
5th	64	67	76	115	228
Total	1829	1562	1762	1813	1284

Table 2 shows that Option 1 comes out highest under this scoring system, with Option 4 a close second.

On this basis, the emerging preference is as follows:

1. Option 1 (Within settlements)
2. Option 4 (New Settlement)
3. Option 3 (Strategic sites)
4. Option 2 (Dispersal)
5. Option 5 (SPA avoidance)

To conclude on the ranking exercise, Option 1 (within settlements) and Option 4 (new settlement) emerge as the two preferred options in both analyses. They are followed by Option 3 (Strategic sites), Option 2 (Dispersal) and Option 5 (SPA avoidance) in that order.

Comments on option 1 (Settlement Focus) – those in support of this option identified; that this was likely to happen anyway; that it should be maximised; would support town centre regeneration; would deliver in the short term, and could combine with other options. There was concern that this option put a strain on local services and satisfied no-one.

Comments on option 2 (Dispersal Strategy) – Comments on this option identified that; development should be shared, it would have the least adverse effect on the environment and would benefit local businesses and would help sustain local facilities. However, there were concerns about the availability of sites; that it does not consider the characteristics of settlements; would be ad-hoc development outside settlement boundaries, and would impact on smaller communities in an unbalanced way.

Comments on option 3 (Focused Growth Strategic Urban Extensions) – Comments on this option suggested it is easier to expand existing larger settlements which have existing infrastructure; it maximises protection of the countryside and is the most sustainable option. However, concerns expressed against this option were; the pressure on existing infrastructure; the difficulties in finding suitable locations; the impact on 'host settlements; and penalising areas because they had taken growth already.

Comments on option 4 (Focused Growth New Settlement) – Comments made on this option suggested that this would allow for proper long term planned development of housing and infrastructure; that it would relieve pressure on existing infrastructure; would protect the character of existing settlements; would provide employment opportunities and that there are sites available. There were concerns expressed about this option considering that it would have a greater impact on the environment than other options; that it would need a long lead in time; that it would change the character of Hart; would conflict with the SPA; should be on a brownfield site and would cause coalescence of settlements. A number of specific sites were suggested for a new settlement as well as comments suggesting that it must be located close to good road and rail links.

Comments on option 5 (Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy) – Comments on this option were generally opposed to this as an option due to the impact on the best rural areas and historic villages in the district; impact on flooding; limited infrastructure; unfair; would not provide adequate housing; loss of agricultural land. Other comments made were that the interests of birds should not be made above those of humans.

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

- A combination of options 1 and 3
- A combination of options 1 and 4

- A combination of options 4 and 5
- A combination of options 2 and 4

Place specific comments – there were also comments suggesting areas where development should be focused, including MOD land and empty office and premises. There were also specific comments made on many of the towns and villages in Hart, predominantly setting out concerns about the impact of new development, but also suggesting locations where development could go.

Other comments – there were a number of comments which questioned the need for this number of new homes, but also comments supporting this level of housing, or a higher number, being met. There were mixed comments on the need to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), and there were additional comments relating to the need to involve residents; to prepare a plan as soon as possible; to focus on brownfield land and protect greenfield sites, and the need to take account of existing expansion plans. There were also a number of detailed comments setting out concerns about existing infrastructure and the need to ensure that new development must be supported with appropriate infrastructure alongside it.

Question 2: Housing in even the smallest settlements:

Table 3: Number of respondents who responded either Yes/No or Don't Know.

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	322
No	151
Don't Know	59

There was strong support for some additional housing in the smallest settlements in Hart.

Comments from those responding 'yes': - these comments set out that housing should be shared; that it would help support local facilities and to create 'thriving' communities; all areas can accommodate a small amount of development; that it would contribute to the overall number; would provide housing for people to stay close to their families and would protect the character of the District. Comments also suggested that this should only be allowed if it was infill and within the settlements boundaries; if it was limited to a set number or percentage; if it was based on local need; was of a high standard of design and was for affordable homes. There were also comments relating to the need to review settlement boundaries and the settlement hierarchy.

Comments from those responding 'no': - these comments suggested that villages have low levels of sustainability; this would be detrimental to their character; they already see some development; road network is unsuitable; would put undue pressure on infrastructure; development should go to more sustainable locations, or to other

Boroughs and that the villages are part of Hart's attraction and contribute to the high quality of life.

Comments from those responding 'Don't know' – these comments expressed some support in that it could be viable, but also concerns that it might ruin the villages, possible highway issues, and that residents should be asked what they want.

Question 3 – Possible Location for a new settlement, if Option 4 chosen:

A number of site specific comments were made both in favour and opposed to different locations in the District. These are set out in Appendix 3.

In addition there were a number of suggestions that development should be located outside the District, but also concern that there was insufficient information at this stage on the evidence, and the options available to take a view. A number of suggestions were made regarding the size of a potential new settlement. These ranged from 500 – 8,000 new homes. A number of respondents also stated that they could not support this option, and some felt that the documents unfairly led to only one answer.

Question 4 – Any other possible housing development options?

Table 4: Number of respondents who responded either Yes/No or Don't Know.

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	141
No	71
Don't Know	280

A wide range of comments were received in relation to this question. These include a number related to ensuring that adequate infrastructure was provided, and concern that existing infrastructure was already overstretched. Others related to the need to protect the countryside and greenspace; the need to provide specialist housing; concerns about the housing numbers and how they have been arrived at; the need to cap immigration; site specific comments; the need for more information; the maintenance of new sites; the need to protect the SPA, and the need for the local council and residents to make the decision, not central Government.

Question 5 – Any other comments (includes email and letter responses)

A wide range of issues were made in response to this question and by separate letters and emails. Of note is that there are a number of representations challenging the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) methodology and suggesting that

the District's housing need is higher. In addition, a number of specific sites have been put forward for development across the District. A number of comments also questioned the need for so many homes and there were also concerns about the capacity of existing infrastructure. Comments were also made regarding the need to complete the evidence base before further work was done on agreeing the options. Further detailed comments on the merits or disadvantages of specific options were also made in response to this question.

A number of comments were made on the Sustainability Appraisal. These have not been summarised in this document but will be picked up in the preparation of the next stage of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

5. Next Steps

These responses, along with a range of evidence on issues including housing, landscape, retail, employment and transport, will be used to inform the next stage in the preparation of the Hart Local Plan 2011 - 2032: Strategy and Sites Document. It is anticipated that this will be published in summer 2015.

The following Appendices set out a summary of responses to the following:

- Appendix 1 - Responses to Question 1
- Appendix 2 – Responses to Question 2
- Appendix 3 – Responses to Question 3
- Appendix 4 – Responses to Question 4
- Appendix 5 – Responses to Question 5
- Appendix 6 - A summary of other responses made by letter and email
- Appendix 7 - Comments made by the Duty to Co-operate bodies.
- Appendix 8 - Comments from other specific consultees
- Appendix 9 – Comments from other interest groups
- Appendix 10 – Gender and age breakdown of respondents
- Appendix 11 – Consultation Questionnaire

APPENDIX I

Question 1: We would like you to rank the five options in order of preference, 1 being your favourite option and 5 being your least favourite option.

Additional Comments relating to Question 1:

Comments on the Number of New Homes
The option depends on the number of houses
Don't understand why we need so many new homes – Government should tackle immigration.
Questions why 4,000 new homes are needed/should challenge rationale
Don't see the need for more houses, need to cap immigration and the size of families
Reserve the right to further critique the assumptions in the SHMA.
Crucial that objectively assessed need is met in order to deliver affordable housing.
Past affordable housing delivery rates suggest that an uplift in housing number is justified.
Further consideration should be given in the evidence to accommodate the unmet needs of London.
Clear from other examinations that the Plan will not be found sound if objectively assessed needs are not met.
Welcomes review of the housing target.
Due to demographic changes and the release of new homes, Hart's housing need can be catered for without building a single new house.
Option 6 – no increased housing
There should be much greater pressure put on our parliamentary representatives to change the current centralising policy to one of diversification
Should not meet housing quota on time or will be asked to take more
Until final housing figure is known it is hard to know how much each option can contribute.
Hart does not have a big town like Reading or Basingstoke with shops and services and is not suitable for thousands of houses.
What about targets beyond 2032?
Comments on Option 1 – Settlement Focus
Will fit in with any option and should be included provided doesn't alter the character of the settlement.
Accepting the time limitations of option 4, growth should be centred around existing urban centres.
Preferred option
Should maximise growth in existing towns and villages.
This should happen anyway and combine with another.
Strongly support
Already happening around Odiham
Would hope the problem of 'too many people' is solved in the short/medium term thus reducing housing needs
Should maximise this option as per the basis set out in the options document.
Agree should be part of the solution – should be part of regeneration of town centres.
Town centre development and development within settlements should be the focus.
Can start at once and combined with option 2 give 5 year supply.
Do not agree that this shouldn't apply to the smaller villages or hamlets,
Will happen anyway, questions why previous conversion of offices in Fleet was refused and premises empty and vandalised.
Need to be open to overcoming some of the constraints identified for this option.
Changes in employment patterns might increase the opportunity for housing.
Promotes sustainable development, protects the rural environment and supports commercial viability of the principal settlements.
Within settlements
Reuse underused sites/vacant buildings

Supported but should be amended to provide both a settlement and re-development of brownfield sites focus.
Does not meet the housing development requirement. No provision for SANG.
Least preferred as puts a strain on local provision.
Satisfies nobody
Not enough road space for the increase in traffic
Comments on Option 2 – Dispersal Strategy
Should include the redevelopment of existing employment sites.
Growth should be shared.
Preferred option
Would help sustain local facilities.
Would have least adverse impact on environment and lifestyle enjoyed by Hart.
Development should be rolled out across the whole area.
Supports evolutionary development around existing communities.
Major towns have taken most development so need to spread across the district.
Seems fairest
Most likely to maintain Harts rural character and benefit small businesses.
Needed until option 4 in place
Should be shared and 10% growth seems appropriate.
Core to delivering the plan.
Only option which will deliver sufficient growth but must take account of past growth e.g. Hook has had higher past growth than other areas.
All should take a share but if options 1 and 5 chosen, the share is only 3%
There are plenty of sites near to existing towns that could accommodate the sort of additional growth required
Best option - endorsed by Para 52 of the NPPF
Supported but all opportunities at Fleet/Church Crookham and Yateley/Blackwater are explored first.
Only option which will help sustain the rural communities.
Takes no account of other characteristics of the settlements.
Expanding existing villages/towns means people have to put up with a larger/busier place than they chose.
Least favoured option as no good planning reason, entails building outside settlement boundaries, would be 'ad-hoc' development and some places will have constraints which mean that they cannot take their share.
Opposed as does not create sustainable development and can become very confrontational with local residents.
Would impact on smaller communities in an unbalanced way.
Consider that due to constraints with other options this will be most likely regardless of any public feedback.
Could mean unfair burdens on some villages.
Option 2 - Doesn't answer the infrastructure requirements. Disproportionate adverse impact on smaller settlements.
Suggest that this option is amended slightly to take into account not only settlements in Hart's settlement hierarchy, but also settlements outside the District where these are on the border between Hart and other authority areas. Would apply to site at Riseley, in Hart but adjacent to Wokingham Borough.
Should be based on what land is available at each settlement rather than in relation to size as unlikely that land availability will match proportionate growth at each settlement.
Offers the political convenience of apparent equity cross the District, if the appropriate distribution of new sites could be identified, but otherwise it simply spreads the environmental degradation into every corner of the District.
Finding suitable locations will be difficult
Concerned about lack of sites, infrastructure and number of houses to be built in a short space of time
Only spreads the pain, not good planning.

Comments on Option 3 – Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extensions)
Preferred – easier to expand existing settlements (Fleet, Hook) than spoil smaller villages which do not have sufficient infrastructure.
Protects the rural environment of villages.
Would not affect the characteristics of the areas proposed
Best option with specific emphasis on Hook and Yateley/Blackwater.
Most sustainable option with north west Hook as the most appropriate sustainable extension.
Should be 'core' option supported by others if absolutely necessary as has other benefits, minimising environmental impact, maximises protection of the countryside, minimises the need for additional infrastructure elsewhere, follows existing travel patterns and is less likely to put a strain on the host settlements infrastructure and character.
Provides housing where existing travel infrastructure
Option 3 - Significant potential for housing delivery. Infrastructure requirements are more easily addressed. Could accommodate the SANG requirement.
Option 3 is the best way forward and should be focused around Fleet., in particular to the west of Fleet/Church Crookham given constraints elsewhere.
A range of urban extension sites should be considered.
Is not enough, even with option 1.
Finding suitable locations will be difficult
Not efficient for meeting housing needs due to risks set out in housing options paper
Would destroy character of many areas and put pressure on infrastructure.
Opposed to whole concept of option 3/not supported
Not supported due to impact on 'host' settlement, increased pressure on infrastructure
If this option required, only towns should be included, not Hook and Church Crookham.
Option 3 would penalise areas just because they have already had growth.
Identified extensions to tier 1 and 2 settlements would seem best way forward.
Unsuitable, past developments have failed to provide the infrastructure required to support the urban extensions.
Unless this excluded Yateley and Blackwater then this becomes the lowest priority.
Option 3 needs target of 4,000 homes by e.g. expanding Fleet.
Least preferred option – places large amounts of development in most overburdened areas.
Comments on Option 4 – Focused Growth (New Settlement)
Most sensible option is to create a new town/settlement
Would allow for the provision of planned new infrastructure, schools etc to be put in place/ a fully planned town
Land is available for this option
Why is any other option needed if this option is chosen, would reduce pressure on other areas
Only realistic long term solution/only option to plan properly
Allows for energy saving projects and to provide a showpiece town.
Would be self-supporting but must have good public transport links.
Would relieve pressure on existing infrastructure.
Will have the least impact and be the best planned.
Preferred/best option/only viable option
Forward looking and could grow beyond 2032.
Would protect character of existing settlements
Would release pressure on surrounding areas.
Existing infrastructure would not support further development.
Attractive if has planned infrastructure.
On land fronting A30 near Hook and Hartley Wintney.
Most economical
At Winchfield and a new M3 Junction could meet most of housing allocation
Should be filling between existing towns or villages rather than spreading into unspoilt countryside.
Strongly support from 2024 onwards
Although would only deliver from 2020 reduces the burden from the other options.

Would provide a focus which is needed in Hart
Should be located close to motorway junction or train station
Should be at Winchfield or South Hook.
Would overcome problems associated with piecemeal development
New settlement with access to rail and M3 is the way forward with additional small developments on outskirts of Hart away from the SPA.
Only option able to deliver long-term requirements, combine with option 5
Would provide housing and also employment opportunities.
Opportunity to create a modern well-planned new diverse settlement area.
Without this option, all other 4 options will be needed.
Option 4 would at least be one that did not result in overcrowding, strained infrastructure and already overburdened roads.
Appropriate economies of scale. Infrastructure requirements can be more easily addressed. Would facilitate the SANG issue.
Should do it now as development will be needed after 2031
A new settlement would address infrastructure capacity issues at Fleet, Crookham Village and Elvetham Heath.
Considerable risks identified
Why does option 4 only show Winchfield?
Would have a larger impact on the environment than other options.
Completely opposed to a new town in Hart
A new settlement would make Hart into Milton Keynes and requires more infrastructure and will increase crime.
Still not a complete option as will need some 'quick fixes'.
Would depend where it is built.
Too radical to be accepted
Least favoured as long lead in time but would also require 10,000 dwellings to be sustainable.
Time consuming to identify a suitable location and impact on 5 year supply, would need to be a town, not village to deliver sufficient housing and infrastructure, would destroy countryside, might fall foul of SPA limitations and is risky relying on one option.
Would change the character of Hart,
Opposed unless totally on a brownfield site.
Not large enough to make a sustainable settlement, and as not all landowners likely to take part, it will be unviable.
Would be a mistake, current balance of towns and villages should be maintained.
Would conflict with the SPA constraint.
A new settlement is not justified, it would cause coalescence of settlements and would not be 'distinct and separate'. The impact on the SPA has been underplayed.
This is the worst option- everyone loses out
Only option that delivers the infrastructure needed following the expansion of Fleet
If option 4 selected, then need a new survey setting out possible locations.
Would not be sustainable
Contrary to many of the SA objectives and would be concrete vandalism.
Would still need options 1,2 and 3 first and by then wouldn't need option 4.
Important green lung should be protected.
Important rural haven for wildlife and recreation.
Winchfield station bursting at the seams
Option 4 is damaging and divisive; no area in Hart is appropriate for an independent town at the expense of our countryside.
This would be highly disruptive and destroy much of the fabric and natural attributes of green belt countryside.
Not a suitable option – policies on countryside, strategic gaps and preservation of character of communities should be invoked.
Concerned about uncertainty over number of homes from other options and which could be delivered from a new settlement within the Plan period – this should be made clearer.
A new settlement would not be large enough to bring much in the way of new such facilities and would end up just being another dormitory suburb in search of a town.

Would not make best use of existing infrastructure in Fleet/Church Crookham and Yateley/Blackwater.
Comments on Option 5 – Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy
Having regard to EU law, SE Plan option 5 is the only legally compliant approach and should be maximised before any other option considered.
Not helpful – the birds will move somewhere else.
Does not provide adequate houses.
Does not recognise the environmental sensitivities of the south and west of the district.
Would focus development on the best rural areas and historic villages.
Would adversely load existing settlements without solving the problem.
Option 5 disturbs the use of excellent agricultural land.
Is ranked 5 th as would not want to inconvenience humans for SPA.
Not supported
Unfair for all other areas
5km SPA zone should be maintained but puts a burden on the rest of Hart
Object as would impact on landscape, historic settlements etc.
Less likely to impact on existing flooding and standing water issues in the area.
Favours the protection of certain villages and unfairly penalises others.
Continued development in proximity to the SPA will lead to additional use. SANGs help but does not stop all additional use. SANGs should be made more interesting.
In principle attractive but may take too long to implement.
Totally unacceptable, need to protect the historic character of villages like Odiham which once lost, cannot be replaced.
Using the SPA as an excuse to target development in one area is unsound and unacceptable and this option should be rejected.
Inappropriate as limits development the western area of the district.
Strongly opposed – a rural area with limited infrastructure.
High landscape quality, narrow lanes, no infrastructure
Would seem to be high risk for reasons of delivery, potential for land-banking, failure to provide a suitable mix and type of housing, landscape quality has not been assessed, housing within 5km can be mitigated.
Object as would lead to an unsustainable quantity and concentration of housing development in the predominantly agricultural and rural south-west corner of the district.
Would ruin the area with the greatest number of heritage assets in the County (outside Winchester)
Developments would be isolated from main settlements.
SPA should be protected at all costs.
Least favourite option because of the impact on the landscape and on the historic environment.
Option 5 does not accord with the principles of the NPPF in particular the golden thread that runs through the document of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Instead this focuses on a single issue and seeks to direct development to the least sustainable areas of the District.
Surrey and Rushmoor use their land within the TBHSPA, Hart can do likewise.
Would impact on historic villages of Odiham and North Warnborough.
Least sustainable option.
Should be maximised before other options including land promoted off Hop Garden Road, Hook.
Would not support development in the most sustainable locations of Fleet/Church Crookham and Yateley/Blackwater.
Comments on a combination of options
Options 3 and 4 not viable – too much pressure on infrastructure.
A mix of options 3 and 4 preferred
Options 3 and 4 provide capability to plan new neighbourhoods with necessary facilities.
Combination of options 1 and 3 preferred, will allow infrastructure upgrades without destroying open spaces/achieve best balance.
Combine option 3 and 1 so modest development in smaller settlements but protect the countryside.
Combine options 1 and 3, will do least damage to the environment.
Options 1 and 3 would maintain the existing hierarchy of settlements in Hart

Options 1 and 3 seem fairest combination, would allow modest building in smaller settlements but protect the countryside
Option 3 would need to be combined with 1
Option 1 should be supported by option 3
Options 1 and 2 best for the next 15 years/preferred
Options 1,2 and 3 all flawed as cannot provide sustainable infrastructure.
A combination of 2 and 4 would minimise infrastructure costs and maintain village integrity.
Support a careful mix of options 2 and 4.
Combine options 2 and 4
Hybrid scheme of options 1 - 4
Option 1 - 4
Options 1 and 4 preferred.
Option 4 to be used with Option 1
Option 4 similar to Elvetham Heath is least worst option, combined with option 1.
Would support options 4 and 1 as would deliver appropriate infrastructure
Combine option 4 and option 1, option 1 will allow time for option 4 to be developed.
Option 4 with option 3 or 1
Options 2 and 3 would lead to 'creeping growth' without sufficient infrastructure.
Focus on options 2 and 3 but with some element of option 2.
Option 3 with options 1 and 2
If options 1 and 2 chosen HDC must work closely with Parish Councils.
Options 1 and 2 would deliver the housing in the time frame.
Support options 1 and 2 and an element of 3.
Options 1 and 2 would just result in urban sprawl.
Option 2 with option 1 would give fairest and least damaging solution.
Give priority to option 1 and 2 sites outside the 5km SPA zone
A combination of options 1, 2 and 3 is most suitable.
Not really options as only 2 can deliver housing requirement.
Small amount of proportionate growth should take place in existing villages and towns plus 2 or 3 urban extensions.
Options 3 and 5 would protect SPA
Options 1, 5 and a scaled down option 4 at Winchfield is preferable.
The combination of Options 1 and 5 will deliver 2,375 houses, moving development to a corner of Hart that has seen very little of the development that has taken place elsewhere, thus relieving pressure on the rest of Hart and offering the best protection for the SPA's.
Combine Option 4 with Option 5 as a short term back up measure.
Option 4 combined with option 5 provides the required level of housing plus associated infrastructure and avoids an overdevelopment of existing settlements.
A combination of 4 and 5 is best
Option 5 for the short term with option 4 for the long term
Combine option 5 and option 1
Option 3 combined with option 2 or Option 4 combined with option 2
Option 3 should be combined with option 2 in the primary and secondary local service centres but not the main villages due to lack of infrastructure.
Option 2 (short term) combined with option 4 (long term), although if this combination is chosen, must have a plan in place to ensure that infrastructure is delivered alongside new development.
Options 1, 2 and 5 should be pursued with most new development focused at the main settlements and large villages outside the 5km TBHSPA zone.
Sites in south west around settlements like Fleet and Hook have facilities to accommodate further development
Focus growth on existing towns and combine with smaller developments across other towns and villages.
There is an option 6 – based on options 1 and 2.
Other – Location of development
MOD land should be the focus.
Should focus/maximise on brownfield sites and protect/avoid greenfield.

Avoid development in/protect all Conservation Areas
Should be converting empty offices/retail/agricultural buildings
There is special environment in the south of Hart which is also worth conserving and in spite of the TBHSPA in the north it should take a share of development.
Focus growth on employment opportunities.
Must avoid joining settlements together.
Increase densities in and around centres.
Would prefer to see two large developments – suggest extend Elvetham Heath and either land between Redfields Garden Centre and Tadpole Lane or Edenbrook to Pale Lane
Plenty of brownfield sites - For example - Blackbushe, Guillemont Park, Jewsons / Travis Perkins, possible MOD land depending on the long term plans of the RAF / Army.
Place specific comments – villages (general)
Smaller villages should be preserved/protect historic character
Don't have the infrastructure for new development
Must protect rural villages.
Would exacerbate road problems and the need to provide for an ageing population.
More development would aggravate car use of single track roads.
Already hazardous to leave the house on foot in some villages.
Development should be concentrated to protect villages.
Style of development should be in character with houses around it.
Place specific comments – Church Crookham
Already overdeveloped and infrastructure cannot cope
Would not be in favour of a new settlement in Church Crookham
Church Crookham has already taken its fair share of housing so development should go elsewhere.
Move any new housing away from Church Crookham/Crookham Village
Avoid any more housing around Crookham.
Fleet and Church Crookham have a small number of routes in and out which limits the opportunity for expansion
Options 1, 2 and 3 mean more building in Church Crookham
Fleet and Church Crookham are now 'full' and there cannot be more pressure on the SPA.
Place specific comments – Crondall
Amenities of Crondall, especially open spaces must be protected
Crondall is not comparable with Hook, Odiham and Hartley Wintney.
Few employment opportunities, extensive historic environment, important open spaces, thriving community and flooding issues. Also within 5km of the TBHSPA.
New houses would only add to the number of commuters, Thriving community to corrective development not necessary.
Village in 5km zone and should be protected from further development.
Wrongly identified as a larger village (para 2.2). It should be treated as not having sufficient infrastructure for even modest expansion.
Support the recognition that Crondall suffers from flooding.
Villages like Crondall should take some housing it needs. There are sites within the settlement boundary and adjacent to it.
Place specific comments – Crookham Village
Move any new housing away from Church Crookham/Crookham Village
Avoid any more housing around Crookham
Roads from Crookham Village and Dogmersfield to the A287 often backed up.
Place specific comments - Dogmersfield
Would oppose development around Dogmersfield.
Main concern is impact of any of the options on the flooding issues in Dogmersfield.
Such an increase would be proportional to the size of the village it would not spoil its character and style spelt out in the officially adopted paper "Dogmersfield Conservation Area - Character Appraisal

and Management Proposals"
Elvetham Heath
Already relatively new so more housing would not disfigure them as much as old villages.
Eversley
The Settlement Hierarchy Paper fails to recognise that Eversley is effectively made up of Eversley Cross, Eversley Centre/Up Green and arguably Eversley Street/Lower Common which are all located within a small geographical area within which a range of services and facilities are shared. It also has a daily bus service and employment provision.
Eversley ranks as the main village with the largest amount of services and facilities within the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Paper and therefore the most sustainable. As such, it is entirely appropriate that Eversley should take an increased proportion of housing compared to the other main villages.
Land at Eversley is promoted which would bring a range of benefits including a significant amount of SANG.
Place Specific Comments – Fleet
Fleet is overdeveloped and existing infrastructure is struggling to cope/at breaking point/cannot support further development.
Additional flood risks if develop further around Fleet.
The burden of development should be shared to places other than Fleet.
Development should stop
Fleet schools are at capacity
Would not be in favour of a new settlement in Fleet.
Fleet has already taken its fair share of housing so it should go elsewhere.
Some road junctions at capacity.
Must consider a Fleet bypass to the M3.
Avoid any more housing around Fleet.
Already relatively new so more housing would not disfigure them as much as old villages.
Remaining green spaces should be preserved.
West Fleet is already over developed and has flooding issues and inadequate infrastructure.
Site proposed at Bramshott Lane, Cove for 45 dwellings. Would comprise redevelopment of a brownfield site and an extension to an existing settlement (Cove) and the principles supported by the NPPF.
Settlement should be developed around Fleet and Hook, extending existing towns where infrastructure exists.
Fleet has appropriate infrastructure, vacancies in the Shopping Centre and with an improved rail service to London, in contrast with Hook or Winchfield.
Fleet and Church Crookham are now 'full' and there cannot be more pressure on the SPA.
Largest settlement with widest range of facilities and services.
Albany Park promoted as a sustainable option for development.
Place Specific – Hartley Wintney
Would oppose development around Hartley Wintney
Promotes a site at Wintney Court, Phoenix Green as a sustainable location for development which could also deliver SANG.
Place specific comments – Hook
Hook is already overdeveloped
GP's in Hook can't cope with existing levels of development
Large scale expansion of Hook should not take place
Should upgrade the rail station at Hook.
Has had enough development and is being unfairly targeted/development should go elsewhere.
Large scale development should be concentrated at Hook.
All options except 4 will include further development at Hook. Should try and increase homes elsewhere first.

Has had fair share of development and needs time to settle/should spread the load.
Need careful consideration of traffic and road gridlock at peak times.
Hook is not a town it is a village without the infrastructure you would expect to see in a town.
Prepared for some in-fill in Hook but objects to other options.
Hook is on the strategic road network, has good rail connections and a range of supporting infrastructure. It is also close to employment opportunities in Hook. Land northwest of Hop Garden Road is appropriate for development. It is deliverable and outside 5km SPA zone.
The Council should allocate land at North West Hook as a Sustainable urban extension. The site is capable of accommodating 1,500 – 2,000 units.
Hook down to North Warnborough has had very little development and there is available open space.
Already relatively new so more housing would not disfigure them as much as old villages.
Hook should take its fair share, but need to take account of development which already has planning permission in agreeing what a fair share would be.
Hook cannot cope with increased local housing which will be totally unsuitable.
North Warnborough
Promotion of land at Hook Road, currently subject to a planning application. The site is in a sustainable location.
Odiham and North Warnborough are sustainable settlements which should be identified as providing additional brownfield and greenfield development over the Local Plan period. Land to the south of Farnham Road is promoted for development.
Areas around North Warnborough and Odiham that would prove suitable for expansion.
Place specific comments - Odiham
Land south of Odiham could be developed through a new by-pass Road linking A287 to the Alton Road
Odiham is already overloaded/infrastructure struggles.
Odiham (and South Warnborough) have escaped large scale development so would still retain a 'rural' feel with further development.
Areas around North Warnborough and Odiham that would prove suitable for expansion.
Has already had fair share of development, some of which is spoiling the character of the village.
Already has sites under construction and in the pipeline and existing infrastructure cannot cope.
Concerned about the impact of development at the Hatchwood site and the way the developers got planning permission.
RAF Odiham would be a good site.
Concerned about the impact development has already had on local infrastructure such as roads and GP capacity.
Already problems on the roads and parking issues, development should go further north.
Any further pressure upon King Street in Odiham will endanger the school children, cyclists and pedestrians who use it.
There must be a greater readiness to move south, Odiham is blessed with a bypass which is a considerable benefit and would reduce greatly traffic issues from development.
Odiham and North Warnborough are sustainable settlements which should be identified as providing additional brownfield and greenfield development over the Local Plan period. Land to the south of Farnham Road is promoted for development.
Place specific comments - South Warnborough
South Warnborough (and Odiham) have escaped large scale development so would still retain a 'rural' feel with further development.
Place specific comments – Winchfield
Large scale development at Winchfield would harm the rural nature, landscape and heritage
New settlement at Winchfield is the best option
Strongly oppose identifying Winchfield as a new settlement.
A new settlement at Winchfield would engulf Hartley Wintney, Yateley, Fleet, Odiham and Hook.
Obvious location with station and proximity to M3.

Winchfield has been badly affected by traffic from Elvetham Heath and Edenbrook.
New building should be restricted to the area from Winchfield Station to the A30
Transport concerns - the B3016 will need to be upgraded, the A30 will not cope with the additional traffic, the B3011 will not cope and there is no scope to widen, or straighten it and the A323 will be overwhelmed.
Network Rail and South West Trains do not have the capacity to load Winchfield Station with the numbers generated.
Hook, Hartley Wintney, Winchfield, Fleet, Farnborough, Aldershot would become one contiguous conurbation with no green gaps.
Promoting land at Old Potbridge Road, Winchfield for a range of housing of up to 20 dwellings.
Consider that there is an error in not including the settlement policy boundary for Winchfield.
Place Specific comments – Yateley
Yateley cannot expand further – additional pressure on infrastructure.
Yateley needs more affordable homes.
Too much development in Yateley already, time other areas took their share.
Comments on infrastructure not already highlighted above
Existing settlements do not have the infrastructure to cope with additional development/exacerbates problems
Any new development must include the provision of a community centre.
Infrastructure is a major constraint/insufficient infrastructure
Should focus where existing infrastructure – Fleet, Hook, Yateley, Blackwater.
Must have rail links.
Infrastructure must be provided alongside housing, not after.
Concern that no one organisation has responsibility for delivering infrastructure.
Insufficient consideration given to areas with traffic problems.
Hard to prioritise as no past evidence that adequate infrastructure will be delivered e.g. QEB turning into a congested black spot.
Concerned about impact of traffic and overall lack of infrastructure/need and adequate transport strategy.
Every aspect of infrastructure must be tested.
Existing developments are not being provided with adequate infrastructure (e.g. Elvetham Heath and Edenbrook)
Whole Plan is flawed unless improve travel links e.g. A30 Yateley to Hook and cycleways.
Concern about the pressure on existing local services
Urgent need for a flood risk assessment
Must start any large scale development with suitable road infrastructure
Focused growth must provide employment as well as infrastructure and may need its own hospital.
The need for additional main hospital capacity is not adequately addressed.
Focus should be in areas where there are good transport links.
It is not necessarily true that smaller developments can provide less in terms of infrastructure. It is often the case that large scale sites face higher delivery costs, and therefore can provide less in terms of infrastructure (supported by evidence in some CIL Charging Schedules).
The Council should pay more attention to the future provision of utilities and consider the additional pressure that will be placed on schools.
Any option is feasible provided the saturated infrastructure issues are addressed.
Comments on the TBHSPA
SPA mitigation is not working properly.
People should take priority over ground nesting birds
Should be able to reduce the housing requirement by the area unavailable because of the SPA.
SPA should be protected.
Not convinced of the need to avoid the TBHSPA.
SPA being given too much weight in planning proposals
Reconsider SPA area

Other
Residents should be involved in the design of new development
Take development away from the north which has already suffered massive expansion.
Priority should be protecting natural habitats.
What are the main towns and villages in Hart?
Survival of shops is to do with greedy landlords and not population.
Local authority housing should be given to local communities only.
Must ensure developers do not price people out of the market.
Failure to integrate with neighbouring authorities plans.
Need a plan as soon as possible, will it really take until 2016.
Hart should adopt the Government's right to build initiative.
New housing does not fill up with locals but people from elsewhere.
Need to get Government to plan holistically.
Take account of existing expansion plans since 2012.
Hart river valley at risk of losing its integrity.
Countryside and green land must be protected
Concentrate on brownfield land, vacant buildings.
Character of Hart is rural and it is vital to avoid creating an urban sprawl.
Single people need flats in town centres not boxes in fields
Document hard to understand
Insufficient information to make a choice
Cannot rank a specific option as further work needs to be done on the needs and constraints within the district and work on the SA to determine which hybrid option is the most sustainable.
This should be seen as an opportunity to improve the lives of people living in the area.
Development companies see an opportunity to build houses and make money – exacerbated by the lack of a local housing plan.
Development must recognise historic character.
Cannot see how building on greenfield would enrich anyone's lives or be sustainable
Since Hart already has almost full time employment where are the new residents going to work?
The only people who benefit are those who make a profit
People have moved to Hart because of its character and as 'the best place to live'
Fully support the comments of Winchfield Parish Council
Most urgent needs are for small, basic starter homes for young people and nice, two- or three-bedroom homes for retired people
Existing developments need time to bed in, experiencing power cuts following Dilly Lane development.
No more gypsy sites.
Building on greenfield sites would destroy the character and desirability and may destroy ecologically valuable habitat forever.

APPENDIX 2:

Question 2: None of the options suggest housing in Hart's smallest villages and hamlets. Do you think even the smallest settlements should see some new housing?

Additional Comments relating to Question 2:

Comments from those responding 'yes':
Housing should be shared/fair to spread the load
Shared but a smaller percentage to smaller villages
Will contribute to overall number
Help to support local facilities/thriving communities
Yes if limited
Should accommodate natural growth, support needs of local residents
Infill only, only in settlement boundaries
Decide on an individual basis
1 house per 10 existing
On brownfield sites
Consider dispersed development
Would create more sense of 'community'
Everywhere needs new vitality
Housing shortage means people moving away from family
Nothing bigger than settlements of 200 – 300 houses
Note the north west avoids development in all plans
Social housing/affordable housing needed/ a priority
Size of settlement is irrelevant and unfair
All areas can sustain 1 or 2 new houses
Dependent on infrastructure and proportionality/relevant to current size and character
Must remain inside the settlement boundary
If not a significant transport issue
Would give opportunity for self-build
Re-use brownfield sites
Unfair for larger settlements to bear the brunt of further development
Assumes access to essential local infrastructure can be supplied/infrastructure can cope
Should adopt 'Right to Build' initiative
At Long Sutton
Allows for regeneration
Carefully targeted in the north west of the District
The towns can't cope with more growth
Should include some for first time buyers/affordable homes/for those with connections in the village
Must be low cost homes for locals, not executive homes, not big estates
Smaller settlements will wither if populated by ageing population only, need to attract families and accommodate expanding families
Why should they be exempt – they also have people needing housing
Could build bungalows without detracting from character
Only if get consent of existing residents
Only if option 2 selected
Would redistribute strain on infrastructure
Without some development house prices will become even more unaffordable
Otherwise there will be a 'them and us' situation
So long as avoids creep into adjacent rural/historic areas
Perhaps 20 new homes in each would help the overall total.
Because at the moment only Hook and Fleet are being targeted.
Yes but limited to 4 or 5 dwellings.
Only if no more than 10% of existing housing in each village.

Must insist on high standards of design
On a gradual basis, should not result in estates or major projects.
Yes, but would not build on SPA's
Must be based on local need regardless of the size of the settlements
May encourage young people to stay in villages and support families, reducing the pressure on social services.
Villages like Greywell could have a few well designed small new homes
Should not explicitly exclude Tier 5 settlements from growth.
Major sites in the countryside such as Bramshill Police Training Centre have potential for housing in the countryside.
Redevelopment opportunities should not be confined to those within the settlements
Concerned that Winchfield village is not recognised as a settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy Paper and should do so in any review – should be identified as a Tier 4 village.
Would support the plan making an allowance for development in these locations. Would not however consider such locations to be suitable for significant development, unless the location was supported by an appropriate level of facilities and services.
Hart should also assess opportunities which lie adjacent to settlements in other authorities.
Provided sufficient provision of services.
Option 2 should include all settlements
Each village or hamlet needs a long term plan.
Focus on brownfield sites, can bring benefits
Yes, at their requests, Seems to be a demand for rural exception schemes.
Greywell could assist in satisfying demand for sites in Odiham, North Warnborough, and Hook.
Broad Oak and Bartley Heath should also provide some infill sites.
All should contribute to the shortage of housing nationally
Yes but most new housing should be concentrated in an urban context.
Accept that Winchfield could take 40 – 50 homes over the plan period, everyone should take a share.
Provides the opportunity to protect the character of the District and of individual settlements.
The housing needs are not limited to any one area or groups of areas, so it follows that there would also be housing needs within even the smallest settlements.
Identifies a concept plan for Mill Lane and the suggestion that the settlement could be upsized with the use of brownfield land, conversions, PD rights and redevelopment of land already in residential uses.
Identifies a concept plan showing how Crookham Village could be upsized. This would allow for a mix of housing and SANG.
Settlement hierarchy must be reviewed and in particular corrections made to the previous exclusion of a settlement policy boundary at Winchfield.
If it can be justified for local needs, but not for significant development unless supported by appropriate facilities.
Comments from those responding 'no'
Development should be directed to other Boroughs
Seem to be ruining all Hart's towns and villages
Must protect the countryside
Villages have low levels of sustainability
No more than 4 or 5 house developments should be permitted in rural areas
Little or no infrastructure/Infrastructure cannot cope
Will affect their nature, beauty, character
Why would you want to destroy character villages
Countryside should be sacrosanct
Villages are part of Hart's attraction
Infill would be detrimental to character
Only where little or no objection from local community
Public transport non existent
Hamlets are the last bastion of rural settlement, not under threat from suburbanisation.
Villages already see some development

Needs to be a strategic gap between settlements
Winchfield is not a village
Only possible if guaranteed infrastructure improvements
Difficult to expand when single track roads and blind bends
Need protection not development
Hart should be proud it protects these settlements
No - look at impact on Hartley Wintney of further development
Homes should be sited where infrastructure already exists
Would be too insignificant to make an impact
Should go to already densely populated areas.
Should not be any planned allocation, natural infill will be sufficient.
Undue pressure on infrastructure
Crondall is already gridlocked
As no need for small villages, no need to spoil villages.
Important to protect conservation areas
Extensions to existing areas represent the least impact on the District.
Could materially affect the quality of life for those in the villages.
Hamlets have no settlements boundary and very rural settings.
It would only take a few houses to change the settlement.
The quality of the area is related to the character of the small hamlets.
Why are we building houses for people from different areas?
Village character important for tourism.
Placing more people further away from services
Would put additional strain on medical services as likely that older people will buy the new homes.
Would need to substantially improve public transport – how would this be paid for?
Do not need to join up the villages to make another large town.
Character and environment of the small villages and hamlets are vulnerable to change.
Destruction of any village not supported
Not unless limited to one or two sympathetic dwellings
Not unless agreed under neighbourhood plans
Do not have the range of local facilities and services available in higher order settlements. Would encourage lengthier journeys by less sustainable modes of travel.
Comments from those responding ‘Don’t Know’
Likely to be highway issues.
Could be viable to develop on the edge of smaller settlements
Would be a shame to ruin some of the beautiful villages
Ask the residents what they want
Wouldn’t want to see villages swamped with development but also not fair to keep enlarging Hook
Depends whether there would be benefit to the local communities.
Would prefer development to avoid all Hart’s existing settlements
Best option is to build a new settlement
Consider on a case by case basis
Crondall or Long Sutton could take some new housing but would only be a small contribution to overall number.
It depends which ones are being considered. There may be some value in replacing a large obsolete house with several smaller ones, for example. The policy should have some flexibility.

APPENDIX 3:

Question 3: If Option 4 (Focused Growth – New Settlement) were selected, where in Hart do you think the new settlement should be located and how large should it be? Please give reasons for your views.

Location Related Comments
Blackwater
Minley Barracks as close to the M3 and if Hart has to take some housing from Rushmoor
Minley Manor
Blackwater
Near Gibraltar Barracks
North east, close to Fleet, Yateley, Blackwater
Close to Yateley and Blackwater
Bramshill
Perhaps Bramshill
Bramshill Police College
Church Crookham
Towards Church Crookham as Fleet has infrastructure to support development
Fleet and Church Crookham provide significant opportunities for growth
Army training land between Church Crookham and Aldershot
Crondall
Between Crondall and Dogmersfield/Odiham
Crondall
Between South Warnborough and Crondall
Between Crondall and Long Sutton has no settlements
Crookham village
Between Edenbrook and Crookham Village
Dogmersfield
Between Crondall and Dogmersfield/Odiham
Dogmersfield
As far from Dogmersfield as possible
Between Dogmersfield and Hartley Wintney
Appears to be land around Dogmersfield
By Dogmersfield and Elvetham
Around Winchfield, Dogmersfield area
Elvetham Heath
West/north west of Elvetham Heath
Near Elvetham Heath as could be expanded into a larger settlement.
North of Elvetham Heath
Area between Elvetham Heath and Blackwater
Adjacent to Elvetham Heath
Between Elvetham Heath and Hartley Wintney
Eversley

West of Eversley (2) or Blackbushe area
West of Eversley
Eversley, Yateley or Finchampstead
Around the gravel pits of Eversley
Fleet
Employment sites in Fleet
Near Fleet, 3,500 homes
Between Fleet and Hook
Between Fleet and Eversley
Fleet, infrastructure available
Fleet area close to major road and rail access routes
Logically, in or near Fleet where existing infrastructure, SANG could be addressed
Between Odiham and Fleet
As far from Fleet as possible
Fleet/Hook/Blackwater
Hartfordbridge area to link Fleet, Hartley Wintney and Yateley.
Between Fleet and Winchfield
On the borders of Fleet and towards Crondall
Fleet, Hook and Hartley Wintney which are already being developed.
North of Fleet so access to the station via Minley.
Bramshott – good access to the motorway and Fleet and Farnborough Stations.
Fleet and Church Crookham provide significant opportunities for growth
Please redevelop Fleet Town
Fleet has the infrastructure and would benefit from investment
North east, close to Fleet, Yateley, Blackwater
Between Ewshot and Fleet
North of Fleet, close to transport links.
Hartley Wintney
Between Yateley and Hartley Wintney, has no settlements
West and south west of A30 from Hartley Wintney
Triangle area bounded by Heckfield, Hartley Wintney and Eversley.
Hartley Wintney
Between M25 and Hartley Wintney with links to Winchfield station
Hartley Wintney - proximity to M3/A30
North west of the A30
Between Dogmersfield and Hartley Wintney
Between Hartley Wintney and Hook – open land and close to main roads
Between Hartley Wintney and Odiham
North West of Hartley Wintney and large enough to take housing needed for next 20 years
Hartfordbridge area to link Fleet, Hartley Wintney and Yateley.
East of Hartley Wintney has next to no housing.
Heckfield
Combine option 4 and option 1, option 1 will allow time for option 4 to be developed.
Should be on the land between Hook and Hartley Wintney. There are huge areas which, as yet have no housing on whatsoever and therefore a new settlement would not encroach in any way on any existing villages.
Between Elvetham Heath and Hartley Wintney
Hook
West or South of Hook
Employment sites in Hook
South of Hook and M3
Has a proposed supermarket and large housing estate
Odiham/Hook, still relatively undeveloped with good train and M3 access

On the A30 going towards Basingstoke
North of Hook
Outskirts of Hook
Similar development to Elvetham Heath in North Hook or north Winchfield
Hook – proximity to M3/A30
Between Hartley Wintney and Hook – open land and close to main roads
Fleet/Hook/Blackwater
Between Hook and North Warnborough – about 2,000 houses
Expand Hook - it has the infrastructure, is already urbanised and could become a pleasant new town
South Hook, between the railway station and the M3
Off the A30 between Fleet and Hook
Between Hook and Elvetham
Hook, near Junction 5 of the M3 and close to A30.
If this option selected (not supported) then a possible site at Hook.
Should be close to Hook
Opposite Griffen Road roundabout
North east of Hook
Hook, has business premises, no historic connections, and is separated from other towns.
Should be on the land between Hook and Hartley Wintney. There are huge areas which, as yet have no housing and therefore a new settlement would not encroach in any way on any existing villages.
Long Sutton
Long Sutton area
North Warnborough
South of Odiham and North Warnborough
North Warnborough has potential and least destructive to more rural settlements and outside SPA zone.
Between Hook and North Warnborough – about 2,000 houses
Odiham, North Warnborough or Winchfield.
Odiham
Between Crondall and Dogmersfield/Odiham
Odiham/Hook, still relatively undeveloped with good train and M3 access
Odiham
Area south of Odiham and Fleet is least populated
Between Odiham and Fleet
Small new settlement near Odiham/RAF Odiham
Between Hartley Wintney and Odiham
South of Odiham – about 2,000 houses
Rotherwick
North west around Rotherwick, access to motorways
Near Odiham makes sense.
Odiham/Broad Oak area – good access to M3
South of the A287, east and southeast of Odiham airfield
Rotherwick
Area north of Rotherwick has next to no housing on it.
Yateley
Between Yateley and Hartley Wintney
Blackbushe Airfield

Land bordering A327 and Swan Valley, would close the gap between Yateley, Darby Green and Frogmore and allow about 200 homes.
Between Yateley and Eversley – effectively two town centres separated by Yateley Manor/Yateley industries
South of Yateley and Eversley
Yateley and Eversley area as space to develop good infrastructure
Hartfordbridge area to link Fleet, Hartley Wintney and Yateley.
Regeneration to create a town centre with mixed development should be a priority.
Between Yateley, Hartley Wintney and Fleet
Near Yateley – better transport options
Eversley, Yateley or Finchampstead
South west of Yateley
North east, close to Fleet, Yateley, Blackwater
Around Blackbushe Airport
South Warnborough
Between north and south Warnborough if available
South Warnborough
Odiham, North Warnborough or Winchfield.
Around Long Sutton/South Warnborough
East of South Warnborough
Winchfield
Near expandable infrastructure like Winchfield
As has a station and could have links to M3 and A30
Has already been 'earmarked'
Sufficiently far from existing urban areas to avoid conurbation
North Winchfield is best option
Might suit but not qualified to comment
Between Winchfield station and M3
Winchfield with transport upgraded
Winchfield/close to Winchfield (multiple)
Not Winchfield as it will join up with Fleet destroying the rural character of the area
Winchfield, it is the only station on the Basingstoke line
Area near Winchfield/Dogmersfield would satisfy transport criteria/around Winchfield, Dogmersfield area
Has a station and good environment for development
Winchfield area to be similar size to Elvetham Heath
Winchfield – should be a village with growth to 10,000
Land available, could continue after 2032
Suitable location
Close to main roads and Secondary School
Appears to be land around Winchfield
4,000 would be inappropriate, perhaps 2,000 here
Would provide some of the housing need and save other areas from ruinous overdevelopment
Winchfield, better use of station and possible new junction to M3
Winchfield – station and could provide new school
Odiham, North Warnborough or Winchfield.
Winchfield – is in a depression so could accommodate taller buildings
Winchfield – would provide transport for those who need to commute
Winchfield station area/north of Winchfield station
Winchfield – 6,000 – 8,000 houses
Winchfield, 3,000 homes
Winchfield has significant potential but not in this plan period.
Winchfield 3,500 – 4,500 houses
Appropriate but may have significant deliverability issues in the plan period.

Not in Winchfield, should not have been mentioned in the options paper
Difficult to see how a new settlement at Winchfield could do anything other than grossly affect Dogmersfield and Crookham Village.
Would need to ensure gaps maintained with existing settlements.
Winchfield should be preserved as a green lung in Hart.
Not in Winchfield which is a rural area of benefit to residents and visitors.
Not suitable as too close to Fleet, Church Crookham, Hartley Wintney and Hook
Winchfield is not the best option as it would use farmland which is valuable for food production.
Other Locations
Perhaps areas around the A30
Tweseldown racecourse
Fleet/Hook/Blackwater
A significant distance from the Elvetham Heath new settlement
In the south, away from Fleet
To the west of the district away from Fleet and Church Crookham and the SPA. Closer to Hook and Winchfield with mainline trains to London/Basingstoke.
In the middle of the Hart District Corridor
Next to large towns such as Hook, Farnborough or Fleet
Should use army land
Must be close to a rail station and large enough to provide a secondary school etc
As far away from Fleet as possible
Near the M3/A30
North west side of the A30
MOD land in Aldershot area
Not in the vicinity of other settlements
North west area of Hart seems short of development
Near major road links
In the corridor between A30 in North and London to Basingstoke railway line in South, with A323 and Hawley as the West/East boundaries.
Next to existing developed area to make use of new and existing infrastructure
Arborfield
To the north and west, no larger than 1500 homes
South west of Hart away from Special Protection Areas
Near transport hubs, M3 and SW trains
Greenfield space above junction 4a
With reasonable access to motorway but not too close to existing junctions
SW Hart so SPA zone of influence not undermined
Land between Farnborough and Aldershot
Near the M3 corridor and rail links e.g. Winchfield, Heckfield or Mattingley
Any brownfield sites in the northern part of Hart
Avoid areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Away from the SPA
To the west of Hart to minimise impact on existing settlements.
Aldershot, Borden, Frensham
North east of the District
South west of Hart, 4,000 houses
Outside SPA's
Not on a flood plain or high water table
In the town centres to replace empty shops and condense the high street
Basingstoke
Not close to historic villages
Far south of the district between Long Sutton and Crondall Wards

North of the A30
New village towards Reading
Must be on a brownfield site
Edges of existing towns but traffic must be considered
North of the railway line, south of the M3
Could be located in the north eastern area of Hart towards Yateley, Blackwater and Hawley, utilising one of the SANGs in order to off-set the potential environmental costs.
Other Comments
Too involved a question at this stage although clear one is needed.
Least favoured due to infrastructure being limited to new development
Could never support this option/must not be selected
Well away from existing settlements/must ensure gaps remain
Explore in conjunction with other authorities
Should not be an option until 2025/2030
Should be as small as possible
Where minimal disruption to wildlife
Ideally 4 – 6,000 so future proofed
Limit size and therefore impact
Not viable/not needed/should not be considered
Nowhere is suitable, opposed
Would like to see something like Poundbury
To benefit local families, development must be dispersed
Must be able to support its own educational demands and have other relevant community infrastructure so should be between 5,000 – 8,000 homes.
No larger than 2,000 homes
Would wreck the beautiful countryside
Must have good transport links and support its own educational and medical needs, and include employment opportunities.
In areas underused or underutilised.
Approximately 3,000 homes
Should take the whole 4,000 new homes
No to a new settlement, enough huge developments in Fleet
Limit of 2,000 should be set and other options used
Only location where it could be accommodated is the south east corner but this would be a bad idea
Should be looking County wide
Not within any of the rural areas of Hart
Need a range of shops and smaller properties
Against using any agricultural land
Equivalent to the size of Odiham and North Warnborough
Do not need or want a new settlement
Hart is not large enough to take a new settlement
Better to convert empty offices
No more than 500 houses.
Do not want, or need a new settlement
A minimum of 4 miles from other developments
Where least environmental and human impact
Need to see pros and cons for each option
Should be large enough for next 20-30 years
Utilities can be provided from scratch
Disastrous, would merge existing settlements
Cannot comment because all the options have not been identified.
Mistakes made at Elvetham Heath (no motorway access or train station) should not be repeated.
Needs to meet the needs of Hart and not be for commuters from London.

DRAFT

APPENDIX 4:

Question 4: Are there any other possible housing development options?

If 'yes' please outline what those might be:

Comments
Site specific
Significant expansion of Fleet
Allocation of RAF Odiham
Alton may wish to expand
MOD land
Land north and west of Hitches Lane
Fleet could do with a boost
Micheldever – good train access
MOD land/MOD land in Aldershot
Between South Warnborough and Alton
More development in the north of the area
Between Hook and Murrell Green
Bramshill & Heckfield do not seem to be included in the options
Hook
Takeover Blackbushe Airport and surrounding area. Expand Yateley into the New Settlement.
Several new smaller settlements at West of Eversley, Blackbushe, NE of Fleet (near Minley)
A 'new town' near Odiham way for 2,000 homes. Spread the additional 2,000 across the region, all areas. Look to extend Hook north towards Reading.
Gravel works beyond Hartley Wintney and Eversley Cross, Blackbushe market/airport.
Scrub land by the M3
Hart is too small for large scale development, Rushmoor has much vacant army land.
Affordable retirement homes should be included in any plans for Yateley.
Winchfield should not be developed
Yateley could be expanded
Could create an Elvetham Heath in north east of Hart
Revisit Foxley Wood proposal at Bramshill but smaller
Any other option is a bad idea, already too much development in Yateley, Hook and Fleet
Odiham to Rotherwick along the M3 corridor
Opportunity at the Police College at Bramshill?
Artificial lines on a map between Basingstoke, Hart and Rushmoor should not mean housing should be built where should not be.
In Adjacent authorities/combine with neighbouring authorities – Waverley/Rushmoor, Basingstoke and London
Little opportunity to expand centres of Hook and Fleet so simply adding more housing just exacerbates existing problems.
Expand Hook to link up with Odiham
Strategic urban extension west of Fleet
Opportunity at Winchfield
Odiham, North Warnborough, Lodge Farm triangle.
Fleet. It has a sports facility and now it's getting a new one! So it make sense on environmental travel grounds to put the housing there.
Fleet, Rushmoor and Aldershot could combine to make a new City.
Development of a further floor above the Hart Centre car park for flats and re-build of the High Street frontage south of Iceland to provide flats facing the High Street.
Brownfield sites of former quarries near the A30 at Blackbushe and Minley should be considered.
Resolve with neighbours, what about Sun Park site
Basingstoke and Reading have scope to expand
Blackbushe Airport and Market

Area between Fleet, Church Crookham and Aldershot
RAF Odiham
A large new town south of Basingstoke
The area between Fleet and Blackwater or between Long Sutton and Crondall (and to the south of them) might provide for a new settlement.
Bringing forward a site in Riseley could provide additional spare SANG capacity.
Only Fleet or Yateley or Hawley could take higher density development which would dent housing target.
With the potential for building at Watery Lane Crookham Village will be slowly absorbed into the housing melee.
Expand Basingstoke.
Grove Farm, Fleet
The amount of development at Eversley should also be increased in recognition of its status as the most sustainable of the 10 main villages and the environmental and highway benefits that can be delivered in parallel to housing development.
Option 3 preferred, specifically focused on Fleet (including Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath).
Proposes a settlement review of Crondall to allow for suitable, well-designed insertions within the context of a good sized tier 4 settlement.
Comments on Options
Must be a combination of options
Balance/combination of options 2 and 4
Option 2 is the worst option, piecemeal and will not deliver infrastructure
A combination of options 1,2 and 3
Query whether there are further opportunities which should be explored under the umbrella of Option 3, such as the expansion of cross-boundary settlements on land within Hart. At present we consider Option 3 to be very restricted by only looking at Tier 1 and 2 settlements.
Option 1 will allow regeneration of town centres, reduces the need to drive and supports local services.
Options 1 and 3 most suitable
If option 3 considered this should also consider the expansion of existing Tier 4 and 5 villages.
Other
Should consider the re-use/conversion of buildings/offices/vacant buildings
Maximise use of brownfield sites
Listen to residents who know their area
Protect the countryside
Housing should be shared
Push back housing requirements to other Districts
No more housing is needed
Create new legislation to protect rural areas
Convert and modernise low rise buildings to high rise
Target should be increased substantially
Reduce the 4,000 number
Build fewer flats for senior citizens and more starter properties in town centres
Small developments in rural areas and anything larger in towns
Limited settlements along current main roads
Multi-storey living space
Help home owners to extend and increase value of property and provide larger family homes.
Build on green land –consider in rural areas needing housing
Expand one town with facilities to match the expansion
Small, sympathetic development on brownfield sites
Extensions to existing newer towns
Don't feel there is a need for new houses
Focus strategic urban extensions on areas which have environment around them of least value, rather than settlements with least historic character
Support for 'self-build'

Work on the 'blocks' in the market
Perhaps build two new villages/towns of 2,000 each
Free up under-occupied family homes
A new township could offer diversity of housing, schools, shops and medical centre
Must maintain integrity of Conservation Areas
Convert disused Government buildings into affordable housing
Housing development should be encouraged in the north of England/Scotland to relieve pressure in the south.
Combine development of a new settlement with adjacent local authorities
Combination of options will be necessary to maintain a 5 year supply.
Gestation period for a new town needs to be shortened
This is an opportunity to build for the future and not short term quick fix solutions
The places where Hart's residents work should take some of the housing requirement.
Can we be sure housing number are accurate/unconvinced so much housing is needed
Not solely in Hart District.
Further large development should be deterred from the congested southern areas of England.
Consider on brownfield sites outside defined settlements.
Need to talk to Government about a long term (50 year) plan, other things than building can grow the economy
Hart is at capacity
Council should identify the sites rather than let developers lead the way
Housing need should be considered on a County wide basis
Conservation areas should be protected
More scope for development on land around large houses
Small villages and settlements to take up to 20 homes each
Should challenge the number of houses/the top-down approach.
Could reintroduce accommodation tied to employment.
Several new smaller developments with suitable facilities and allowing room for growth.
Give authority to local parishes who can address the needs of local communities not developers
Should find out where people lived before they moved to Hart.
A number of smaller developments, not one large one.
Why give any more land for gypsy sites, would be better used for housing
Build new smaller villages
There is a need for smaller well designed properties suitable for downsizing.
Should slow down building rates and let places grow organically.
Should hold a referendum on the forced urbanisation of our countryside
SPA rulings should be challenged
The Council must represent residents interests.

APPENDIX 5:

Question 5: Any other comments on the Housing Development Options Paper or the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal:

Development Options Paper:

Comments on Options
Option 5 is highly impractical
Option 4 too long term
Option 2 makes the most sense subject to infrastructure
Option 2 will only add to transport infrastructure problems.
Option 4 is the most sustainable in the SA and should be the preferred approach
Options 1 – 3 would exacerbate existing problems caused by lack of coherent planning. New settlement is the best option.
Only realistic choice is option 3 provided infrastructure can be provided alongside
Concerned what happens in the period up to implementing Option 4 if this one is chosen
Option 4 will lead to more traffic and a decline in Fleet town centre.
Option 1 should be the first consideration. Infrastructure is at capacity. Option 4 should be given least priority. Option 5 has too many uncertainties. Least harmful approach would be options 1 and 3.
Option 1 should be a priority before other options are considered.
Option 5 has to be followed in conjunction with option 4 – the new settlement must be south of Odiham to avoid the SPA.
Options only represent a 'which one is least appealing' approach
First 3 options are all short term and will not avoid long term need.
Options show a bias for overdevelopment in Hook
Infrastructure
Need to demonstrate how infrastructure will be developed alongside the housing strategy
Must provide appropriate infrastructure (Schools, doctors, roads, drainage etc)
Alternate routing of A30 through Hartley Wintney
Sufficient infrastructure is vital
GPs and roads can't cope
A new secondary school will be required at Hook post 2030
Need more local shops
Need road improvements such as the continuation of Odiham by-pass onto the Alton road
Concern about what infrastructure would be like with hundreds of new homes
Must not add to traffic hotspots
Need to improve infrastructure and increase Police presence
No sense in building affordable housing where no access to schools and public transport
No information on internet infrastructure – need detailed fibre optic roll out proposals
Crondall GP surgery has some capacity to expand – please consult.
Past/current developments in Fleet areas are not provided with sufficient infrastructure.
New infrastructure needed, particularly secondary schools, doctors
Improving the infrastructure with commitment from Hampshire CC and NHS must lead any plans to housing development.
Site specific
Protect Blackwater Valley and Hart river valley
Protect and preserve small villages like Eversley
MOD land around Fleet should be kept as open space
Best place is the other side of Hook towards Basingstoke as motorway access and away from Fleet
No further expansion of Fleet
Do not approve permission for the Hawley Park Farm development
Bulk of new development should be adjacent to Hook and/or Fleet. Possible strategic urban

extensions at east of Hook, west of Elvetham Heath or immediately west of Fleet.
Fleet and Church Crookham have taken significant development affecting quality of life, particularly apparent in the provision of school places.
Plan should state that a new town at Winchfield was previously rejected/strongly against development at Winchfield
Must consider the impact that development at Arborfield will have on settlements in Yateley
Hopes that the regeneration of Fleet town centre can be brought forward into this Plan
New developments like Edenbrook and Elvetham Heath do nothing for local people.
A new settlement at Winchfield would be donut shaped as some landowners will not sell.
Why is Winchfield shown – is the decision made?
Biggest challenge in Blackwater and Hawley is peak hour traffic.
Should concentrate on Fleet – the only urban area.
Promoting land at Yateley off Love Lane. Yateley is a more sustainable location for accommodating new housing development than Blackwater or Hook.
Proposes a settlement review of Long Sutton to allow for suitable and well-designed insertions within the settlement.
Promoting development of land to the north of Vicarage Road and the east of Moulsham Lane, Yateley.
Housing Numbers/Level of Growth
NE Hants is already too overcrowded
Local council's and residents must make the decisions and not be overridden by central Government
Should stop building and development should go elsewhere
Welcome an element of growth to sustain social vitality
Everyone should take a share
Should cap immigration and more limits on child benefits. Don't need huge new housing developments and have insufficient infrastructure
Government national house building targets are unsustainable
Hart is big enough already
Concern that the SHMA does not accept the Experian forecasts.
Consider 359 a reasonable figure, but concerned about backlog of affordable housing.
Have other LA's been asked to take any of Hart's housing?
Questions whether the demand based approach is sensible
Wait on deciding the number of new homes to be built until after the Local Plan has been adopted.
Does not believe in sustainable growth, should plan for zero growth
No explanation as to why new housing needed, should not be creating 'employment opportunities
Have already raised concerns about how low the SHMA housing figures are. Will make further representations once the housing target agreed.
4,000 additional homes appears arbitrary, no accuracy about the housing potential of each option or on cost of likely associated infrastructure. Should delay choosing best option until this is known.
Planning is a local issue and 'how many and where' should be left to us to decide. Housing need generated by unchecked immigration.
Do not believe the Council have adequately demonstrated that they have satisfied the Duty to Cooperate particularly with regard to meeting neighbouring authorities' unmet housing need.
Do not agree that there is no justification to uplift the housing requirement in order to meet affordable housing needs contrary to the NPPF. Just because a target is challenging is not adequate justification for failing to make provision for adequate homes over the plan period.
The HMA area is currently only providing 55% of the assessed annual housing needs requirement for 2011-2032.
Questions need for so many homes – is this to take the London overspill.
Consider there are fundamental flaws regarding not only the amount of housing that should be delivered but also that an Appropriate Assessment has not been undertaken and the evidence base is not complete. Further progress should be put on hold until this work is complete.
Consider that the SHMA work is flawed, their own work suggests OAN should be 387 dwellings per annum.
The OAN figure should be treated as an absolute minimum. Other Local Plan examples demonstrate the need for the plan to meet objectively assessed need.

Other:
Promote underground parking
Re-use vacant houses
Need an end to large scale dormitory housing estates
Must protect green areas
Development must be within 1 mile of Hart's boundary
Must protect green areas/green spaces
SPA must be protected at all costs
Any new town must be well designed and laid out
Need a pragmatic approach to protection of wildlife and birds
Housing needs to be affordable and sympathetic to the history of the area
Need a radical new approach to maintenance of new development – through a residents maintenance charge to a management company
Need to plan the new town and get on with it
Need to better match skills and employment and reduce commuting
Provide sheltered homes for retired people who want to move on
Put abbreviations at the front or back of the document
No overall responsibility for co-ordinating partners – suggest a Planning Commissioner
Hopes that communication will continue
Challenge will be to design and enforce a Local Plan which maintains the character of the area
Estates on many of the villages, where the housing is largely pre-Victorian, would spoil the ambience and decrease the values of their houses.
Must reduce the likelihood of planning and ensure adequate drainage
If must add to settlements should be on the edge and not lose open land/spaces within settlements
Development should meet the needs of local people before being extended to everyone.
Must provide housing for an ageing population
Hart is in danger of being completely ruined
Important to provide shared equity properties
Rural villages are under threat from in-filling
Cycle paths are not always well-maintained
Recent developments have cramped layouts, insufficient parking and only token open space
As population rises it is inevitable that some building on greenfield sites will be needed.
Congratulations on clear and concise consultation documents
Further work needs to be done before the public can make an informed decision
Need a detailed survey of commuting patterns
Must prevent developers having a landbank
Hart should be vigorously fighting the housing numbers because of constraints
Concerned about interim developments proceeding while the plan is being prepared – can they be stopped
Must ensure that we maintain gaps between settlements
Should use more flats and apartments than housing – nothing of any size in Hart
Does not agree proposals are necessary or sustainable
Disappointed previous plan withdrawn
Glad to be involved, documents helpful in explaining the options
Important that extensive 'garden-grabbing' does not occur
Must respect the landscape in rural areas and large open green space should remain largely rural in nature
Adding to settlements here and there is not sustainable – support a new settlements
Should shorten the timescale within which affordable housing is delivered
Questions EU SPA directive, and suggests we should revisit the UK agreement to this.
Concerned the Council will go for the easy options, room for sensitive development but a new settlement would be a negative choice.
Remember small communities can only respond proportionately to larger ones.
Paper driven by politics not common sense
Strategy must consider potential on major sites in the countryside
Reiterates need for HDC to work closely with Parish Councils

Considers need another consultation before the draft Plan to get buy in from the community to a hybrid of options.
Consider that allocations should be included within this plan and not left to a Site Allocations document.
Planning applications should be frozen until Plan is agreed
Keep development away from rivers
Is 'sustainable' defined anywhere
Should adopt London Housing Standards and strict environmental codes
How will the importance attached by residents of Hart to individual policies be taken into account
Use local developers, carbon neutral houses, local in character
Please do not rush into a decision before having involvement from highly qualified, professional, experienced Planning and Conservation officers to ensure that the best decision is made for the Hart ratepayers.
Recognise need for housing, must ensure most minimal impact on areas left.
Consultation is flawed in that the papers only leads you to one possible answer to question 3.
Do retirement homes count towards the total number of new homes?
Why is the idea of a new settlement being considered again?
Questions what employment opportunities there would be in a new settlement
Future development must be within environmental limits.
Must plan properly for the demographics of the area
Need road safety improvements
Larger towns have more voting power.
Wishes of the local population should be respected and taken into consideration.
If 4000 houses were being built today there would still be a perceived housing shortage because there are many thousands more who would like to move into this area.
Well-designed urban development offers higher densities and the satisfactions of better transport connections, community support and infrastructure at less cost to national character than the sprawl implied by development of estates in villages.
Could be potentially disruptive and not in communities' best interests if Parish/Town Councils were involved in deciding where new developments might be sited in their area.
Must protect the character of hamlets and villages.
How does the rejection of Hart's 2012 Plan accord with allowing local communities to make decisions?
Have already gone too far in spoiling our countryside, with permanent effects.
Must make provision for starter homes, and homes for retired people who want to stay in the area but who don't need large houses.
The Government should come and see the damage that is being caused in the south.
Paper is poorly done and understood that it was to be changed but wasn't – why not? Too many acronyms and poor English.
No more traveller sites.
Fleet really needs to attract young people with perhaps more disposable income to keep the economy of the district going.
Would support a further phase of consultation in advance of the draft plan. Unconvinced that two documents will take longer than one.
Reserve the right to make further comments once the housing and TBHSPA evidence is in place.

APPENDIX 6:

Other email/letter responses:

Options:
Would recommend option 4 and land at Winchfield is the only area with requisite transport links and scope to allow a garden style community.
Preferred option is option 5 combined with option 3 as the least damaging to the natural environment.
Concerned about the amount of development being forced upon Hart District and Fleet in particular. Only viable option is Option 4 for a new settlement which should be in the Winchfield area. Must plan long term.
Only option 4 will allow for long-term proactive planning allowing the integration of housing with infrastructure.
Option 3 is the most suitable, could accommodate housing (bungalows or small houses for the elderly) on Phantom Motors site if they were allowed to move.
HDC should opt for options 1 and 2 as would allow an even spread of development across Hart with a range of advantages.
Most suitable option for Crondall is Option 3. The existing main settlements have established infrastructure and would be most sustainable. Apart from some small infill no further development would be appropriate at Crondall.
Option 4, and a new town at Winchfield must be avoided. This is one of the few green lungs in Hart and has significant ecological value. There would be an impact on water supply and the water table, and an adverse impact on archaeology.
Concerned about the level of development around Fleet, and the provision of insufficient infrastructure. Should now look at new settlements as suggested in Option 4.
Option 4 is preferred option followed by Option 3 and then Option 2.
Believe that a new settlement is the best long term option as it could provide/affordable homes/homes for the elderly and for single people and families.
Reluctantly consider that option 3 may be needed in the short to medium term.
Suggest further flexibility is built into option 5 – the spatial distribution should not be designed to avoid the SPA zone of influence, rather should comprise the most sustainable pattern of development.
Support a hybrid of options 1, 2 and 3 with an emphasis on the need to provide for growth at the most sustainable settlements (option 1).
Considers that a combination of options 1, 2 and 5 should be pursued with development focused on the main settlements and large villages. This should include Odiham which being outside the 5km SPA buffer is less constrained than other locations. Additional development at Odiham should be provided on a range of small and medium sized sites. Land south of Farnham Road, Odiham is promoted as an appropriate and sustainable location.
Option 3 is the most appropriate with strategic urban extensions focussed on Fleet (including Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath), specifically to the west of Fleet/Church Crookham given the constraints elsewhere. The remaining requirement could be met through option 2 although this should not include the main villages. Options 1 and 2 cannot be relied upon. Option 5 is the least suitable as development would be located as far as possible from the most sustainable urban centre in the District at Fleet/Church Crookham.
Option 1 – a preference for brownfield must be balanced against the need to retain other uses and avoid overdevelopment. Agree that a combination of options will be required. Consider option 3 the other most appropriate option with an element of option 2.
Growth option 2 is the most sustainable strategy but must be combined with another option.
Consider that focusing development in and around existing main settlements and larger villages is the most suitable. Site proposed at Eversley for residential development, with two parts which would fall within option 2.
Site specific comments:
Concerned at the level of development which has taken place around Fleet and the impact on infrastructure, particularly the road network.
Additional housing around Yateley would not meet relevant sections of the NPPF (sections 9, 10 and 11).

Welcome the indication of the committed status of the North East Hook site and reaffirm clients intention for early delivery and implementation of this scheme.
Having taken a significant amount of development already Fleet and Church Crookham are now already at crunch point, particularly in terms of transport and education. Little investment forthcoming from the County Council.
Would support the development of a new settlement of about 4,000 homes at Winchfield as it would be sufficiently large to deliver its own infrastructure.
Submitting details of land at Guillemont Park North as a potential housing site. Vacant office site which lies adjacent to settlement in Rushmoor.
The spatial strategy should be sufficiently flexible so as not to preclude sites like Guillemont Park as a previously developed site in a sustainable location, next to an existing settlement.
Promotes the allocation of land off Hare's Lane, Hartley Wintney for a residential care village – application likely to be submitted in the next few weeks.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land at Bridge Farm is unconstrained and could be made available.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that 22.80 hectares of land on the north west edge of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available.
Identifies land available to the north of Deptford Lane, North Warnborough which is available for residential and employment development.
Identifies land available at Lodge Farm, south of Hook for a garden village community.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land at Swans Farm, south of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available, including public open space integral with Odiham Common.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land owned by Shapley Fishing Syndicate on the north west edge of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land at Shapley Ranch on the northern edge of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land on the south west edge of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available.
Supports the development of Winchfield as a new settlement and confirms that land on the western edge of Winchfield is unconstrained and could be made available.
Rural housing is essential to support local facilities. The dispersal approach is therefore supported in principle, but a more sophisticated approach is needed for allocation. This must be based on the level of services and facilities at the settlement. The settlement hierarchy paper fails to recognise that Eversley is made up of a number of smaller settlements which share facilities. Land at Eversley is being promoted through the call for sites process, and other land is owned in Eversley which could be brought forward. This could include the provision of a significant area of SANGs which NE have already identified they would support.
Development at Stillers Farm lies adjacent to the QEB development and could accommodate additional dwellings as part of a natural extension to the Crookham Park development.
Land is promoted off Hop Garden Road, Hook, for development. The site offers a sustainably located and deliverable opportunity for housing development for approximately 48 dwellings.
Promoting site in Land north of Netherhouse Copse, Fleet, currently the subject of an outline planning application.
Sets out supporting documentation for the delivery of 4,000 homes and supporting infrastructure for Winchfield Garden Community including a vision document.
Seeks clarification as to why areas such as the North West of Hants are not really being looked at. The documents show a new town next to Fleet, why not nearer Eversley or Heckfield?
The Eversley area would be better suited to more housing than Crookham Village or Ewshot.
Housing Numbers/Growth levels
The Government must attempt to deal with the demographic problem rather than a 'sticking plaster' approach of building more homes.
Noted that at the public meeting (with Brandon Lewis), many people were concerned about the impact of new development on their communities but no-one was arguing for more development.
The Government needs to tackle the issue of population growth.
Accept that there is a need for future housing.

Supports the uplift in housing but reserves the right to critique the final version of the SHMA. Critical that the objectively assessed housing need figure is met to ensure affordable housing can be delivered. Likely pressures from London and other local authorities further support the need to fully meet Hart's own objectively assessed need.
Considers that the proposed housing requirement fails to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of Hart District for all types of housing including affordable.
Do not consider that the Duty to co-operate has been made, particularly in relation to meeting neighbouring authorities unmet need. The annual requirement for the HMA is 238 less than the objectively assessed need and this must be addressed. There is also no consideration of the shortfall of other authorities outside the HMA.
Considers that the housing figures are an underestimate of overall need, contrary to the NPPF. A number of concerns are expressed at the SHMA methodology including migration and commuting data and links with other districts, the need for a long term net-migration scenario covering 2001 – 2012, the use of the 'unattributable Population Change', the need for additional household formation rate sensitivity scenarios for demographic and economic led housing growth, consideration of the 2012-based ONS SNPP, the need to consider the Experian forecasts in full and the need to boost supply to address adverse market signals. Suggest that up to 659 dwellings per annum are needed.
Concerned that the options are based on a restrictively low housing requirement. The Council should be considering the ability to meet objectively assessed need achieved through the application of SANG and other avoidance mitigation measures.
Some concerns expressed about elements of the SHMA and consider that it should be amended. Consider that up to 659 dwellings per annum are required to meet economic led need and meet NPPF requirements.
It is clear that HMA needs will not be met unless Hart can support the requirements of Rushmoor and Surrey Heath.
Separate housing analysis suggests that OAN should be between 575 – 660 dwellings for Hart.
Concerns regarding the SHMA methodology. Considers the OAN should be 658 dpa.
Concerns regarding the SHMA methodology. Considers that the OAHN is at least 550 dpa.
Other
Most critical issues are infrastructure which are at full capacity in many areas.
Planning Policy team are to be complimented on the content and layout of the Housing Options Paper.
It is unfortunate that there is no information as to where the existing sites with planning permission are located as this is a factor in considering where additional housing could go.
The Employment Land Review, 2009 is out of date and does not reflect current market conditions and must be updated.
The smallest settlements should not take additional housing as they do not have the level of services and facilities to support it.
Questions the concerns the Council has regarding the upscaling of SANGs and suggests that need can be met through the application of SANG and other avoidance and mitigation measures.
Concerned that this consultation has taken place in advance of much of the evidence base being prepared, crucially, the housing requirement for Hart has not been identified. This uncertainty means the options are meaningless.
Smaller villages and hamlets should take some new housing as it provides an opportunity to maintain the overall character of the district and individual settlements.
No options should be agreed until a full and thorough programme of road improvements and upgrading is put into effect.
Suggests that major movements from haulage would be more detrimental to the SPA and environment than houses.

APPENDIX 7:

Responses from the Duty to Co-operate Bodies

Duty to Co-operate Body	Summary of Response
Basingstoke & Deane District Council	<p>Comments on the Duty to Co-operate Scoping Exercise:</p> <p>Issue 1 - B&D should be listed as a partner in relation to 'Mitigating the effects of new housing in the vicinity of the TBHSPA'.</p> <p>Issue 2 – Meeting objectively assessed need for housing – this is wider than just meeting OAN but also identifying the OAN in the first instance - B& D should be listed as a relevant body.</p> <p>Issue 4 – Employment - Do not consider B&D to be a partner involved in this issue.</p> <p>Issue 5 – Retail and Leisure – this has not been raised previously as a strategic issue between the two authorities.</p> <p>May also be helpful to include in the table all the relevant DTC prescribed bodies as set out in the relevant Regulations.</p>
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	No response received
Civil Aviation Authority	No response received
Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership	<p>Welcomes the consideration given in the consultation paper to the Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan. Committed to working with Hart to help address issues of joint interest.</p> <p>Para 2.25 and 2.26 – endorse the use of up to date economic evidence.</p> <p>Para 2.35 – Consider that the review of employment land requirements should be carried out as soon as possible.</p> <p>Para 2.48 – Encourage Hart to work jointly with the LEP on possible future projects for the Local Growth Fund.</p> <p>Para 2.54 – recognise the challenges of affordability across the area and encourages Hart to fully consider this strategic issue when developing the Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 3.23 – In relation to housing acceleration, it may be more accurate to say subject to Government 'funding' as well as 'support'.</p> <p>Para 3.24 – in contrast to the statement in para 3.24, the LEP has made it clear that this applies across the area and is not broken down to individual authorities.</p> <p>Para 3.52 – support the objective relating to economic development. Would urge that the Plan is based on up to date market intelligence and insight and they are happy to help.</p> <p>Para 3.55 – There are five step up towns, not seven.</p> <p>Para 3.62 – Welcomes and supports the joint working taking place with Rushmoor and Surrey Heath.</p> <p>Comments on Duty to Co-operate issues:</p> <p>TBHSPA – endorses the key partners identified</p> <p>Housing need – would be helpful to set out how Hart will engage on a wider network of partners including Enterprise M3, on relevant issues to housing.</p> <p>Employment needs across the functional economic area – endorse the list identified. May be appropriate to include the Thames Valley LEP and Reading Borough Council in this list, and also Woking, Runnymede and West Berkshire Councils.</p> <p>Retail and leisure needs – comments as for employment above.</p> <p>Transport issues – with the introduction of the Local Growth Fund in 2015/16 it will be important that Enterprise M3 is engaged in discussions on this issue, particularly where infrastructure funding is required to unlock growth. Might also</p>

	consider whether to involve Network Rail and the Train Operating companies in discussions.
English Heritage	<p>Response to Question 1 - Options</p> <p>There is insufficient information available at this stage in terms of the potential effect on the historic environment of any of these five options, as recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal, for English Heritage to express preferences between all the options.</p> <p>Welcome the recognition of the historic environment of Hart as a potential influence on the level and nature of housing development in some area although would prefer positive characteristics to be highlighted rather than as a negative constraint.</p> <p>In Option 1, Conservation Area designations are recognition of the special architectural or historic interest of such areas. It is the potential effect on this special interest, informed by a Character Appraisal identifying the contribution of open spaces to that special interest, that should determine whether development on such open spaces is appropriate, rather than the designation itself.</p> <p>In determining eventual locations to be allocated for new housing (and other development), English Heritage will look for a robust evidence base underpinning the selection in which the historic environment is given proper weight in accordance with statutory provisions and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>We would comment that Appendix A contains no specific reference to any specific historic environment evidence for the district (except perhaps the Urban Characterisation and Density Study).</p> <p>Response to Question 2: Smallest villages and hamlets</p> <p>Make the general comment that where the village or hamlet is historically important, its small size is likely to mean that its capacity to absorb new development without degrading that importance or character is reduced.</p> <p>Response to Question 3: Location for new settlement</p> <p>Would expect such a location, if this option was pursued, to be informed by historic environment considerations.</p> <p>Response to Question 4: Any other options:</p> <p>Would expect any such options to be informed by historic environment considerations, including designated and undesignated heritage assets and historic landscape character and sensitivity, as part of the range of necessary considerations.</p> <p>Response to Question 5: Any other comments:</p> <p>English Heritage previously commented on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and we are pleased to see the Council's responses to our comments.</p> <p>We note that the Report identifies an uncertain impact against SA Objective SA7 for all of the five potential options, on the basis that site specific or broad locations would be required in order to fully establish a likely significant positive or negative effect. We generally agree with this position, although we would suggest that Option 5 should be recognised as being likely to have the greatest potential impact on designated heritage assets.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Comments on the Housing Options Consultation Document:</p> <p>Welcome involvement at this early stage.</p> <p>Para 1.24 and Appendix A: Evidence Base Review – consider that a water cycle study will be required to assess infrastructure capacity and the impact on both water resources and water quality (this was acknowledged in the 2011 Water Cycle Scoping Study). Support the SFRA update. The HCC Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2013, and the HCC Surface Water Management Plan (in preparation) should also be part of the evidence.</p> <p>Section 2: Issues</p> <p>Environmental – welcome acknowledgement of many of the environmental issues</p>

	<p>within the EA remit. Para 2.16 should also acknowledge the need for mitigation and adaptation to climate change in terms of flood risk, biodiversity, water resources and water quality.</p> <p>Infrastructure – Water resources and foul drainage must be identified as infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Section 3: Assessing growth and development needed.</p> <p>Biodiversity - The ecological value of river sites should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Flooding constraints – there is no mention of the sequential test for any future site allocations. The updated SFRA should form the evidence base on which this is tested. Evidence that the sequential test will be required if there are sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Any strategic sequential test should inform the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Infrastructure Capacity – The growth proposed will place a significant increase in loading on the water supply and foul drainage infrastructure. The plan and supporting evidence must show that the proposed allocations are deliverable. EA require evidence to show how much of the planned growth is accounted for within the Thames Water Asset Management Plan 2015 – 2020. Sewage treatment works may also need to be upgraded but as yet there is no assessment of the impact on the SWTs.</p> <p>A review of the infrastructure delivery plan will need to be undertaken.</p> <p>Section 4: Options – no specific comments. Reiterate that the constraints of flood risk, water supply and foul drainage infrastructure must be taken into account.</p> <p>Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal:</p> <p>No comments on the methodology, but some points as follows:</p> <p>Appendix 3, SA Framework:</p> <p>SA10 – no appraisal of the foul drainage infrastructure has been undertaken to ensure that future development does not lead to a deterioration of water quality and non compliance with the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>SA13 – For clarity would be helpful for the framework to state there will be no development in Flood Zone 3. A sequential test will be needed for future sites allocated in flood zone 2 and the results will form the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Appendix 6, Appraisal Tables – the EA do not understand the appraisal of the options against this objective, particularly that greater levels of growth will result in a more likely significant positive effect on water quality. Clarity on this would be welcome.</p> <p>There has been no assessment of the impacts on water quality and the Water Framework Directive requirements from the increased loading on the foul drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>Comments on Duty to Co-operate issues:</p> <p>The scoping tables do not identify the impacts that may occur by meeting development needs and therefore the mitigation required. The impact on the environment in terms of water supply, wastewater, flood risk and biodiversity may require assessment and improvement in the infrastructure.</p>
Hampshire County Council	<p>Para 1.9, Page 3</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and a web link added.</p> <p>Para 2.16, page 14</p> <p>Welcomes role in reducing carbon emissions, the need to reduce the use of coal and oil and to see identification of renewable energy technologies with potential in the area. HCC would encourage more attention to adapting to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Para 2.56, page 20</p> <p>When sustainability of housing is considered in the Development Plan, the mix of building types has been the main focus and not the sustainability of the natural and built environment. HCC would encourage consideration of longer term sustainability of both the built and the natural environment.</p>

	<p>Para 3.47 – there is a discrepancy between the SA and the Options Paper – para 3.47 of the Options Paper does not reference Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments. They should all be mentioned to be consistent with Section 7 of the SA. The document should also reference the Historic Environment Record as part of the evidence base.</p> <p>HCC would need to see the associated transport modelling for each option to fully understand the potential impacts of each on Hampshire and the strategic road network. The transport evidence to support these potential development options should assess the impacts of proposed options on the local and strategic transport network. Any transport modelling and background evidence paper should also link in with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 – Education Authority Comments The location and number of dwellings to be provided in the new Local Plan period need to be clarified in order to be able to assess the implications on school place planning and propose specific solutions should additional school places be required. Until detailed information is available the comments made here relate to principles of school place planning.</p> <p>Detailed comments made regarding pupil generation and class/school size. Options 3 and 4 provide the best opportunity to provide new primary schools providing the quantum of housing in one area is a minimum of 1,400 dwellings to allow the provision of a new 2 FE primary school, as highlighted in Option 3.</p> <p>Option 4 provides the best opportunity to provide additional primary schools and to consider the provision of a new secondary school.</p> <p>The provision of expansions to existing schools or the provision of new schools will depend on the factors affecting school organisation and school place planning at the time the housing development is proposed.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Welcomes inclusion of Objective SA12 - To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, manage the impacts of climate change and improve air quality.</p> <p>Suggest that the preliminary SA decision making criteria should include: Will the objective reduce vulnerability of people, the built and natural environment to warmer wetter winters, hotter dryer summers and more frequent extreme weather events?</p> <p>SHLAA – new site proposal Requests the inclusion of Thurlston House, Victoria Hill Road, Fleet (former Adult Services site) for housing.</p> <p>Comments on Duty to Co-operate Issues: Agree with the identification of joint issues between HCC and HDC with the addition of 'Minerals Safeguarding'.</p>
Highways Agency	The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. It is noted that much of the evidence is to be updated and have no further comments at this time.
Homes and Community Agency	No response received
The Mayor of London	No response received.
Natural England	We note that Option 5 is relevant to para. 2 of NRM6 on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) which states that: 'Priority should be given to

	<p>directing development to those areas where effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures'.</p> <p>Scale of development, cumulative impact, and any in-combination effects will need to be considered, and we note that these elements are indeed acknowledged on pages 54-55 of the Housing Development Options Paper (Hart DC, August 2014)</p>
North Hampshire & Farnham CCG	No response received
North Hampshire CCG	No response received
Office of Rail Regulation	No response received
Runnymede Borough Council	No comments on the Development Options Paper or the Sustainability Appraisal.
Rushmoor Borough Council	<p>Comments on Development Options Paper:</p> <p>Welcomes the opportunity to respond. Notes that the Options paper takes forward the recommendations of the joint SHMA and recognises that the needs of the HMA as a whole must be met.</p> <p>Welcomes consideration of a range of options to maximise housing delivery potential. Identifies that initial capacity work at Rushmoor suggests there is likely to be a shortfall of about 1,800 dwellings (initial figure subject to further work) in meeting the housing needs identified in the SHMA up to 2032. Requests that HDC notes this and considers whether any of this shortfall could be met within Hart District. Rushmoor will also write to Surrey Heath Borough Council to advise them of a likely shortfall and to ask Surrey Heath if they can consider if they will be able to accommodate any of this shortfall.</p> <p>Comments on Duty to Co-operate Issues:</p> <p>Agreed that the issues identified by Hart are the relevant cross boundary issues that affect Hart and Rushmoor.</p>
Spelthorne Borough Council ²	<p>Currently undertaking a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) with Runnymede BC which lies adjacent to the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Housing Market Area (HMA). Initial findings consider that links between the two areas are very limited and confined to Runnymede/Surrey Heath only.</p> <p>As the Options document considers broad locations and not the actual housing number, at this moment in time it cannot be determined what effect (if any) Hart's housing needs will have on the Spelthorne/Runnymede area.</p> <p>Spelthorne Borough Council has no comment to make regarding which distribution option Hart should pursue.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to meet Hart's housing need either within Hart or within the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath HMA in the first instance. Any shortfall of needs within the HMA as a whole could have implications for areas outside of the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath HMA which may include the Spelthorne/Runnymede area.</p>
Surrey County Council	No response received
Surrey Heath Borough Council	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Welcomes the recognition that there may be a requirement for Hart to meet the needs of neighbouring authorities, particularly those in the HMA.</p> <p>Support consideration of a range of options which indicates land available for circa</p>

² Spelthorne Borough Council are not strictly speaking a duty to co-operate body.

	<p>9,580 – 9,875 dwellings (2014 – 2032), above Hart's OAN.</p> <p>Despite best endeavours, Surrey Heath may not be able to meet its OAHN due to environmental constraints.</p> <p>Whilst recognising there is further work to be done, this indicates that Hart could be in a position to help deliver the HMA requirement if other authorities are unable to.</p> <p>Surrey Heath will also write to Rushmoor to request that if Surrey Heath has a shortfall, whether Rushmoor could accommodate any of this.</p> <p>Makes some specific corrections in relation to Surrey Heath completions figures.</p> <p>Notes and welcomes recognition of the joint working already underway within the HMA.</p>
Waverley Borough Council	<p>Waverley BC would ask that whichever option is chosen that the implications for infrastructure and services both within Hart District and in neighbouring areas like Waverley are identified and addressed.</p> <p>If the Local Plan were to proceed with a housing target that does not meet the needs then this needs to be fully justified, given that undersupply in one area may result in pressure to increase delivery in another where similar constraints apply.</p> <p>Note that one option relates to the part of the district outside the zone of influence of the TBH SPA. Trusts that the need to adopt a consistent approach to the SPA will be considered in taking the Plan forward.</p>
Woking Borough Council	<p>Welcomes the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>The only strategic issue is that of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Woking would therefore advise that the preferred option should reflect the TBH Delivery Framework which both authorities are signed up to.</p>
Wokingham Borough Council	<p>Of particular concern to Wokingham Borough are options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Option 1, Settlement Focus would involve concentrating new housing development within the existing boundaries of the main settlements and larger villages within Hart. Of particular interest to Wokingham Borough are the settlements of Yateley and Eversley, which are near the Wokingham Borough boundary. Wokingham Borough Council would request that Hart District Council consider the impacts on Wokingham Borough infrastructure of growth along this boundary, particularly with regards to transportation, education, flood risk, etc.</p> <p>Option 2, Dispersal Strategy would involve allocating new housing development adjacent to the main settlements and larger villages in Hart District which would include Yateley and Eversley. Wokingham Borough Council would request here too that Hart District Council consider the impacts of growth in these areas on Wokingham Borough.</p> <p>Options 3, 4 and 5 do not propose additional growth along the Hart boundary with Wokingham Borough and so are not of particular concern to the Council.</p> <p>The development options for Yateley and Eversley would be likely to generate education, transport and flood risk impacts on Wokingham Borough. WBC would welcome the opportunity to discuss any issues associated with development at Yateley and Eversley so that deliverable solutions can be identified.</p>

APPENDIX 8:

Summary of responses from other 'Specific' Consultees

Town and Parish Councils	
Church Crookham Parish Council	<p>Question 1: Support Option 4 (new settlement) as the preferred option with additional small developments on the outskirts of Hart away from the SPA. Option 3 – Strategic Urban extensions could have a negative impact on the host settlements due to increased pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Question 2: Would prefer all settlements to take a share of the housing as all areas need affordable housing. The scale and style of new housing should maintain the character of each settlement.</p> <p>Question 3: Development could be located near the M3 corridor and rail links e.g. Winchfield, Heckfield or Mattingley. The settlement must have good transport links, support its own educational needs and a medical centre and include planned employment opportunities.</p> <p>Question 4: It is likely that a combination of options would be required and a potential new settlement could be combined with option 2: Dispersal Strategy.</p> <p>Question 5: Fleet and Church Crookham have taken the brunt of development over the past 20 years without sufficient infrastructure. This is particularly evident in relation to school places. CCPC considers that the emphasis is on selecting an option rather than trying to set boundaries in which each of the options could be exploited. Must ensure that the developments are sustainable. CCPC would like to see the location and size of schools required considered as part of the Plan. In addition, a parish survey in 2012 supported the need for more local employment. CCPC favours a solution that does not significantly add to local housing as the local infrastructure is already strained and piecemeal development does not provide the funding to rectify the problem.</p>
Crondall Parish Council	<p>Comments are made without knowing where the 3,500 new homes already built or committed are to be located.</p> <p>Option 1 – On the basis of the evidence in the consultation document it would seem sensible to extract the maximum possible from this option so reducing the pressure on other options.</p> <p>Option 2 – This is the least attractive option as there is no good planning reason for sharing the burden, it would entail building outside settlement boundaries, it would exacerbate the impact on infrastructure and here will be constraints preventing some communities from taking their share.</p> <p>Option 3 – This should be the 'core' option supplemented by others as absolutely necessary. Further benefits are, it minimises environmental impacts in terms of carbon emissions, travel etc, it maximises protection of the countryside, it minimises the need for additional infrastructure, logical to follow existing travel patterns and is less likely to put a strain on the host settlement and character than other options. The focussing of development close to the M3 ribbon and railway network makes good sense with regards to transport, jobs, infrastructure and environmental protection.</p> <p>Option 4 – In theory as attractive as option 3, however, this would require a long time frame and risk meeting the 5 year supply. It would need to be a new town taking most of the 20 years requirement to ensure critical mass and would destroy a substantial area of countryside/farmland. In addition it may fall foul of the SPA limitations and would be a risky strategy to put 'all the eggs in one basket'.</p> <p>Option 5 – this would create serious problems for all the communities involved as well as other environmental impacts.</p>

	<p>Crondall specific – it is inappropriate to compare Crondall with other larger villages, Hook, Odiham and Hartley Wintney as these have substantially more facilities, infrastructure etc than Crondall. As mentioned in some places it is more appropriately described as a 'main' village.</p> <p>In addition, there are few employment opportunities in Crondall, it has an extensive Conservation Area and many Listed Buildings. Open spaces must be protected, the village is already thriving, there are flooding issues and the village is within 5 m of the TBH SPA and thus subject to a qualified presumption against development.</p>
Dogmersfield Parish Council	<p>Option 1 ranked first – will optimise current settlement footprints.</p> <p>Option 2 – ranked 2nd – will keep growth at settlements to a minimum and promote social cohesion, recognise this will mean an additional seven houses outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Option 3 ranked 3rd – unattractive as will focus the burden on a small number of settlements, however some aspect of this may be needed to deliver option 2 on a balanced basis. Further development west of Fleet would reduce the separation between Dogmersfield and Fleet.</p> <p>Option 4 ranked 5th – this would undermine the characteristics of the District wherever it is located. It will also threaten the separation, separate character and identity of neighbouring villages. Should a new settlement be centred on Winchfield it will pose a major threat to the character, appearance and distinctiveness of the Dogmersfield Conservation Area and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>Option 5 ranked 4th – could only provide a proportion of the housing need and therefore not practical.</p> <p>Question 2 – development in smallest villages: No – even a small number of new homes will have an impact on the smaller settlements and they should not have an allocation. Applications could be granted if there is no local opposition.</p> <p>Question 3 – Location of a new settlement: Don't know – insufficient information and a number of factors to be taken into account. Seems unlikely there will be anywhere suitable in Hart.</p> <p>Question 4 – Other housing development options: Brownfield sites should be targeted before greenfield – this should apply across the HMA.</p> <p>Question 5 – Other comments Much of Paper is welcomed. However, the document is too geared towards economic drivers, and insufficient identification of the concerns of residents and the adverse impact that further development has on quality of life.</p> <p>Scale of increase must be fully justified and there seems to be no scrutiny of consultants work.</p> <p>Consider that there are good grounds for reducing housing numbers for the reasons set out in the options paper.</p> <p>The quality of life in Hart is a valuable asset and why the District is a popular place to live. The interests of local residents must be given equal weight to economic factors.</p> <p>Overall support priority to be given to option 1, and then an equitable share under option 2 with option 3 used to allow larger settlements to take their share. Infrastructure must be provided alongside new development.</p>
Eversley Parish Council	<p>Question 1: This option is what happens anyway but will need to be supplemented. Eversley has a number of potential windfall sites which means that it will be making a significant contribution to the housing requirement.</p> <p>Option 2 – EPC does not agree with the settlement hierarchy designations at Eversley and as yet this is untested. The Dispersal Strategy puts green fields around each as</p>

		<p>potential allocations. Yateley is regarded as a “Primary Local Service Centre”, so would be regarded as a main town. Any extension to the west of Yateley would have to be built on land in Eversley. Therefore, this option concentrates the planners’ and developers’ attention on very large swathes of the parish. Eversley cannot accept any new allocations of housing on these sites, whether as extensions of Eversley settlements or as an extension of Yateley. Infrastructure constraints preclude any level of planned growth below that which might be associated with a new settlement. It would not appear to be possible, logistically, to develop new towns at Arborfield and Eversley concurrently, so that, effectively, rules out the possibility of any growth in Eversley beyond that that will be achieved through infill, redevelopment.</p> <p>Question 2:</p> <p>Yes, none of the options bar housing in them, they just don’t propose specific allocations. Eversley Parish could contain a number of Hart’s “smallest villages and hamlets”, namely New Mill Road, Lower Common, Warbrook Lane, Eversley Street, and Up Green, if not Eversley Centre and Eversley Cross as well. There may be some opportunities for them to accept modest growth, but if “... they do not constitute sustainable locations for new housing ...” any contribution that they can make to overall housing numbers will not be significant. The “exception policy” for local affordable housing is seen to have worked well and provided much needed local housing. It would be sensible not to make planning policies so restrictive as to rule out the possibility entirely as there may be reasons why communities may welcome some housing. Such development should be community led.</p> <p>Question 3:</p> <p>In Eversley’s case, where there are extreme restrictions on the community’s ability to accommodate any growth beyond its Option 1 level, the only scale of designated growth that could possibly deliver the new infrastructure package required would be at the “new settlement” level. An enormous amount of detailed work would be required to assess the viability of such an option, wherever it was in Hart, against the known constraints. It is not considered possible, at this late stage, to incorporate a “new settlement” in this Local Plan, but ad-hoc decisions should not prevent this in any Review.</p> <p>Question 4:</p> <p>Records will show “concealed households” are in housing need, when they are not actually competing in the housing market. If this is not recognised this can result in overestimates of housing need. A more relaxed approach to subdivision would create new homes without the need for building and could satisfy demand in the affordable sector more quickly. Would help increase numbers under option 1.</p> <p>Question 5:</p> <p>The Paper fails to address the carrying capacity of the environment or infrastructure, so that consideration of the options is being carried out as an academic rather than realistic process.</p> <p>Infrastructure planning is not linear including school provision and road capacity. Concerns about the impact of development in Wokingham Borough on the A327 and its junctions, as this is the main north-south link with Berkshire and beyond.</p> <p>Eversley finds itself, due to decisions made in Wokingham, in an “all or nothing” situation. Infrastructure constraints preclude any level of planned growth below that which might be associated with a new settlement. It would not appear to be possible, logistically, to develop new towns at Arborfield and Eversley concurrently, so that, effectively, rules out the possibility of any growth in Eversley beyond that that will be achieved through infill, redevelopment and the identification of any further exception policy sites.</p>
Fleet Council	Town	<p>Question 1:</p> <p>FTC would not support Option 3 because of the significant negative impacts on the "host settlement" brought about by the increased stress on existing infrastructure and social impact of redefining the "centre of gravity" of the settlement.</p> <p>Question 2:</p> <p>Yes - all settlements, even the smallest villages and hamlets should accept some level of new development. Important to protect character but need to keep expanding</p>

		<p>families and attract younger families.</p> <p>Question 3: It is vital the new settlement should have strong transport links to relieve the pressure on existing settlements where infrastructure cannot be expanded. Potentially 5,000 – 8,000 new homes and able to support its own educational and medical facilities, provide employment opportunities and be developed as a 'garden town'.</p> <p>Any existing settlements within the designated new town area should be sensitively treated within the overall conceptual design. Any necessary infrastructure to be implemented prior to the occupation of the development.</p> <p>Question 4: Consider that a combination of options will be needed to maintain a 5 year supply. A new settlement will take time but this needs to be significantly reduced from the anticipated 10 years. Whilst sufficient supply in the early years, the issue is maintaining a rolling 5 years supply. If a new settlement takes 10 years, it will not be required to provide sufficient housing in the plan period to make it viable. Planning should be fast tracked and phased with early infrastructure on available land. This is the chance to plan for the future.</p> <p>Question 5: One issue that was not adequately addressed in the sustainability assessment was the vital question of an improved road network to facilitate the significant out-commuting from the district. SA18 addresses "improving the efficiency of transport networks by enhancing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and promoting policies that reduce the need to travel." The negative social, economic and environmental impact of new developments caused by increasing the stress on existing road infrastructure should be assessed for development options that rely on increasing the density of or expanding existing settlement boundaries. This issue has not been addressed in the Sustainability Assessment and would heavily weigh against Options 2 and 3.</p>
Hook Council	Parish	<p>Question 2: But for only for rural affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <p>Question 3: In the area that is within easy access of the underutilised railway station at Winchfield. In addition Minley Barracks could be a possible site being adjacent to the M3 particularly if Hart is expected to meet some of the Rushmoor housing needs.</p>
Long Sutton and Well Council	Parish	<p>Question 1: Object to option 5 as would lead to an unsustainable quantity and concentration of housing development in the predominantly agricultural and rural south-west corner of the district.</p> <p>Option 3 is preferred option as would minimise the impact on rural areas. This could be combined with elements of options 1 and 2 but this should be done in conjunction with the parish councils, and avoid being done in a piecemeal way.</p> <p>Question 2: No. Would damage the setting and character of the smallest settlements. They may lack sufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Question 3: No specific view except must be supported by appropriate infrastructure including access from main highways rather than rural roads and should not be located in areas of landscape value.</p> <p>Question 4: No further options identified.</p> <p>Question 5: Recognise that further housing is needed in Hart. However, it must be planned so as to be sustainable, provide appropriate infrastructure and be appropriate for its setting. Therefore important that the District Council works with parish councils to identify potential sites which will have local support.</p>
Newnham Council	Parish	<p>Question 1: Strongly supports reuse of brownfield sites rather than building in the open countryside.</p>

	<p>Options 2, 3 and 5 all appear to threaten the Local Gap between Hook and Newnham. Option 2 would be the preferred of these options if the dispersal was proportionate to the settlement size across the District.</p> <p>Requests that the District Council take account of Saved Policy 5.2 Conservation Policies: Con 21 Local gaps, particularly in relation to the local gap between Hook and Newnham.</p> <p>Question 2: Yes, but small scale individually designed houses only.</p> <p>Question 3: A new settlement should be centred on a brownfield site if this could be achieved anywhere in the District.</p>
Odiham Parish Council	<p>Strongly Object to Option 5. This would conflict with many of the objectives in para 17 of the NPPF (economic development/recognising the intrinsic beauty of the countryside/using land of lesser environmental quality/multi-functional use of land in and around the Parish/conservate heritage assets/promote sustainable transport modes/provision of local services and facilities.</p> <p>Landscape and heritage assets must be more fully assessed before option 5 is considered. There is insufficient recognition of the heritage assets in Odiham and the difficulty in finding SHLAA sites.</p> <p>The most likely sites are still not guaranteed as will lie within 7km of the SPA and will still need appropriate assessment.</p> <p>This option would not deliver sufficient housing alone so whilst damaging landscape and heritage assets it would not protect other parts of the District.</p> <p>Object to Option 2 as it skews development towards the villages where there is land available. This would cause serious infrastructure issues.</p> <p>OPC understand the need for new housing and is progressing its own Neighbourhood Plan. If option 4 is not practical then strong consideration should be given to options 1 and due to their ability to leverage existing infrastructure and thereby limit the impact on landscape and heritage.</p>
Rotherwick Parish Council	<p>Question 1: Considers Option 4 to be the most favourable in the long term to meet the target numbers with minimal effect on existing settlements. However, may need to be combined with options 1 and 3 in the short term. Option 2 is not favourable as it includes the necessity to improve the associated infrastructure in multiple locations which is not deliverable and would not be cost effective. Upgrading infrastructure in multiple areas would cause disruption to the largest number of residents. Option 5 is considered to be the least viable in the period in terms of delivery and numbers.</p> <p>Question 2: Yes - may be appropriate in all locations if it is introduced in a proportionate manner (appropriate numbers, scale and design for the settlement). Development must provide adequate provision of services and not adversely affect residents.</p> <p>Question 3: Should have good communication links in terms of access to transport and the ability to be able to be integrated with surrounding infrastructure. It should also be an appropriate distance from existing settlements to avoid future merging and have minimal impact on surrounding settlements during development. Size is dependent on chosen location and proximity to existing settlements. Consideration should be given to access arrangements and new junctions to major roads including the M3.</p> <p>Question 4: No</p>
South Warnborough Parish Council	<p>SWPC feel that the most critical issues are those of the infrastructure, which is at full capacity in many areas. For example: Schools, both primary and secondary; doctors surgeries, roads are very busy and in a rural area it is vital to own a car. More inhabitants means more traffic and our roads will not cope. There are no buses or other public transport.</p>

		<p>Option 4 is the preferred option - Winchfield is close to the M3, and has a main-line railway and shops in Odiham or Hartley Wintney. This would require infrastructure but has the space.</p> <p>Option 3 - With established settlements in Hook, Fleet and Elvetham Heath these areas could take a large proportion of the immediate housing needs until a new settlement can be built in several years' time.</p> <p>Option 2 - Growth within and adjoining rural settlements, such as in South Warnborough, needs to have the backing of the community and needs to be sympathetically and tactfully dealt with. Swamping a small village or hamlet with too large a development would destroy its charm and community spirit and it is felt that village life will die. It is very important that Hart Housing take the view of all its residents into account and deal with each area on an individual development basis. □</p>
Winchfield Parish Council		<p>A new settlement of 4,000 homes at Winchfield would devastate the rural heartland of Hart and lead to a conurbation taking in surrounding settlements. SANG mitigation land would need a further 100 hectares. Traffic impacts would be unacceptable, and traffic would need to cross part of the SPA at Hazeley Heath.</p> <p>Unhappy about the consultation process and the treatment of the possible option for a new settlement and in particular the use of maps indicating only one possible option. Concern that the documentation, including the SA only leads to reference to one place where it could go. Other questions are more balanced. This follows conflicting HDC officer advice as to whether the maps would be used as part of the consultation.</p> <p>HDC has previously rejected the idea of a new settlement (press release March 2012), planning should be consistent so why change the approach.</p>
Yateley Council	Town	<p>Question 1: Option 4 is preferred with option 5 as a short term back-up. There are much more suitable places for development than Yateley.</p> <p>Question 2: Don't know</p> <p>Question 3: Close to railway and motorway links.</p>
Health		
Frimley NHS Trust	Health Foundation	Interested in how the housing will affect the hospitals covered by the Trust and would welcome further discussion.
Utilities		
Thames Utilities Ltd	Water	<p>Thames Water seeks to work closely with the local planning authority to plan for the necessary sewerage/wastewater infrastructure to service development in its area in accordance with national policy and guidance. New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Where there are infrastructure constraints, it is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment & Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years.</p> <p>TW sets out guidance for development in proximity to Thames Water Assets.</p> <p>TW request a specific policy and text on Water/Wastewater Infrastructure – draft wording provided.</p> <p>Any flood risk policy should therefore include reference to sewer flooding and an</p>

	<p>acceptance that flooding could occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site infrastructure is not in place ahead of development.</p> <p>Comments on Options:</p> <p>OPTION 1 concentrating new housing development within the existing boundaries of the main settlements and larger villages within Hart. 580 and 875 homes, mostly within Fleet, Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath. The lead-in times under this option would be minimal and new homes could start to be delivered within a year or two. This is considered to be a viable solution, however, a local network upgrades should be anticipated especially around Fleet.</p> <p>OPTION 2 – DISPERSAL STRATEGY 3,300 to 4,000 homes allocating new housing development adjacent to each settlement. Detailed investigations would have to be carried out to review spare capacity. A strategic solution might be required to accommodate proposed growth.</p> <p>OPTION 3 – FOCUSED GROWTH (STRATEGIC URBAN EXTENSIONS) 3,500 homes in total, split across a number of sites in Hook and Fleet. Both Hook and Fleet would require detailed investigations to determine impact on sewerage network and also sewage treatment capacity.</p> <p>OPTION 4 – FOCUSED GROWTH (NEW SETTLEMENT)</p> <p>An interesting option and an opportunity for an innovative and enhanced sustainable approach to conveying and treating wastewater.</p> <p>OPTION 5 – FOCUSING DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM THE THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPA ZONE OF INFLUENCE – In general terms, Thames Water's preferred approach for growth is for a small number of large clearly defined sites to be delivered rather than a large number of smaller sites as this would simplify the delivery of any necessary infrastructure upgrades.</p> <p>As a general comment, the impact of brownfield sites on the local sewerage treatment works is less than the impact of greenfield sites. This is due to the existence of historical flows from brownfield sites, as opposed to greenfield sites that have not previously been drained. TW would therefore support a policy that considers brownfield sites before greenfield sites.</p> <p>Detailed site specific sewerage issues are set out for each settlement.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX 9: Summaries of responses from other interest groups

Consultee	Comments
Sport and Recreation	
Sport England	<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy undertaken will help ensure there is a good supply of high quality pitches and playing fields available. Sport England can provide a number of planning tools to help this process.</p> <p>Some development options will affect existing playing fields – the Council will need to consider the issues set out in para 74 of the NPPF.</p>
Countryside/Rural Environment	
RSPB	<p>Question 1 – Options for growth: Support Option 5, which reflects saved Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heaths SPA) of the South East Plan. This option will significantly reduce pressure on the District's valuable natural assets (ie the SPA) and also help reduce the financial burden on developers who would otherwise need to contribute towards (or themselves provide SANGs) and other SPA access management mitigation.</p> <p>RSPB do not have a preference between the other options, although the further away development is from the SPA, the better it is for reducing recreational pressure.</p> <p>Question 2 – Development in smaller villages: Support this approach only where it would further help reduce pressure on the SPA (by locating housing outside of the zone of influence) and meet other sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Question 3 – New settlement location Any new settlement should be located at the greatest possible distance from the SPA while meeting other sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Question 5 – Other Comments: Concerned that the Sustainability Appraisal may have resulted in some perverse outcomes in respect of the assessment of Option 5. Assessment against SA Objective 2 (health and wellbeing) overlooks the purpose of SANGs (ie to deliver an alternative recreational resource), and also ignores the existing greenspace available in the less heavily developed South West of the District.</p> <p>Under SA Objective 8 (To protect and enhance biodiversity) - given that the effects of SANGs in attracting existing visitors from the SPA has not been evidenced, and that the Delivery Framework aims only to result in no net increase in SPA visitors from new development, the wider positive benefits to the SPA from delivering new housing within the zone of influence are highly doubtful. These matters should be more robustly considered in the next draft of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
CPRE NEH	<p>Question 1: Option 1 is preferred approach. SHLAA shortcomings are that it only identifies sites put forward by developers. The 850 capacity is an under-estimate.</p> <p>Option 2 places a disproportionate emphasis on the growth of those settlements that are the least sustainable. The expectation that a high proportion of these sites would be identified by local communities, rather than being developer/landowner led proposals, introduces an additional delay to site allocation. Alternatively could do a full review of the settlement boundaries although this would introduce delay.</p> <p>Option 3 recognises that site allocations should take into account both the capacity of existing infrastructure to accommodate growth and the opportunities of new infrastructure provision to address existing shortfalls. This option encourages development in the most sustainable locations and minimises the impact on open</p>

	<p>countryside.</p> <p>Option 4 would be the most damaging and the most divisive option. Considering different site options would lead to delays. In addition this option would affect not only the countryside on which it was built but the countryside around it.</p> <p>Option 5 is not founded on valid planning criteria. The designation of the TBH SPA cannot have made those parts of the District beyond its zone of influence more suitable for housing development than they were before. If there are houses that cannot be provided because of the adverse impact that they would have on the TBH SPA then these should be deleted from the District's target figure.</p> <p>Question 2: Yes.</p> <p>Policies should enable development to be considered in the smallest villages and hamlets, however this is unlikely to make a significant housing contribution. Even developments on sites such as Bramshill House or Minley Manor estates, in the open countryside, are unlikely to influence the decision on the appropriate options. Ensuring new developments respect the existing vernacular and are of a form and scale appropriate to their neighbours and location are even more important in smaller communities. Support the use of Landscape character assessments.</p> <p>Question 3: Nowhere large enough in Hart for a truly sustainable settlement of about 10,000 homes, therefore would be a satellite settlement reliant on another urban centre. An easy access system would be needed between the two. CPRE has not carried out any work to identify sites.</p> <p>Question 4: The most urgent need in Hart District is for affordable housing, which none of the proposed options would see fully addressed for up to ten years. Suggests temporary change of use of land within or adjacent to existing settlements for the establishment of temporary low-cost homes. Reduction in costs would be significant and would relieve the immediate pressure on greenfield land.</p> <p>Question 5: Critical of the SHLAA process leading to an under-estimate of potential. There has been no consultation on the Settlement Hierarchy Paper. SHMA predictions are based on aspirational demand rather than on identifiable and realistic need, but accepts at this stage must use the SHMA OAN number. Overestimates must be corrected in any Plan review. The total number of houses and the annual build rates remain dependent on the outcome of research into the impacts of the TBH SPA on the deliverability of housing within the zone of influence without adverse impacts on the SPA. Any shortfall that cannot be accommodated due to the SPA should be deleted from the total. Comments are made on the basis that the TBH SPA mitigation measures can be proven to be effective and scalable. The siting, size, tenure, etc. of the units delivered must match the recognised needs. Given the high cost of living and an over-dependence on private transport, the cost of any affordable housing provided must be sufficiently low, that those in need can afford to occupy and live in it.</p>
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	<p>The Wildlife Trust would encourage HDC to talk to the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership about the ecological networks for the Hart District Council area.</p> <p>When planning which options to choose and where to develop the Trust asks that the ecological networks, the Trusts nature reserves and the Loddon and Eversley Living Landscape Area are taken into account. They also wish to ensure that the ability to graze the heathlands and other habitats is not compromised by the location of development.</p> <p>Whichever option is chosen we believe that it is critical to positively plan for green infrastructure, new open spaces and ecological networks through the local plan process and not to leave this to individual developments.</p> <p>Supportive of Edenbrook SANG but consider QEB SANG of insufficient quality and</p>

	<p>standard and hope this will be addressed.</p> <p>Adequate public open space must be provided, and not just as SANG (Link to HIWWT report). Research shows that open space provision in Hart has not kept up with population growth.</p> <p>The Plan should take a strategic approach to positively plan to halt biodiversity loss and achieve a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The Trust would welcome further discussions.</p>
Place Specific Groups	
The Odiham Society	<p>Question 1: Option 2 combined with Option 1 offers the fairest and least damaging solution. Option 4 is unattractive as a new town could only be built at huge cost to the countryside and would cripple the infrastructure. Option 5 is highly unattractive and would be very damaging to the SW corner of the district. The SPA is being given too much weight in planning proposals.</p> <p>Question 2: No - The small villages should be allowed to retain their particular character, this would be destroyed by further building.</p> <p>Question 3: Do not support Option 4. There is no suitable site that could be developed on acceptable conditions.</p> <p>Supplementary Comments Although option 3 is superficially attractive, past evidence is that infrastructure will lag behind development. In addition most villages may benefit from limited development through the dispersal strategy. Option 5 – the SPA is already given undue weight because it is an EU designation but ignores other considerations such as heritage and landscape. Consider that this is the worst option.</p>
The Yateley Society	<p>Appendix 1 - Our District and the issues we face: Q1 - Hart's attractiveness is achieved through the open spaces between settlements, which is enhanced by tree planting. Q2 – The issues of additional main hospital capacity is not adequately addressed. Concerned about impact of additional homes on this. Hart is reliant on hospitals in Surrey Heath and Basingstoke therefore expect the D2C to address this. Q3 – Yateley has no town centre as this was never planned therefore regeneration to create a town centre with mixed development should be a priority.</p> <p>Section 3: Assessing the growth and development we need to 2032: Q1 – Expect that the Government will support the Experian growth forecast data which is likely to increase the housing numbers. Also concerned about the possible backlog of affordable homes. May also need to consider in more detail the relationship with other areas such as Basingstoke and Berkshire. Q2 – Consider that 359 homes per annum is a reasonable objectively assessed quantity but may be pressure to increase for reasons already set out. Q3 – Unclear as to whether other authorities have requested that Hart take any of their housing? But also could they take any of Hart's housing?</p> <p>Section 4: Potential Options for Future Housing Development Strategies: Q1 – Agree option 1 should be part of the solution. Should be part of the regeneration of the town centres and would be contained in Neighbourhood Plans. Q2 – In principle it should include all areas. Option 2 – Opposed to this option since it does not create sustainable development where infrastructure and services are already overloaded, and also it is an option that can become very confrontational with local residents.</p> <p>Option 3 – There is nowhere else to locate SUEs. The main argument against any further development around Tier 1 and 2 areas is the lack of unconstrained land. Option 4 – Consider the number of new homes required can only realistically be met by a large development. This would be supported by regeneration of the town centres. Obvious location is along the M3, connected to main road network and main</p>

	<p>line station. An alternative is south west Hart but this is less sustainable and more confrontational.</p> <p>All five options:</p> <p>Could ask adjacent LA's to take a share of the housing.</p> <p>The main risk is the delivery of sufficient infrastructure and community facilities.</p> <p>The options are rated as follows:</p> <p>1st - Option 4, 2nd – Option 1, 3rd – Option 3, 4th – option 5, 5th – option 2</p> <p>Consider it is essential to first know the number of homes required for Hart and the net effects of any constraints that may affect one or more options, for example the impact of the TBHSPA.</p>
Action Group for the Preservation of the Crondall Conservation Area	<p>Question 1:</p> <p>Consider that it is appropriate for the majority of future housing development to occur where there is appropriate infrastructure and facilities that can accommodate such expansion. Paragraph 2.2 wrongly identifies Crondall as one of the larger villages in the District along with Yateley. Hook, Odiham, and Hartley Wintney. Crondall is much smaller than these larger settlements and it does not include even a small proportion of the facilities of the larger villages. It is correctly identified as a main village in para 2.1. Support the recognition that Crondall suffers from flooding.</p> <p>Option 1 - support the general principle of housing development within the current settlement boundaries of the towns and larger villages, as new development will inevitably benefit from existing infrastructure. Suggest that the sentence which refers to the smaller settlements is either deleted or reworded to state: "Therefore the option is intended to relate to all tiers of settlements of the hierarchy where there is satisfactory infrastructure and no adverse affect on the historical environment."</p> <p>Option 2 – this option takes no account of any other of the settlements characteristics apart from its size. It does not take account of infrastructure, location, transport, sustainability, historical, social or environmental issues. As such, we consider that this option should be discounted.</p> <p>Option 3 - consider that identified strategic urban extensions to tier 1 and 2 settlements would seem the most sensible way forward as it is the most sustainable, taking advantage of the existing infrastructure and facilities of the larger urban areas.</p> <p>Option 4 - this is also an option that could give a unique opportunity to plan an environmentally sustainable settlement which minimizes its impact on the surrounding area. However, will take a long time to implement.</p> <p>Option 5 - suggest that any option that is dictated by only one identified constraint (development should be limited within a 5km of a SPA) is not considering the wider issues and it is therefore an inappropriate way to consider future growth.</p> <p>Therefore the Strategy for growth should be focused on Option 3 identifying the potential expansion sites and planning the infrastructure to support them. Short term needs could be met (within limits particularly in historical settlements) through option 1 and option 4 is worth a detailed study. Conservation areas need particular protection.</p> <p>Question 2:</p> <p>There are several small settlements in the Parish boundary that are outside the village envelope of Crondall where one or two additional houses could fit in well and not overstretch the infrastructure.</p> <p>Question 3:</p> <p>Winchfield</p>
Fleet and Church Crookham Society	<p>Question 1:</p> <p>Fleet and Church Crookham have suffered considerable growth without sufficient improvement in infrastructure in order to maintain the amenity of residents and users of the towns. A comprehensive plan is urgently required that will not only deliver appropriate growth that is demanded, but essentially provide an infrastructure network that is able to keep pace with such growth.</p> <p>Option 4 is preferred - The New Settlement option seems to be the obvious solution to long term growth and infrastructure needs in a properly planned and sustainable manner whereas the Urban Extension option dumps large concentrations of growth on the most already overburdened areas. Concerned over the lack of clarity as to how many dwellings will need to be delivered from across the other options before a</p>

	<p>new settlement is capable of delivering appropriate numbers of housing and that half the numbers from a new settlement will be in a later plan period. Assuming a large quantity still needs to be found from the other options, options 1 and 5 clearly have the least impact over the already overburdened Fleet and Church Crookham areas. These are therefore ranked equally as preference 2. The obvious danger with these options is that small scale developments are constrained in providing noticeable infrastructure, mainly as the geographic area is scattered and infrastructure improvement is more likely to be distanced from the new housing. Should option 2 be chosen to supplement option 4, then it is essential that a robust plan is put in place to deliver infrastructure to keep pace with increased housing numbers</p> <p>Question 2: The Local Plan has to demonstrate that it is capable of delivering a large number of houses to meet demand. This has to balance the needs of many residents that feel recent growth has already been excessive and those which are finding it difficult to find suitable (or affordable) housing. The housing needs are not limited to any one area or groups of areas, so it follows that there would also be housing needs within even the smallest settlements. The extent of new housing in these areas should be within the context of their settlement size and able to be supported by the available infrastructure.</p> <p>Question 3: As F&CCS do not have an intimate knowledge of the needs of other neighbouring communities within the district. It would therefore not be appropriate to promote specific sites. However, in the selection process of possible new settlement sites, we feel that it is essential that such candidates should have easy access to major road and rail networks and be capable for future expansion to meet the needs of subsequent planning periods.</p> <p>Question 4: Encouragement should be provided to land owners and developers to promote suitable sites that can accommodate additional housing within areas that are able to preserve or enhance infrastructure for existing and new inhabitants.</p> <p>Question 5 SPA mitigation (SANGs) are unproven and may be unlawful and cause damage to the SPA. Must be addressed in the Local Plan. Fleet & Church Crookham has taken the brunt of the burden that additional housing brings and has suffered greatly as a result of the time lag in delivering improvements in infrastructure. Often contributions towards infrastructure through the Section 106 mechanism disappears outside the district or is delivered much later than the housing itself. With the advent of the Community Infrastructure Levy F&CCS are concerned that there will be a disconnect between the developer funding and the extent of tangible benefit delivered. This must be dealt with through the Local Plan. F&CCS are very concerned that there may be pressure on Hart to take greater housing numbers due to the timing differences in neighbouring authorities local plans. They therefore urge clarity of these numbers and a mechanism in place for neighbouring authorities to realign their delivery plans in relation to recent housing needs data. As Hart is open to developer pressure by not having a plan in place, they urge the Council to get a Local Plan in place as soon as possible.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX 10: Age and gender breakdown of respondents


Gender breakdown of respondents (those that submitted a form)

Male	301
Female	201
Prefer not to say	26

Age break down of respondents (those that submitted a form)

Age Range	Number
Under 18	1
18 – 24	8
25 – 34	26
35 – 44	69
45 – 54	88
55 – 64	118
65+	170
Prefer not to say	56

APPENDIX 11: Consultation Response Form

Hart District Council Housing Development Options Consultation RESPONSE FORM	
---	---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YOUR DETAILS	
Title:	<i>Mr /Mrs/ Miss / Ms / Dr / Other</i>
First Name:	
Surname:	
Address:	
Post code:	
E-mail Address:	
Organisation: <i>(if applicable)</i>	
Agents: <i>(Please give the name of</i>	

the person /organisation you represent)

Q1 The five different options for growth are listed below.

We would like you to rank the options in order of preference, 1 being your favourite option, and 5 being your least favourite option.

Please see the consultation papers or summary leaflet for information on each option.

	Please circle one rank for each option				
Option 1 – Settlement Focus	1	2	3	4	5
Option 2 – Dispersal Strategy	1	2	3	4	5
Option 3 – Focused Growth (Strategic Urban Extensions)	1	2	3	4	5
Option 4 – Focused Growth (New Settlement)	1	2	3	4	5
Option 5 – Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy	1	2	3	4	5

Please add any comments that support your response.

Q2 None of the options suggest housing in Hart's smallest villages and hamlets. Do you think even the smallest settlements should see some new housing?

Yes

No

Don't Know

☐
☐
☐

Please add any comments that support your response.

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

Comments:

Q4 Are there any other possible housing development options?

Yes

No

Don't Know

☐
☐
☐

If you have said 'yes' please outline what other option or options there might be:

Q5 Please use this space to make any other comments on the Housing Development Options Paper or the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. (Please attach separate sheets as necessary)

Comments:

DRAFT

About You

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

Q6 Gender (please tick ☐ one box only)

☐ Male

☐ Female

☐ Prefer not to say

Q7 Age (please tick ☐ one box only)

☐ Under 18

☐ 25 - 34

☐ 45 - 54

☐ 65 +

☐ 18 - 24

☐ 35 - 44

☐ 55 - 64

☐ Prefer not to say