

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation

Document 1 - Local Plan Update Issues and Options Consultation

Section 1. Background to consultation, Section 2. Introduction and Section 3. National and Regional Picture

The preliminary sections of the Issues and Options consultation setting out the background and policy context didn't attract many responses. One respondent suggests that the climate change emergency and council's commitment to carbon neutrality should be highlighted whilst another challenges the Local Plan timetable and plan period commenting that adoption is more likely to be in 2024 and the plan period should run until March 2040.

Section 4 Key Issues

Question 4a: Do you agree with the key issues that have been identified?

The consultation document identified seven key issues for the LPU:

- Tackling the climate emergency
- Focusing on place shaping and design
- Protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage
- Meeting the changing needs of all
- Providing the Right Housing
- Facilitating infrastructure delivery
- Supporting the economy and town/district centres

80 respondents were in general support of the key issues identified.

Points raised included:

- The key issues should be ordered by importance;
- One developer argue that the LPU should, in line with national policy, focus on planning issues and be refined to focus only on identifying sustainable locations for future growth;
- Three respondents promote land for development stated that the issues the adopted Local Plan seeks to address remain largely similar to those outlined and that it is therefore logical for the current spatial strategy to be carried forward into the new LPU;
- In relation to key issue 4, one affordable housing provider whilst generally supportive, argue it is not forthright enough about provision and diversity of housing tenures in 'meeting the needs for all';
- Whilst another respondent refers to flexibility to take account of viability and local circumstances in providing homes to meet needs of all;
- In response to key issue 5 a number of respondents note the lack of five-year housing land supply and identified under-delivery of housing as key issues to be addressed including holding developers to account; whilst concerns over rising housing numbers are also raised by a number of respondents;

- A number of respondents (including site promoters, developers and affordable housing providers) refer to the importance of the LPU remaining focused on addressing the borough's future local housing needs in particular in light of the continuing national housing crisis;
- They also highlight flexibility to respond to the changes proposed to the planning system in the Planning White Paper;
- With regards to key issue 6, infrastructure, there was support for delivery of a Western Link Road and recognition that there must be timely delivery of school places;
- Key issue 7 received an objection to redeveloping the Leisure Park as a regional destination.

Question 4b: Are there any other issues which you consider to be central to the LPU?

- 25 responses from various stakeholders, developers and those in the community suggest reviewing policies in light of Covid and Brexit to understand the impact they have had on the borough along with incorporating resilience to future pandemics;
 - This includes providing the right housing in the right places as Covid has highlighted inequalities, isolation and the need for the market to provide a variety of tenures, such as affordable and older persons accommodation where a need has been identified, a point raised by the North Wessex Downs AONB amongst others;
 - Emphasis on greater home working, increased demand and use of local facilities and opportunities in rural communities;
 - The impact on employment spaces and opportunities live and work more locally.
- A number of respondents suggest that tackling the climate emergency should be central to the LPU and this should be expressed and embedded more deeply;
- There is agreement between a number respondents that there should be a focus on sustainability and a well co-ordinated movement strategy that promote alternatives to the car, and provision of community and recreation facilities where people live to reduce the need to travel;
- Several respondents refer to raising the profile of the environment, wildlife and biodiversity by putting it at the centre of policy making as per the pledge in the Environment Bill and approach set out for Nature Recovery Networks, along with the identification of valued landscapes and provision of green infrastructure;
- Several respondents including Sherfield on Loddon PC refer to maintaining the rural identity of the borough and the character of rural villages, including the need to maintain effective strategic gaps;
- Comments were also in support of an increased role for communities in planning;
- A number of respondents shared the view that the Council must ensure sites which are granted planning permission are actually built out;

- Three respondents including Upton Grey PC agreed that policy should concentrate on the regeneration of Basingstoke itself as it has large areas in need of investment;
- With regards to supporting the economy site promoters refer to opportunities for new employment development as part of large scale mixed use allocations or through the delivery of more local facilities in rural communities.
- Several respondents comment that there will inevitably be a requirement for some compromise between some of the key issues and the evidence base provides the appropriate mechanism for balancing these issues/objectives. This should be acknowledged more clearly and the evidence base made available;
- The 'duty to cooperate' is not mentioned and should be as it significantly influences the LP and its process.

The following comments were made by particular bodies/stakeholders:

- Sport England suggest focussing the LPU on increasing and maintaining physical activity, health and wellbeing and would support a specific key issue on this aspect;
- The MOD request a policy on MOD establishments recognising there is a need to protect operational defence sites;
- West Berkshire Emergency Planner request more detail around the spatial strategy to ensure any increases in population can be accommodated having regard to the Aldermaston and Burghclere AWE DEPZ;
- Southern Water are supportive of key issues 1, 3 and 5 as they align with their own aims to protect water quality alongside the inclusion of a key issue that would ensure that new development must be adequately separated from treatment works to safeguard amenity of future occupiers.

Section 5 – Climate Change

General comments:

- 15 respondents including site promoters and the HBF refer to the recent Government consultation on proposed changes to Building Regulations regarding uplifts to energy efficiency standards and Proposed Future Homes Standard, commenting that any policy relating to energy efficiency in the Local Plan needs to reference national policy and should be flexible to allow for such policy changes and any cumulative implications as a result.
- There is also general agreement that any requirements are supported by robust evidence ensuring they wouldn't impact development viability.

Question 5a: Which option is the most suitable energy standard for new homes and non-residential buildings? Should all types and scales of development be required to meet these standards?

The consultation document identified 3 options for energy standards:

- Option 1: Require all new development to reach net zero carbon

- Option 2: Require an uplift in energy efficiency standards for new homes to approximately 20% above the Building Regulations.
 - Option 3: Continue with the current approach and require new development to meet the Building Regulations or future equivalent.
- 23 respondents support option 1 including Kingsclere PC, East Woodhay PC, Pamber PC, Candovers PC, Overton PC, MP Maria Miller and Natural England.
 - 9 respondents (including site promoters/developers, Chineham PC and Highclere NPG) raise concerns about option 1.
 - 7 respondents support a combination of option 1 and 2 including SOLVE, and Bramley PC although site promoters state should be subject to viability modelling as per the PPG.
 - 17 respondents support option 2 including North Waltham PC, Chineham PC and Highclere NP, SoL Pc, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Sherfield Park PC, and the HBF.
 - 145 respondents support a phased approach where option 2 required until 2025, after which option 1 is applied including Ellisfield PC, Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Weston Patrick and Weston Corbett Parish Meeting.
 - 21 respondents support option 3, largely from the development industry who comment that it removes ambiguity and standardising the approach nationally is simpler and more transparent.
 - Historic England confirm that listed buildings, buildings in conservation areas and scheduled monuments are exempt from the need to comply with energy efficient requirements

Question 5b: Should the council require a minimum proportion of carbon to be reduced by: improvements to the building's fabric and/or; on-site renewable or low carbon energy?

- 48 respondents support the use of both approaches including SoL PC, Newnham PC and Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Pamber PC, Overton PC, Falcon Developments, Persimmon Homes, Bramley PC and SOLVE.
- 11 respondents refer to the Fabric First principle best practice before making use of low carbon renewable energy in accordance with the energy hierarchy.
- Several respondents suggest that where zero carbon cannot be met on-site, an off-setting scheme would be supported provided it was transparent and of benefit to community.
- 21 respondents oppose option 5(b) which requires a minimum proportion of carbon be reduced, including Sherfield Park PC, Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd, Bell Cornwell obo DDE Vivian's Children Settlement, Home Builders Federation, Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes and Phillips Planning Services obo Cooper Estates Strategic Land Limited. They

state that the council should just require building regulations and request policy should remain flexible.

Question 5c: Are there any other options we should be considering?

- Three respondents including the HBF don't think there were any other options.
- However, several respondents do suggest alternatives including the impact of design and layout, natural solutions such as tree planting, reducing the need to travel, passivhaus standard, smart technologies and flexibility for future technology.

Question 5d: Should the council introduce a requirement for non-residential buildings to achieve a BREEAM standard. If so, which level should it be set at?

- 176 respondents support the introduction of a BREEAM standard.
- 165 respondents are supportive of introducing BREEAM 'Excellent' including SoL PC and Newnham PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Cliddesden PC, Pamber PC, Weston Patrick and Weston Corbett Parish Meeting, Overton PC, Bramley PC Basingstoke Transition Network and SOLVE.
- 3 respondents including Upton Grey PC have a preference for 'very good' as baseline with specific targets in specified regeneration areas.
- Site promoters suggest viability testing and engagement with the development industry is required and any standards should be accompanied by appropriate evidence and flexibility in how they will be implemented, avoiding an overly prescriptive approach.

Section 5.3.4: Water Efficiency

- Although there was not a specific question on water efficiency standards, 5 respondents set out support for water efficiency standards including Southern Water and Savills obo Thames Water.
- Cllr Cubbitt and SOLVE oppose the use of water efficiency standards whilst 3 respondents comment it should be flexible enough to accommodate future national changes.

Question 5e: Are there any specific viability issues to consider when setting requirements for non-residential buildings/uses?

- 5 respondents don't believe there were any specific viability issues including Sheffield Park PC and Overton PC.
- Of those identifying viability issues key points include:
 - issues with retro-fitting existing stock as it is more costly and difficult to achieve;
 - importance of expectations being set out early;
 - allowances being made as building shell and fit out of building often undertaken by different developers;
 - flexibility needed for site by site considerations;

- greater flexibility for smaller community non-residential use.

Question 5f: Other than by meeting BREEAM standards, how should applicants demonstrate that they have considered sustainable design and construction in their development?

- Basingstoke Transition Network state non-residential buildings should be built to the highest BREEAM standard “excellent” (code 6) or equivalent to Passivhaus and follow best practice for carbon neutrality.
- 12 respondents including Newnham PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Cliddesden PC refer to the following
 - use of water efficiency standards;
 - solutions which benefit the natural environment (e.g. green roofs, south facing roofs, tree planting, SuDs);
 - factoring in the environmental cost of materials and construction;
 - electric charging points fitted as standard along with cycle infrastructure;
 - mitigation of energy requirements through design and layout and air leakage testing.
- There is support for a variety of quality mark schemes including BRE Quality Mark, WELL ratings and secure by design along with using Building Regulations and EPC.
- Several developers suggest that the potential viability implications of sector led schemes must be understood.
- There is general agreement that the preferred method to demonstrate compliance should be at the planning application stage through either the design and access statement, supporting sustainability/energy statement and/or planning statement.

Question 5g: Are there any other options we should be considering?

- 2 respondents state there were no further options.
- Of those who suggest other options, ideas include:
 - embodied carbon metric as advocated by the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge ,
 - district/community heating,
 - passivhaus and limiting overheating of dwellings,
 - BRE Home Quality Mark and/or BREAAM,
 - flood protection and water efficiency,
 - various approaches set out in design guides,
 - Ensuring that retrofitting options are available and affordable to all, regardless of tenure and landlord and provision of support for social housing providers
- Historic England recommend a specific policy relating to the inclusion of renewable technologies within conservation areas and with regard to historic buildings and the wider historic landscape.

- Its recognised that other options likely to emerge in light of new Government regulations.

Question 5h: Would you support the introduction of a specific policy on design measures that would mitigate climate change, support adaption, and embed sustainable design requirements? What should this include?

- 41 respondents including 7 parish councils, North Hampshire CCG, Basingstoke Transition Network, and several developers support the policy approach provided it is 'fabric first', not overly prescriptive and design isn't compromised.
- 9 respondents including HCC and SoL PC support a specific policy on design matters which uses the hierarchy of movement, through carefully considered design, layouts and building features whilst also offering flexibility for site specific circumstances.
- 3 respondents including Natural England and HCC support a policy for adaption and mitigation of climate change referring to flood resilience, the role of the natural environment (e.g. tree planting) and establishment of a Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategy as these could potentially benefit from carbon offsetting contributions.
- 5 respondents oppose the introduction of design measures to address climate change and support adaption as they believe design is more sensibly addressed by national level measures such as building regulations.
- 12 respondents comment that any policy should be suitably flexible and not prescriptive, it must allow for a reasonable case-by-case assessment, respond to specific local needs and priorities and allow for site specifics and new technologies that may come into force. Also needs to set out the financial and viability implications which need to be considered.

The following detailed elements were suggested for inclusion in such a policy:

- 14 respondents refer to the integration of trees;
- 12 refer to design and siting;
- 12 refer to building materials;
- 9 suggest ensure that developments can cope with changing weather patterns and reduce water demand;
- 5 suggest solar panels and/or solar farms;
- 4 refer to renewable or low carbon energy systems, battery storage and/or community heating;
- 8 suggest designing-in solutions which benefit the natural environment;
- 4 suggest allotments/home composting;
- Protecting water quality;
- Southern Water and HCC refer to effective drainage systems and good SUDs design fundamental to greatly reduce surface water flooding;
- HCC refer to the concept of '15 minute neighbourhoods';

- EV charging, cycle parking and potential for car free developments.

Question 5i: Would you support the above options for delivering low carbon and renewable energy and associated infrastructure?

The consultation document identified the following options for delivering low carbon and renewable energy and associated infrastructure:

- Option 1: Identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources and their supporting infrastructure in the Local Plan Update.
- Option 2: Encourage the allocation of specific renewable and low carbon energy sources or infrastructure through neighbourhood plans and support community-led schemes.
- 31 respondents including North Hampshire CCG and Chineham PC, Savills obo Miller Homes, SoL PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Pamber PC, Bramley PC, Baughurst PC, AECOM obo HCC, BDBC and SMV, Overton PC, Natural England and Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes support both options.
- 10 respondents inc Sherfield Park PC, Falcon Developments, Persimmon Homes and Carter Jonas obo Catesby Estates support option 1.
- 1 respondent (Falcon Developments) support option 2.
- Several respondents suggest policy should be suitably flexible to respond to advances in technology and provide the infrastructure in preparedness for mass low carbon energy production such as Hydrogen.
- A number of respondents challenge the effectiveness of either policy approach and refer to the accelerated pace of on-going technological changes to the sector as well as the size threshold and type of development which renewables and potential connection to DHN would require to be financially viable, desirable and technically achievable along with smaller scale energy becoming unnecessary given to context of a greener national grid.

Question 5j: Are there any other options we should be considering?

- Respondents suggest the following: solar, battery storage, air source heat pumps, windfarms, watermills, district heating, community schemes, EV charging, council led strategic energy generation and decarbonisation scheme, sustainable transport, carbon off-set and green infrastructure.

Question 5k: Should the Local Plan Update encourage or require large scale developments to connect to a district heat network where opportunities to do so have been identified?

- 21 respondents including SoL PC, Sherfield Park PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and Overton PC, agree that large scale development should connect to district heat network where opportunity identified unless technologically or economically unviable.

- A number of respondents oppose option 5(k) as it is unpractical due to the cost to implement and it can affect the viable delivery of sites. There is also only limited sites where it is appropriate.
- Home Builders Federation state that for the foreseeable future it will remain uneconomic for most heat networks to install low-carbon technologies.

Question 5l: Should the Local Plan Update include suitable criteria for assessing planning applications for battery storage and its associated infrastructure?

- 20 respondents support the use of suitable criteria for battery storage in the LPU including East Woodhay PC, Chineham PC, Sherfield Park PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and SOLVE. They make reference to energy storage more generally and this being a new technology likely to become more important.
- Respondents query when and how the policy would operate regarding scale, suitable locations, design, if applicable to all developments/applications, accounting for advances in technology, robust regulation to ensure safety and battery disposal.

Question 5m: Which option or options for sustainable transport and movement would you support?

The consultation sought views on the following four options:

- Option 1: Meeting the needs of the car by adding highway capacity and providing parking spaces to meet demand, with minor improvements to benefit cycling, walking and public transport.
- Option 2: Focus on improvements in facilities for walking, cycling and public transport, including dedicating space on our roads for these forms of transport, including reserving land where required and considering the scope for new railway stations.
- Option 3: Establish an approach that relies on managing demand, such as the pricing of car parking spaces, greater use of technology and more home-working to reduce the need to travel by car.
- Option 4: An approach that sees an improvement to benefit all modes of transport
- Support is split between options 2 (focus improvements on sustainable transport) and 4 (improvement to all modes of transport) as well as many suggestions for a combination of these including some elements of the other options.
- Detailed comments included reference to promoting healthy and active lifestyles, provision of active modes, alternatives to the car, sustainable transport measures and '15 minute neighbourhoods'.

Question 5n: Is there a role for Park and Ride at Basingstoke and where could such a facility be located?

- The majority of respondents are supportive of a Park and Ride (P&R) at Basingstoke. Preferred locations included: Chineham Shopping Centre was the preferred option, followed by the M3 Junction 7, and the M3 Junction 6; and Manydown.
- Those in favour include Pamber Parish Council & Pamber NP Steering Group, Cllr McCormick, Trustees of the Portsmouth Estate, Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council, Baughurst Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, Overton Parish Council, Cliddesden Parish Council, Newnham Parish Council and Mapledurwell & Up Nately Parish Council, Highways England and Local Highway Authority (HCC).
- Those who oppose a P&R include Upton Grey Parish Council and Chineham Parish Council.

Question 5o: Are there other forms of transport that will be important to plan for in the future?

Other forms of transport respondents raise include the following:

- Trams/light rail/electric trams;
- Electric cars, bikes, buses and scooters;
- Small buses of circa 12 to 15 capacity;
- Uber type operations;
- Hydrogen vehicles;
- Autonomous vehicle shuttles/driverless buses and cars;
- Mass rapid transport;
- Shared or hired transport;
- Rail opportunities.

Other considerations/a need for:

- Zero car parking spaces;
- Electric charging points and associated infrastructure;
- Safer walking and cycling routes;
- Catering for those with mobility impairments;
- low traffic neighbourhoods, filtered permeability, and car free developments.

Question 5p: Do you support a review to facilitate a dedicated transport hub by Basingstoke railway station?

- The majority of respondents support a dedicated transport hub by Basingstoke Railway Station
- Those who oppose comment that transport pressure should be diverted away from Basingstoke and towards Chineham and Manydown via the creation of new railway stations there and that Basingstoke isn't large enough for MRT
- The following detailed points are also made: support for measures that create alternatives to the car and encourage sustainable transport habits, HCA support for reduction in impact on strategic road network and reference to Basingstoke Town Centre Transport Study which identified a new interchange.

Question 5q: Are there any specific considerations that need to be taken into account as part of this review, including the suitability of other land uses?

With regard to cycling and walking comments include:

- Meaningful cycle lanes required;
- Making the experience safer and nicer would encourage a shift from the car and this in turn could help to make buses faster due to fewer cars.

Respondents also raise comments regarding the area outside the Basingstoke Railway Station:

- Local transport hubs needed to connect to the central hub in town centre;
- Potential for electric bus / taxis in this location;
- Scope for retail in this location to benefit from footfall;
- Need to remove Clifton House to make this feasible and retention of town centre as main location for retail;
- Consider a wider area such as that occupied by the Moose Centre.

Comments also concern bus services / MRT:

- Where possible MRT should use existing / upgraded links and not major new routes;
- Scope to make use of smaller vehicles with increased frequencies with electric or hydrogen power;
- Must ensure routes are planned for through the Leisure Park to Manydown and to serve the new hospital;
- Priority needed, including for taxis in some areas.

Location of development in the context of transport considerations include:

- Southern Manydown can support new bus routes and MRT, together with extending walk / cycle infrastructure;
- Account should be taken of the scope to improve existing networks in smaller settlements compared to the possibilities for this in Southern Manydown, with innovative options, with higher densities and self-containment;
- Build homes next to employment sites to reduce commuting;
- Rural areas must be considered too, as these are frequently poorly connected.

Other comments:

- Access to rail stations is fundamental by all modes;
- Must consider less pollution once petrol / diesel car sales banned in 2034 as well as electric buses and taxi;
- Consider hydrogen / electric buses to link with Climate Emergency;
- Scope for electric car clubs / driverless vehicles including buses;
- Must consider the impact of more home-working arising from Covid-19.

Section 6 – Creating Beautiful Places

Question 6a: Do you support the identified list of important elements relating to design and layout set out in paragraph 6.2.2?

- There was a considerable amount of agreement with the list contained within the consultation document regarding design priorities for the borough (189 respondents), including from Hampshire Highways, NHS North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, West Berkshire Council, North Wessex Downs AONB, National Trust, Persimmon Homes, David Wilson Homes Thakeham Homes, Taylor Wimpey (overall), Savills on behalf of SMV, Sovereign, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Chineham PC and Kingsclere PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Old Basing PC, Sherfield Park PC and SOLVE.
- Natural England welcome the strong emphasis on the importance of integrating a range of green infrastructure including open spaces, natural habitats, trees etc.
- Those opposing the list suggest it may be better to rely on national guidance, and only add specific design requirements when these are specific to either Basingstoke or specific sites. Comments also refer to the list being too prescriptive and lacking in flexibility to take account of the wide range of site-specific circumstances including the use of standard house types.

Question 6b: Are there any other priorities or additional design related issues which the Local Plan Update should address?

A wide range of issues are identified, but these can largely be summarised as follows:

- Consideration of a range of specific design considerations;
- The importance of incorporating more and better integrated natural environment related features (e.g. street trees);
- Concerns regarding highway related design issues such as parking and pedestrian/cycle paths;
- Importance of sustainable design.

Question 6c: Do you have any views on how these design priorities should be achieved?

- A number of respondents refer to design codes particularly in light of government support for them although they raised the need for flexibility and working collaboratively.

Question 6d: Should the Local Plan Update be more visual and include examples of the type of designs supported?

- Of those who commented, the vast majority agree that it should follow the approach set out in this question (37 responses). This included Cllr Diane Taylor and Cllr Andrew McCormick, AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown), and also Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, and Old Basing and Lychpit PC. Hampshire Highways stated that visual examples of the types of cycle and walking infrastructure would be welcomed in the plan. Sherfield on Loddon PC

said this was an excellent proposal. Overton PC, while supportive of the approach, did state that it mustn't be too prescriptive

- Many of those who do not agree with the inclusion of images within the Plan itself still support the idea of pursuing that approach through SPDs and Design Codes.

Question 6e: Are more specific policies needed? For example, focusing on particular types of development (e.g. housing)

A number of policies are suggested including:

- densities for different areas,
- low carbon,
- car parking,
- building heights,
- rural design solutions,
- facility and transport targets,
- holistic approach to natural environment,
- specific design policies for different types of development,
- homeworking and build quality.

Question 6f: Are there any specific design priorities relevant to particular areas in the borough, for example Basingstoke town centre?

Respondents refer to the following:

- design needs to be high quality and contextual,
- character based approach,
- recognising existing heritage features,
- reflect changing working patterns,
- importance of the natural environment including street trees and green space

Question 6g: Do you agree that the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) should be included as a policy requirement in the Local Plan Update?

If not, why is this?

- Of those who comment on this issue, the vast majority agree that it should be included in the LPU (45 responses). This list includes Taylor Wimpey, Savills on behalf of SMV, HCC and Sovereign and Bramley, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council, Overton PC and SOLVE.
- Only 3 respondents explicitly disagree with its inclusion.
- However, a number of housebuilders questioned the appropriateness, suitability and justification pertaining to the adoption of the NDSS.

Question 6h: Do you have any views on the size of new homes which have been built in the borough in order to inform the evidence base relating to this issue?

- Respondents generally agree that the size of houses previously developed should not be the determining factor in terms of whether the NDSS can be adopted.

- Policy should remain flexible and allow the Local Planning Authority to apply their professional judgement on a case-by-case basis, in discussion with promoters.

Question 6i: Are there any other options that should also be considered, for example other homes standards such as a Home Quality Mark?

- 14 respondents agree that the HQM should be utilised whilst Lifetime Homes also cited.
- Respondents generally agree that any standards or sector-led assessment schemes will need to be understood in the context of emerging Government proposals such as the Future Homes Standard, net zero carbon in-use and net zero carbon statutory targets. A clear and coherent policy framework is required to make explicit what the requirements are and what is guidance.

Question 6j: Is there any more that the Local Plan Update could do to support the creation of safe and healthy communities?

- There is general support for a policy that links public health and wellbeing to the natural environment, and seeks to enhance green infrastructure and ecological connectivity.
- Sport England recommend that the LPU be informed by national guidance recently published, Active Design, which intends to inform the urban design of places, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and active open spaces to promote sport and active lifestyles along with protecting open space. They also refer to the evidence base findings with regards to playing pitches and sporting facilities.
- Numerous respondents refer to improving infrastructure linkages and walking and cycling opportunities.
- Ensuring the safety and usability of public open space is also highlighted along with provision of community social infrastructure.

Section 7 – Developing a Spatial Strategy

Question 7a: Do you agree with the key elements of the spatial strategy listed in paragraph 7.2.1?

- 75 respondents support the spatial strategy in paragraph 7.2.1, including Sherfield Park PC, Kingsclere PC, Newnham PC, Tadley TC, East Woodhay PC, Cliddesden PC, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Pamber PC and NP Group, Bramley PC, Overton PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Upton Grey PC, BDBC/HCC, Old Basing PC, Persimmon Homes, Sovereign Housing, WBC, Catesby, Sports England, Highclere Estate, HCC HA, National Trust, Bewley Homes, Gladman Homes, Highclere NP Group, Taylor Wimpey and Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates.

Optimising development on brownfield/urban sites:

- support for brownfield regeneration opportunities over greenfield development
- should be an appreciation of where known PDL sites are, and how this information relates to the sustainability of growth locations

- remains largely silent on addressing various housing tenures which need to be strongly evidenced

Allocating a mix of suitable and deliverable new housing sites in sustainable locations, which respect the pattern of settlements across the borough whilst meeting local needs:

- several respondents make the argument that whilst the strategy should be supported by a hierarchy, it needs to do more to support rural villages (NPPF para 78) and be more explicit in ensuring that all areas are satisfactorily planned to meet local housing need.
- new development should not be limited by reference to current or reinforcing current, patterns of accessibility to public transport or local facilities and services
- a number of respondents refer to housing mix

Protecting and regenerating the borough's key economic assets, including the borough's most important employment areas. In Basingstoke Town this includes the continued regeneration of Basing View and the leisure park;

- Cllr McCormick suggests strategy doesn't protect the top of town retail provision which should take priority over New River Retail proposals for Leisure Park.

Ensuring an attractive and viable town centre in Basingstoke which is accessible and fit for purpose as the role of town centres continues to change, whilst preserving and enhancing its distinct character and individual heritage assets being environmentally responsible by developing a spatial strategy which protects and enhances the borough's environmental and heritage assets, including its green infrastructure network, landscape character, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and conservation areas. The setting of the borough's towns and villages should be protected:

- Bargate Homes suggest this issue appears to include two separate elements of the spatial strategy and should be split.
- Historic England have provided detailed advice on how the LPU should be positively prepared with historic environment in mind in accordance with para 20 NPPF
- agreement with regards to protecting the borough's environmental and heritage assets as they are what makes a place special and distinct but concerns that the town centre may only be viable by a narrow metric and that the key elements don't go far enough
- Vivid Housing provide support for brownfield allocations which allow for redevelopment of existing land currently in other uses.

Avoiding impacts upon important biodiversity features and designated sites such as the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, and ensuring there will be no adverse impact on nature conservation interests in the borough including priority habitats and ancient trees;

- Hart District Council state when considering potential development sites in BDBC within the 5km and potentially the 7km zone, the SPA and SANG issue will need to be recognised as a constraint.
- Upton Grey PC and two other respondents believe that SPA SANG requirement a barrier to development that should be removed.
- need explicit reference to ancient woodland (most previous and irreplaceable habitat with unique value for biodiversity and as a carbon sink) as well as ancient and veteran trees

Protecting the borough's water environment including water sources and the water quality of the borough's rivers and waterways, and protecting internationally protected sites such as the Solent by ensuring nutrient neutrality in any development falling within the River Test and Itchen catchment;

- Cllr Cubitt suggests action not words required regarding meeting legal requirement to improve the quality of the River Loddon.

Enhancing infrastructure provision, including transport and green infrastructure, to support sustainable development and the creation of new communities whilst minimising impact on existing residents;

- Cllr Cubitt and Wates support this issue in terms of the timely delivery of the Western Link Road for the future wellbeing of the Town and the success of all new developments in south west.
- Highclere NP Group argue that it is important for infrastructure to be developed alongside, rather than after development.

Having due regard to constraints associated with the Atomic Weapons Establishments at Aldermaston and Burghfield which will impact upon development at Tadley.

- Overton PC agree with the point regarding AWE – this area should be reviewed to see if there are any opportunities for development subject to guidelines.

General comments:

- Sport England would support inclusion of a key element referring to the protection of existing sports and recreation sites
- Chineham PC suggest enforcing developers to actually build on sites that already have planning permission.
- Bewley Homes suggest council should remain alive to the changing nature of national planning system and elements introduced through the recent consultation of the Housing White Paper
- BDBC/HCC suggest should also recognise opportunities for environmental net gains alongside potential to provide social infrastructure and economic growth.

Question 7b: Are there other considerations that need to be taken into account in developing the spatial strategy?

- 166 respondents said there are additional considerations which need to be taken into account. They can be summarised as follows:
 - Question housing need figure suggesting should use standard method
 - Plan period should run to 2040
 - A significant number of respondents suggest focus new growth on brownfield sites.
 - A number of respondents refer to the implications of COVID relating to the use of commercial offices and retail sites both in and outside towns as they provide opportunities for regeneration or for reallocation to other uses due to market and behaviour changes. They also highlight the need for functional working from home spaces and changes with online shopping.
 - Bramley PC suggest residential development on redundant brownfield sites should be 'maximised' rather than 'optimised'.
 - Cllr McCormick highlights the importance of promoting retail and office employment in the town centre.
 - All new commercial, leisure and retail development should be mixed use with residential to stop creating ghost centres, and stop urban sprawl.
 - Areas suggested for regeneration/mixed use development include Chineham, Daneshill, the Leisure Park, Basing View and Top of Town.
 - With regards to the settlement hierarchy; respondents suggest that the proposed strategy heavily based on Basingstoke does not adequately consider role and future of other settlements. Important that the LPU makes appropriate provision for housing on smaller and more rural sites, through flexible policies, in order to support the needs of the borough and local communities and maintain the vitality of rural settlements.
 - It also prejudices new, largely self-contained settlements where it does not fit within the hierarchy but can deliver its own social infrastructure and employment land.
 - Needs to remain flexible to change and address Duty to Cooperate matters.
 - Infrastructure was also mentioned by a number of respondents who refer to planning comprehensively, by bringing landowners together and ensure connectivity between and through new places and spaces.
 - Is important that any essential infrastructure required to deliver proposed allocations within the plan is identified. It would need to be demonstrated that there was a reasonable prospect of delivery of the infrastructure that is relied upon.
 - HCC refer to importance of considering school place planning at early stage in LPU development.
 - Respondents also reference importance of strategic gaps, flood zones, conservation areas and AONB.
 - Several respondents also suggest that nature conservation and ecology require more emphasis, whilst Sport England would welcome

reference to improving/maintaining health and wellbeing and the NWD AONB the potential impact on dark skies.

Question 7c: Should land in employment and retail use be considered for new homes where it is vacant or underused? If yes, which locations should be considered?

- 135 respondents including Wield PC, Upton Grey PC, Cliddesden PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC support this approach.
- Areas specifically suggested include town centre, Chineham Business Park, Brighton Hill Retail Park, Basing View, Viables, parts of Houndsmill and South Ham.
- Respondents refer to NPPF para 120 which supports the redevelopment of vacant and underused buildings in employment or retail use as part of an overall approach to the identification of sites for housing.
- Chineham PC, Overton PC, Baughurst PC, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Bramley PC and Newnham PC support reuse of land in Basingstoke particularly the aging industrial/retail parks in and around Basingstoke.
- Working from home will be a legacy of the pandemic therefore the council should be considering revitalising empty or redundant sites in industrial estates prior to consideration of countryside sites.
- However the need to be cautious raised by several respondents suggesting the LPA should undertake a comprehensive review of employment land requirements, being mindful this can fluctuate and the loss could result in sites in less sustainable locations having to be sought in the future.
- Cllr McCormick and others refer to loss of employment only as a last resort, vacant or underused.
- With regards to retail, Cllr Cubbitt and others suggest innovative approach and mix of uses for Top of Town where retail uses could be converted into community uses if vacant.
- Still remains a requirement to identify land for economic and employment generating development so the Local Plan should recognise areas for growth outside of existing employment areas such as M3 corridor.
- Basingstoke Transition Network opposed to conversion of existing commercial buildings to residential since they are substandard, and as the town grows the commercial space will be required and should not be squeezed out; otherwise finish up with long-distance travel to work.

Question 7d: Should more new homes be delivered in Basingstoke town centre? If yes, via what sort of developments (e.g. new blocks of flats, adding additional storeys to existing buildings) and in what locations?

- 31 respondents support the delivery of new homes in Basingstoke Town Centre provided the approach is carefully considered and applied with caution including Sherfield on Loddon PC, Sovereign Housing, Cllr Cubbitt, Chineham PC, Old Basing PC, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC.

- Respondents comment that demand for this type of housing (flats with commercial at ground floor) would need to be carefully assessed.
- Overton PC suggest mixed development on old industrial estates whilst respondents also promote the town centre/Basing View, including Bramley PC who suggest empty offices in Basing View could be converted into flats.
- BDBC/HCC refer to new District/Local centres and transport hubs, such as Southern Manydown.
- BDBC/HCC also suggest some degree of flexibility required depending on availability of sites through SHELAA.
- Respondents consider new development should be of good design, sustainable, include GI and open space, meet minimum space standards and high quality.
- Five respondents were opposed to this approach including Chineham PC and Basingstoke transition Network. Whilst Sherfield Park PC would only support if vacant or underused.
- Thakeham Homes wonder whether this would serve to provide the type of housing people want post Covid as people want access to a garden and countryside.

Question 7e: Would you support the principle of high-density development in suitable locations in the borough? If yes, in what locations?

- 27 respondents including CPRE and SMV support the principle of high-density development in suitable locations (where it responds positively to the site context, related environmental constraints and aligns with community, retail and public transport provisions) to provide a variety of accommodation to deliver healthy mixed sustainable communities where there is substantial evidence of requirement or need.
- BDBC/HCC, Bramley PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC, Upton Grey PC, Vivid, Bewley Homes and others suggested this should be applied on a site by site basis and only in the most accessible locations such as Basingstoke town centre and district and local centres with public transport. Such an approach could be applied on a 'sliding scale' in line with retail hierarchy and along high frequency public transport corridors. SHELAA provides bottom up evidence. Villages should be specifically excluded.
- Clarity is needed on what council defines as 'high density'
- 5 respondents object to principle of high-density development including Sherfield Park PC and Cllr Cubbitt.

Question 7f: Would you support the inclusion of additional tall buildings (over six storeys) in Basingstoke? If yes, what locations would be most suitable?

- 5 respondents support inclusion of tall buildings over 6 storeys in Basingstoke.
- Sherfield on Loddon PC refer to brownfield sites and Chineham PC and Cllr McCormick comment only in the town centre. Upton Grey PC suggest

between 6-10 storeys but design needs to be high quality. Overton PC suggest need outside space for residents.

- BDBC/HCC agree if in town centre and district centres whilst other respondents suggest immediate area around shopping centre and station in a radius of circa ½ mile and only adjacent to other tall buildings.
- 8 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC refer to importance of good quality design and superior materials with reference to Grenfell.
- 9 respondents object to high density development of over 6 stories in Basingstoke including Sheffield Park PC, Old Basing PC.

Question 7g: Would you support the introduction of minimum density standards to uplift the density of residential developments? Please explain your answer.

- 15 respondents support the introduction of minimum density standards making the following detailed points:
 - Cllr McCormick suggests higher density should be concentrated nearer retail centres.
 - Persimmon Homes suggest caution should be applied and property market research undertaken to understand housing needs and whether dense blocks of flats are required. Then once this is determined, policies could be prescribed to meet this and be led by this information.
 - Where appropriate to do so, having regard to character and only in sustainable locations
 - On a zoning basis
 - Bramley PC comment there should also be maximum density standards.
 - Only if outside space and sympathetic materials
- 26 respondents including Sheffield Park PC and Old Basing object to introduction of minimum density standard.
- A number of respondents argue it is not appropriate as at a national level we have moved away from national density standards and it will fail to capture the nuances of developing sites appropriate to their setting and context in line with NPPF. Density should be developer led on site by site basis including through LP allocations and planning applications.
- Maximum density standards should be introduced instead
- Cllr Cubbitt comments that isn't a need for more high-rise flats, keep at 4 storeys with more trees planted. Must ensure water resources can support development.

Question 7h: Which option or combination of options would you support for greenfield development? Please explain your answer.

Option 1, current strategy to focus future development in the borough's larger existing sustainable towns and villages:

- Supported by 17 respondents including Barrett Homes, Taylor Wimpey, SN Development, Sherfield Park PC, Old Basing PC, Cllr McCormick Highways England and Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty.
- Mixed views expressed about approach set out in policy SS5
- Cllr Cubitt argues that it is imperative that the all the focus of the Borough vis a vis greenfield development must be concentrated on the South West of Basingstoke with haste.
- HCC LEA comment that a balance of development could provide a sustainable option in maintaining pupil numbers in the towns and villages.
- Promoters of large greenfield sites support this option as one single landowner with deliverability and infrastructure upfront.

Option 2, focus all development at Basingstoke

- Supported by 142 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, HCC and SMV, Highclere NP Group, Sherfield on Loddon PC, East Woodhay PC, Overton PC, Upton Grey PC and Bramley PC.
- Provides regeneration through high-density high-quality development for the town and the infrastructure is already in place.
- Objection raised by the HBF who in their experience suggest the most effective approach to delivering the levels of housing required is to ensure a wide variety of sites are allocated both in terms of size and location.

Option 3, continuing LP approach but increasing proportion of development at larger and more sustainable towns and villages

- Supported by 18 respondents including Wates, Vistry, Wades Estate, Bargate Homes, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Sovereign Housing, SN Development and Basron Development.
- Not going to be sufficient to allocate only 750 dwellings in the category 2 and 3 settlements as occurred in the adopted Local Plan when faced with a housing requirement of this scale. These settlements will need to provide a greater proportion.
- Purely pursuing option 3 risks excluding sustainable sites which may be sequentially preferable when considering the constraints, local housing need and other material considerations
- Overreliance on strategic sites could result in delays

Option 4: Continue the Local Plan approach but increase the proportion of development taking place in and around the borough's smaller and more rural settlements (category 4 and 5 in paragraph 7.5.3)

- Can help to address lack of 5YHLS
- Preferable to spread development across the borough
- Concerns raised about development in smaller hamlets and villages

Option 5: Create a new settlement/s or village/s

- Any greenfield development will need to make extensive efforts to reduce the need to travel, 'five minute neighbourhoods' referenced.
- Highclere NP Group Overton PC and Bramley PC agree suitable option if much greater need for housing.
- Basingstoke Transition Network comment if must build on greenfield sites; they must not be biodiversity hotspots, and green infrastructure should come first, e.g. ancient woodland. Housing density should be determined by the Council not the developers, should be sufficient to meet housing needs; and should include avoiding reliance on cars for transport.
- Sheffield Park PC suggest given under-delivery of Manydown this seems impractical for LPU.
- Objection raised by the HBF who in their experience suggest the most effective approach to delivering the levels of housing required is to ensure a wide variety of sites are allocated both in terms of size and location
- NHCCG state that any housing developments resulting in a population increase of 2000+ residents may require addition workforce, larger developments may require additional space/estates.

General comments:

- A number of respondents including Flavia Estates, Thakeham Homes, Persimmon Homes, SN development, Gladman Homes, Catesby and Bloor suggest an approach which sees a range of site types and locations allocated will ensure the best opportunities to realise the council's aspirations and meet identified needs.
- Also need to consider employment generating development as part of the spatial strategy.
- Several respondents suggest greenfield development needs to be minimized.
- Villages should be protected from proposals which don't protect distinct, rural character.

Question 7i: Are there any other options that should be considered [in respect of Greenfield development and 7h]?

- Sheffield on Loddon PC and Bramley PC suggest refusing to implement the Government's requirement for housing as it is excessive when taken with the scale of the expansion over the past 30 years.
- why cannot Basingstoke limit growth to brownfield sites, the town centre should be considered more.
- A number of respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC argue that need for greenfield sites should be reassessed in light of Covid and Brexit (therefore should be a last resort in terms of climate change) and the potential for redeveloping employment, office and retail areas as mixed use with residential.
- Council should anticipate how central government might categorise land nationally, therefore a more forward thinking and visionary approach is needed

- All new settlements should first be reviewed via a design brief which particularly specifies infrastructure/services.
- Bewley Homes consider further consideration needed in relation to cross boundary need arising from West Berkshire and Winchester.
- BDBC/HCC comment there may be alternative quantum options, for example it is recommended that all options consider incorporating a 10% over-delivery or non-implementation buffer.
- SMV suggest delivery should be subject to ongoing monitoring as should services and facilities provision.

Question 7j: Do you support the approach of grouping settlements by size, role and provision of services and facilities to inform decision-making for where future development should be located?

- 157 respondents are in general agreement with the approach to grouping of settlements, including BDBC/HCC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Wield PC, Upton Grey PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, CPRE, HCC, WBC, Bewley Homes, Sovereign Housing, Highclere NP Group, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes, Sheffield Park PC, Gladman Homes and Cllr McCormick.
- General agreement that focusing growth on the most sustainable settlements is logical and the correct approach in planning terms and that the level of growth should depend on the level of sustainability allowing for the provision of housing in a dispersed manner across the borough to maintain and enhance vitality and viability of settlements.
- Suggest the grouping should be subject to ongoing monitoring throughout the plan period to account for and respond to changes in provision of services and facilities and to take account of changing preferences and lifestyles, through appropriately weighted criteria and should reflect the way people live today (including Covid and post Covid environment). Strategic scale development could also move sites up or down the hierarchy by the end of the plan period.
- Policies should provide sufficient flexibility within these categories so can still seek to deliver some housing particularly where there is local demand for affordable housing in lower tier settlements.
- The smaller villages (Category 5) should be further categorised based on their school provision.
- It is important to also recognise sites on the edge of Basingstoke, but within other Parish areas due to their physical relationship with the town itself.
- Bloor suggest Tadley should be reviewed for growth given it is the second largest settlement. Conversely WBC state care needs to be taken over the approach to Tadley due to proximity to AWE and the extent of the DEPZ.
- HCC state it is important to consider the availability of school places in the settlements when considering housing allocations to ensure the provision of school places is suitable in respect to any additional pupil places needed or existing provision can accommodate pupils.

- Suggest a similar approach is undertaken to that by WCC in terms of allocating a housing requirement for settlements depending on their position in the hierarchy, this is echoed by Kingsclere PC who would like NP to have more prominence.
- Several respondents oppose the use of settlement hierarchy entirely including SOL PC, Cllr Taylor, JPP Land, Overton PC, The Manydown Company and Bramley PC arguing it is too simplistic, one-size-fits-all approach when it's possible to create sustainable growth in villages in rural areas.

Question 7k: Do you support the proposed categories and the settlements identified in the table above?

- 179 respondents support the proposed categories including Kingsclere PC, Upton Grey PC, Cliddesden PC, East Woodhay PC, Sherfield Park PC, Wades Estate, Gladman Homes, BDBC/HCC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, CPRE, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes, Cllr McCormick. A number of respondents supported the position of individual settlements in the hierarchy.
- 13 respondents oppose the proposed categories and settlements challenging the methodology whilst others challenged the position of individual settlements.
- Labelling settlements in unnecessary and leads to overdevelopment of some areas
- Comments on the methodology included the following:
 - Should be informed by settlement study part 2
 - Should consider local affordable need and demand in lower tier settlements
 - Suggest category 5 is named 'rural villages'
 - Bewley Homes suggest consider those settlements which straddle the boundary, such as Wash Water.
 - Should not overlook opportunities to create sustainable locations
 - Ensure they are fit for purpose as open space within settlements is important meaning development on the edge of settlements may be preferable
 - Also need to explore the possibility of settlements moving up the hierarchy or expanding should there be development opportunities that support such changes.

Question 7l: Do you have any views on the introduction of new SPBs for the five settlements (Bishops Green, Ecchinswell, Headley, Highclere and Silchester) which do not currently have SPBs?

- 24 respondents were in general agreement (but only after consultation with local residents) including Upton Grey PC, Highclere NP Group, Pamber PC and NP Group, Sherfield Park PC, Bramley PC, Highclere Estate, Gladman Homes and Sherfield on Loddon PC.

- Bramley PC suggest that all areas should have an SPB that allows expansion to meet a share of the need whilst Sherfield on Loddon PC and Kingsclere PC recognise that they protect village identities.
- Cllr Diane Taylor comments no harm if expansion is very carefully controlled and fed by local opinion.
- Site promoters suggest they should be drawn to allow for flexibility for appropriate future expansion.
- CPRE agree only if this was determined to be helpful in planning decisions.

Several respondents oppose the introduction of new SPBs making the following points:

- SPBs should only be added where it is supported by clear evidence and justifiable through robust evidence base
- The LPU should take a flexible approach to growth within and on the edge of settlements.
- Highclere NP Group believe that while it might be possible to draw an SPB around this existing settlement, the consequent pressure for infilling would be severe.
- Pamber PC and NP keen to maintain rural and historic nature of the area and question Silchester being given an SPB - if it was to be drawn suggest this could be the extent of the conservation area.

Question 7m: Do you have any views on the suitability of future growth at Tadley, given its unique circumstances?

Several respondents support future growth of Tadley stating the following points:

- Cllr Cubitt commented that Tadley must be permitted to grow to meet the needs of the Town, this is a view supported by site promoters who referred to evidence of housing need in this area.
- A number of respondents including Old Basing PC and Overton PC suggest there is scope for development given its size and sustainability, and lack of past housing delivery.
- Bramley PC consider that Tadley has better services to sustain more development and surrounding villages are as much at risk from AWE as existing residents in Tadley if there was an emergency. Given most existing development is due to presence of AWE, this should not be an impediment
- Sherfield Park PC comment that there are areas of Tadley which require redevelopment.

Respondents also raised concerns about future growth of Tadley:

- ONR state that development is determined under the REPPiR 2019 regulations and unless West Berkshire Council emergency planner provides adequate assurance to ONR that any adverse impacts on the operability and viability of the off-site emergency plan could be mitigated an objection will be raised to large scale developments within the outer consultation zone (OCZ) set by ONR as 8km from central point of grid reference SU595635.

- WBC comment that any development would need to be mindful of the proximity to AWE and extend of the DEPZ, the requirements of the Off-site Emergency Plan and policies of the ONR.
- Tadley Town Council strongly believe that there should not be any additional development apart from small scale of social and affordable housing and shared ownership for local people (within the existing SPB only) a view supported by CPRE (with emphasis on brownfield land).
- Pamber PC and NP Group and Cllr McCormick would not welcome large development in Tadley as would put a strain on the transport infrastructure.
- Sherfield on Loddon PC suggest that this should be the decision of residents in Tadley whilst Baughurst PC and Highclere NP Group suggest decision for AWE/ONR.

Question 7n: Do you agree that the factors listed above should be considered when determining suitable levels of growth in settlements?

- 180 respondents support the factors listed including Wates, Vistry, Cliddesden PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC, Bramley PC, Sherfield Park PC, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Upton Grey PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, HCC, Bewley Homes, Southern Water, Highclere NP Group, North Hampshire CCG, Barrett Homes, Baughurst PC, Gladman Homes, Old Basing PC and Cllr McCormick.

The following detailed points were made:

- Several site promoters do not agree with any approach which seeks to exclude development from locations on the basis that location received growth last time round. Sovereign comment if too much weight given to past growth there is a risk of future under-delivery taken forward exacerbating affordability for local people on lower incomes
- Particularly impact on environmental and heritage assets and availability of suitable sites.
- identifying opportunities for self-build and custom build housing products as they work well in smaller settlements
- allow for both infill development and small sites at the edge of villages where schemes would be proportionate in scale.
- Southern Water agrees that whilst water or wastewater infrastructure capacity should be a consideration, it should not be a constraint.
- important to consider the availability of school places in the settlements when considering housing allocations
- Upton Grey PC consider it important that smaller settlements are not forced to accommodate development which will risk harming their character
- A number of parishes are concerned about highways infrastructure, Bramley PC suggest highway constraints are important whilst Overton PC suggest that aspects that cannot be changed, such as road infrastructure, must be given serious consideration.
- East Woodhay PC and Highclere NP Group consider that infrastructure capacity is not just about highways, GPs and schools – sewage, drains and

broadband need to be considered. Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council believes that BDBC has failed to address such factors in the past.

- Candovers PC welcome inclusion of managed priority habitats and important biodiversity.
- Sherfield Park PC suggest greater focus on social rented as well as affordable rents must be included, and greater emphasis on access to natural green space.
- Site promoters suggest infrastructure capacity should not be a reason for a settlement not to accommodate development when the planning system allows for infrastructure requirements arising from new development to be provided through CIL or obligations such as S106.
- Availability of sites which are demonstrably deliverable should be the key consideration
- WBC suggest this list is not applicable for Tadley

Question 7o: Are there any other factors that should be considered, and why?

Respondents refer to a wide range of factors as set out below:

- Maintaining strategic gaps
- Protection of conservation areas
- Windfall sites in small villages should be taken into account in assessing numbers
- WBC suggests the list of characteristics includes DEPZ due to proximity with AWE Aldermaston
- BDBC/HCC suggest inclusion of urban extensions and new settlement options
- need to provide a balanced portfolio of sites across the borough and to maintain an ongoing housing supply. Regard should be had to the market's appetite to deliver growth in particular locations.
- Upton Grey PC and Overton PC suggest it is important that smaller settlements are not forced to accommodate development which will risk harming their character
- sensitivity of local ecosystems and biodiversity, Nature Recovery Networks and green arteries
- review local priorities for community growth, regeneration or improving resilience (e.g. helping to sustain local services, such as schools or shops).
- Great weight should be afforded to development that focuses on delivery of affordable housing or provides a larger % of affordable housing than required by the policy to meet unmet need.
- It is considered too early in the Plan-making process to set out a closed list of factors.
- Old Basing PC and Bramley PC suggest respect for environmental and heritage assets, conservation areas and avoiding development in flood risk areas. Development priorities will change due to Covid-19 and climate change.
- Agricultural land should not be lost

- Affordable housing in rural areas
- Availability of sustainable transport
- Retail availability

Question 7p: Which option or options would you support?

Option 1: Focus growth in a small number of large development sites accommodating over 1,000 new homes:

- 5 respondents including Cllr Cubitt and Bramley PC support option 1.
- HBF and Barrett Homes oppose option 1 commenting that it is only through having a variety of sites coming forward that will be able to ensure the plan delivers consistently in both the early years of the plan and in the long term. Focussing on a few large sites will potentially reduce choice and place the plan at greater risk of not meeting needs should these sites fail to come forward as expected. Respondents also refer to example in West Berkshire, Sandford where there have been delays.
- HCC as LEA suggest that larger developments make it easier to plan for new schools.

Option 2: Focus growth on a larger number of smaller development sites:

- 7 respondents support option 2 including Bargate Homes, Barrett Homes, Old Basing PC and CPRE (if in combination with option 4).
- Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC and Newnham PC support Option 2 specifically if delivers more housing on brownfield sites

Option 3: Spread the development across a range of different sized sites including both sites over 1,000 new homes and smaller sites:

- 24 respondents support option 3 including Kingsclere PC, East Woodhay PC, BDBC/HCC, Sovereign Housing, Highclere NP Group, Taylor Wimpey, SN Development, Falcon Developments, Maria Miller, Baughurst PC, Rydon Homes, Persimmon Homes, Vistry and Barrett Homes.
- Bramley PC suggest that any development that cannot be contained in Basingstoke should be dispersed.
- Site promoters support this option as it provides for steady housing delivery over the plan period ensuring a 5YHLS can be demonstrated.

Option 4: Include reserve sites within the Local Plan Update in order to improve flexibility.

- Old Basing PC consider Option 4 creates loopholes
- Highclere NP Group suggest could assist with 5YHLS, a view supported by site promoters who suggest a 10% buffer included on allocations within the LPU
- Barrett Homes suggest option 4 is generally to be avoided because the Local Plan should be aiming to allocate only sites which are demonstrably

deliverable, sustainable and sufficient to meet the housing requirement, and if issues arise these should be addressed in the regular 5-year cycle of plan reviews.

Option 5: Include locations for future development in order to provide clarity regarding the locations of future large-scale allocations:

- Bramley PC and HCC suggest option 5 helps longer term infrastructure and community planning by understanding the sequential progression of the spatial strategy.
- Taylor Wimpey would support this option when it is needed, however, suitable evidence would need to be provided at Examination to confirm suitability
- CPRE and Barrett Homes oppose option 5 as 'locations' are less precise than actual allocations which are what is necessary to bring forward suitable deliverable planning applications.

Combination of options:

- 185 respondents suggest various combinations of options, generally to ensure security of housing supply.

Question 7q: Are there any other options which should be considered?

- 148 respondents including, Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, Ellisfield PC, Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Upton Grey PC suggest that SS6 is very important and needs to be included in full in the LPU (and the principles set out within para 7.9.2)
- Cllr McCormick suggests transport
- Review of UK Biodiversity Action Plan and creation of a new biodiversity through LPU.
- Cliddesden PC refer to developing areas for people and wildlife
- Sheffield on Loddon PC promote brownfield sites and within the town boundary to avoid damage to rural communities
- Cllr Cubitt comments that development of south Manydown and South West of Basingstoke must be accompanied with building a western bypass
- Reference to self-build needs to be reviewed
- Overton PC suggest creation of a new settlement and more development at Tadley.
- suggest review in light of Covid/Brexit changes and potential to redevelop employment, office and retail areas as mixed residential.
- Old Basing PC comment that LPA should press ahead with Manydown as not a single house built despite the fact this land was purchased for the specific purpose of housing development.
- Speed up development on land with planning permission generally.
- Upton Grey PC consider that residential development should be focused on zones within Basingstoke town and larger settlements (though these may be multiple sites)
- Bewley Homes suggest greater flexibility and a 10% buffer on top of allocations which can be spread evenly throughout the delivery period.

- Lobby to the Government to reduce immigration

Question 7r: Which option or options would you support?

Option 1 - continue with the current Local Plan approach:

- 20 respondents support option 1 including Cllr McCormick, Cllr Diane Taylor, Cllr Cubbitt, Sherfield on Loddon PC, Bramley PC, Chineham PC, Overton PC and Old Basing PC who refer to the benefits of local areas deciding what/how many/type of homes built.
- East Woodhay PC and Kingsclere PC main concern is housing land supply position.
- Kingsclere NP think NP in Kingsclere has worked reasonably well, policies have been upheld and some applications declined.
- Highclere NP group and Bramley PC support approach but only on basis agreement with the parish on actual housing need
- Cliddesden PC request stop pressuring NP groups to allocate sites
- Cllr Cubitt argues that Neighbourhood Plans must be respected due to the huge amount of investment and time and personal capital within the plans.
- Bewley Homes support the continued role of neighbourhood planning as they offer the ability to add additional and important layer of planning underneath strategic policies. Council needs to give a clear steer to communities with a desire to pursue neighbourhood planning, to ensure that there can be a collective vision for growth as part of the LPU.
- Several respondents suggest SS5 requires review, these comments are set out under paragraph 7.9.

Option 2 - allocate all housing led schemes through LPU:

- 9 respondents support option 2, including Wates, Vistry, Sherfield Park PC, Rydon Homes, Persimmon Homes and Bloor Homes as the most appropriate and transparent way of allocating sites.
- Rydon Homes suggest this is the quickest and surest way of providing such a framework and ensuring delivery takes place as well as planning for future reform directions.

Option 3 - Use a more flexible approach depending on the aspirations of a particular community:

- 16 respondents support option 3, including BDBC/HCC, SMV, Thakeham Homes, Bargate Homes, HCC Property Services, Barrett Homes, SN Development, Pamber PC and NP Group, The Hospital of St Cross & Almshouse of Nobel Poverty, Highclere Estate and Baughurst PC.
- Baughurst PC and Overton PC welcome the flexibility to account for community aspirations whilst Sherfield Park PC comment, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply, the LPU may have to intervene in terms of reviewing settlement boundaries and allocating sufficient sites. They also state it is not the role of NP to allocate sites of strategic nature.
- Suggest role of NP should be dependent on scale of development to be allocated in a parish and role a site has in the council's strategy for delivery.
- Concerns are raised that lack of scrutiny which has resulted in undeliverable sites.

Question 7s: Are there any other options which should be considered?

- Cliddesden PC suggest providing maximum flexibility so communities can decide whether to allocate sites or not whilst Overton PC suggest complete autonomy for areas with a NP.
- Bramley PC suggest housing numbers should be defined by infrastructure
- Sherfield Park PC comment, owing to the lack of a five-year housing land supply, the LPU may have to intervene in terms of reviewing settlement boundaries and allocating sufficient sites as SS5 hasn't been wholly successful.
- SOL PC would not support options which imposed development against the wishes of the local community.
- Rydon Homes comment a further option would be for the LPU to set minimum housing requirements for each Neighbourhood Plan area along with a review of effectiveness of adopted NPs in terms of actual delivery.

Question 7t: Do you have any other comments about how the current approach to neighbourhood planning (in Local Plan Policy SS5) has worked?

Comments from parish councils:

- Sherfield on Loddon PC pleased by the outcome of the recent public inquiry which took account of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has on occasion wished that the Borough itself and its elected members took more note
- Bramley PC state NP has influenced design of facilities, but planning conditions have not been met relating to build timing and quality of amenities.
- Overton PC comment that NPs do not have the teeth people were hoping for and seems will be worse under planning reforms. Plans need more flexibility as some sites have now proved unsuitable since adoption. Neighbourhood Plans are a lot of work to undertake and can be divisive if they then prove to be ineffective.
- Cliddesden PC suggest SS5 is too restrictive and as a result it is too difficult to comply with. The policy should be changed to consider sustainability (e.g. access to transport and services) and to allow smaller groups of houses to count towards the target. The support provided by planning policy team valuable and should be continued however, BDBC has a tendency to push groups to allocate sites in NPs and conversely planning reforms suggest the choice should be with the NP group.
- Sherfield Park PC state NPs are expensive and take a long time to develop and approve. They are not a good use of scarce local precept monies. When they are adopted, they are frequently overturned due to technicalities, such as housing land supply, and local opinion is overruled.
- Highclere NP Group are of the view that NPs are ignored or overruled e.g. lack of 5-year HLS.
- East Woodhay PC refer to a concerning PiP appeal decision to grant permission outside SPB.

Other respondents make the following comments:

- In general NPs have provided an effective mechanism for local residents to determine if further development in their area is appropriate, the type and scale and where it should be directed. However, they need to be reviewed regularly and updated when necessary. They tend to allocate least politically sensitive sites, as opposed to those which are suitable and deliverable, can lack objectivity and be divisive
- Cllr McCormick suggests that not enough support given to some communities (e.g. Brighton Hill) in preparing Neighbourhood Plans
- Cllr Diane Taylor refers to the injustice and lack of control when no 5YHLS.
- With regards to policy SS5, respondents comment that there should be sanctions for failure to submit NPs arguing would have benefitted at the outset with stricter requirements for delivery and timeframes to achieve key milestones.

Paragraph 7.9 – New Homes in the Countryside

- 134 respondents including Wield PC, Ellisfield PC, Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC, CPRE, set out support for adopted Local Plan policy SS6 which is described in this paragraph requesting it is maintained in the LPU.
- CPRE would prefer para a) in this policy to refer to 'brownfield sites' rather than 'previously developed land' and that 'brownfield sites' is defined in the glossary. Would also like to see the word 'isolated' defined in such a way that it carries the meaning in the glossary and is not subject to dispute.
- Highclere Estate suggest policy SS6 is reviewed to allow for small-scale suitable market housing in the countryside.
- Fowler Architecture suggest the following revisions; Criterion (c)(vi) enhancement to the immediate setting is only required where the site is situated in an isolated location in the countryside, Criterion (e) should not be subject to a restriction of '*four dwellings or fewer (net)*', Criterion (f) should be amended to reflect a circumstance where the essential need includes those taking majority control of a farm business and new criterion introduced that supports new dwellings in the countryside where it would arise from the subdivision of an existing residential development.

Section 8 – Economy

Question 8a: Which option or options would you support for strategic employment areas?

The consultation set out the following options for Employment Areas:

- Option 1: Retain all of the current strategic employment areas.
- Option 2: Re-allocate one or more of the existing employment areas for other uses.
- Option 3: Re-allocate parts of existing employment areas for other uses
- The vast majority of those who commented on this question expressed support for option 3 (142), namely re-allocating some existing employment areas for other uses. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Cliddesden PC. There

was only limited support for the other options (option 1: 5, option 2: 13). Several respondents support a balance of options.

- Respondents with a preference for option 2 refer to potential structural changes to the economic landscape in light of Covid-19, that redundant employment land needs to be redeveloped for high quality housing creating mixed use developments.
- Site promoters of strategic developments state that another option is the creation of new employment areas. Whilst others are concerned about potential impact of this approach on Basingstoke.
- The need to ensure that the relevant policy frameworks provide sufficient flexibility to respond to current and changing business requirements is emphasised by the operator of Chineham Business Park. Whilst the site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment suggest in parallel with either option 1, 2 or 3, growth in industrial, storage and distribution floorspace should also be accommodated through extending or creating new employment areas in appropriate locations.
- One respondent states that there needed to be a review of employment land and premises as per paragraphs 120 and 121 of the Framework.

Question 8b: If you support Option 2 and/or 3, which areas do you consider are the most suitable for reuse? What other uses would be most appropriate?

- Whilst one respondent suggests all employment areas are now suitable for a mix of uses others suggest should only consider those which are run/down and less successful employment areas.
- A number of specific areas are suggested for reuse including South Ham, Houndmills, Bilton Industrial Estate, Central 37 site next to Eli Lily, Viables, Overton Mill (if closed) and the council offices. Respondents also suggest that Manydown and land at junction 7 could accommodate any relocated employment uses.
- The site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment states that Options 1, 2 and 3 do not take into consideration the demand for good quality industrial, storage and distribution floorspace.

Question 8c: Are there any other options that should be considered for growth in the future?

- Sport England suggest should consider D2 sports uses; fitness clubs, gyms, climbing centres and five aside centres, to be acceptable on employment/office sites as it creates a better and more sustainable working environment and therefore an attractive area for business to locate in or relocate to.
- A number of respondents refer to relocation of employment uses to appropriate town centre locations such as Station Approach which should be reclassified as a strategic employment area.
- Hampshire Highways state that Chineham, apart from the District Centre, is remote from a number of other facilities and is car dominated in terms of trips to the site. It is currently being assessed as part of a Modal Shift Strategy for East Basingstoke as well as through MRT studies and the LCWIP.

- Large greenfield site promoters for Southern Manydown and Upper Swallick suggest their sites could provide a mix of employment uses with excellent transport links.

Question 8d: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's office sector and why?

The consultation sets out the following options for developing the borough's office sector:

- Option 1: Continue to focus new office development in existing office areas such as Basing View and Chineham.
 - Option 2: Deliver new office development in new employment areas on the edge of Basingstoke. Option 3: Deliver new office development on housing allocations on the edge of Basingstoke in order to create mixed use developments.
 - Option 4: Support office development within the town centre.
 - Option 5: Provide more protection for existing offices.
- Of those who commented, the vast majority support options 1 and 4 (149 and 150 respectively), namely focusing office development on existing office areas and also the town centre. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Cliddesden PC. A limited number support the other options (option 2 (new employment areas on edge of Basingstoke): 4, option 3 (new mixed use developments): 7 and option 5 (more protection for existing offices): 4).
 - The feeling is expressed that office space demand will plummet as post-covid work from home persists. Consequently, it is considered that the best approach would be to retain existing centres only, with suitable buildings converted to mixed use live/work.
 - Conversely a number of respondents state that providing office development with housing at the edge of town could help bring about shorter distance travel, providing the types of employers which match the local skillset.
 - The Southern Manydown site promoters suggest it could offer such facilities to complement Basingstoke town centre.

Question 8e: If you think a combination of the above options is most suitable, please indicate which options you favour and why?

- A number of respondents emphasise the impact of Covid-19 and the increased emphasis on homeworking, meaning that a combination of options would be needed.
- Respondents also refer to reducing the need to travel, sustainable transport, variety of options for different size and types of business.

Question 8f: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Respondents stress the need to have regard to the likely impact of Covid-19 in terms of reducing demand for office space in the future, suggesting homeworking hubs, incubator space, hot-desking and small scale office accommodation in rural and/or residential areas.

- The importance of ensuring that all of the employment areas can be accessed via sustainable transport was emphasised.
- One respondent states that all new properties should include a ground floor office, which would also be capable of being used as a bedroom by disabled residents if needed.

Question 8g: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's industrial sector?

- This question did not attract a standard response from any interest groups and so the responses were much more evenly spread. Of those who commented, the majority support option 1 (16), namely focusing on existing employment areas, followed by option 4 (10), which entailed no specific allocation but allowing sites to come forward on a flexible basis. Option 2 received some support (8 comments), namely providing any required floorspace on new sites outside of/on the edge of Basingstoke or elsewhere. The least favoured choice was option 3 (5), namely providing the required floorspace within housing allocations.

Question 8h: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Other options suggested include catering for technology orientated businesses, opportunities provided by parts of the borough in close proximity to the strategic road network, such as the A34, using brownfield land in the first instance, ensuring that industrial uses do not cause pollution and provision of access for large vehicles.
- The importance of reviewing projections in light of the impact of covid and the need for flexibility are also raised.

Question 8i: Which option or options would you support for developing the borough's storage and distribution sector?

- This question also didn't receive any comments from interest groups and so the number of comments was lower and more evenly spread. The majority of those who commented on this question prefer option 1 (17), namely providing the required floorspace on the edge of Basingstoke.
- Of the 17 respondents who preferred option 1, this included Cllrs Cubitt and McCormick, and also Bramley PC, Chineham PC, East Woodhay PC and Sheffield Park PC. Avison Young of behalf of Newlands support this option, as it provides the best opportunity to deliver sites which are close to the strategic road network. The site promoter for the Brighton Hill Retail Park redevelopment also states a preference for option 1, and that their site would be an excellent opportunity for pursuing that option.
- 6 respondents express a preference for option 3 (i.e. relying on a policy to allow the required sites to come forward in a flexible manner), including Cllr Diane Taylor, Baughurst PC and Overton PC.
- Basingstoke Transition Network and several other respondents oppose the provision of any additional sites and number of respondents set out objections to a new distribution centre west of Basingstoke.

- Highways England stress that any approach assesses and identifies the transport implications of employment uses and seeks to minimise any potential impacts to the Strategic Road Network.

Question 8j: Are there any other options that should be considered?

Other options cited are as follows:

- capacity in neighbouring boroughs should be used first;
- agricultural facilities should not be used for 'industrial' purposes;
- preference for brownfield and repurposing existing sites over greenfield development;
- specific locations were promoted such as sites in close proximity to the A34 and junction 6 and 7 or M3.

Question 8k: Should the Local Plan Update include a policy which enables economic development proposals to come forward to address needs not currently identified?

- 16 respondents state that such a future proofing policy should be included. This list included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Chineham PC, Overton PC, Sherfield Park PC, and also Sovereign. Only 1 respondent expressly states that such a policy should not be included.

Question 8l: Is there anything more that the Local Plan Update can do to help future proof the borough's economy, for example in relation to increased home working?

- Respondents highlight the importance of access to high quality broad band and digital access. They also refer to the need to reduce travel, introduce residential space standards and support for homeworking.

Question 8m: Which option would you support for Basing View? Please explain your answer.

- Of those who commented on this question, the vast majority of respondents (149) express a preference for option 3, namely a policy supporting a more flexible approach to the uses permitted on the site, including uses such as retail and residential. This includes AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown), Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Bramley PC, Cliddesden PC, Overton PC, and Gladman Homes. Hampshire Highways also recommend that a mixed-use approach be pursued, including the provision of residential, as they feel this would 'reduce the car dominance of the site' and help spread out vehicle movements over the course of the day. Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE support this option, though they did stress the need for future-proofing to be incorporated. It was felt that with the emerging trend of working from home, this called into question future office requirements. Therefore, flexibility is identified by some as being essential.

Question 8n: Are there any other options that should be considered?

The following options are suggested:

- route east from Basing View crossing Ringway to connect with Daneshill and Basing;
- improved walking and cycling linkages are required from Basing View to the railway station and the town centre alongside consideration of park and ride options;
- Mixed views around future uses with some respondents suggesting focussed on office use with some leisure, hospitality and retail whilst others advocate provision of additional residential development.

Question 8o: Which option would you support for the rural economy? Please explain your answer.

- Of those who commented on this question the vast majority of respondents state a preference for option 1 (23), namely maintaining the current policy approach. This list included Cllr Andrew McCormick and Baughurst PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, SOLVE, Pamber Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Pamber PC, Sherfield Park PC, Upton Grey PC and Overton PC. There was also some support (7 comments) for increasing the level of protection for existing rural businesses (option 3). Of the 7 respondents who expressed support for option 3, this included Bramley and Chineham PCs.
- 2 respondents prefer option 2, namely increasing the level of policy support for the rural economy. This included Cllr Cubitt, who stresses the need to support the rural economy and encourage economic development in an efficient and helpful manner, especially in light of the economic impact of Covid-10.

Question 8p: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Other options suggested include support for the retention of agricultural land to provide local food and contribute to the UK food supply, measures which would support home working, the need for a masterplan in relation to the rural economy and concerns about the impacts of Brexit owing to the significant impact this would have on farming.

Question 8q: Which option would you support for tourism?

- The majority of those who commented on this question supported option 2 (18), namely providing more policy support for the borough's tourism sector. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Chineham PC, Overton PC, Sherfield Park PC, Upton Grey PC, Basingstoke Transition Network and The National Trust.
- Furthermore, The National Trust request that the option considers not only new tourist development but the expansion and diversification of existing tourist facilities. Savills on behalf of Highclere Estate also support this approach. The reasons given include, that it was considered that the borough has many underused tourist attractions.
- 7 respondents express support for option 1 (retaining the current policy). This included Bramley PC, East Woodhay PC and Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE. JLL on behalf of BDBC Property Services also preferred option 1, they state that they see the regeneration of the Leisure Park with its current facilities as an important ingredient to attract tourists to Basingstoke.

Question 8r: If a more proactive approach is taken to tourism, should this be limited to certain locations and types of tourist accommodation?

- 5 respondents, including the Sherfield Park PC and the National Trust, express a preference for no restrictions. Whereas a number of respondents suggest there should be restrictions imposed.
- The National Trust consider that it would be difficult to limit tourism to certain locations and types as tourism can cover a wide variety of services and facilities and given the time period of the LPU these may change and evolve.
- The importance of sustainable travel was emphasised by Basingstoke Transition Network and others.

Question 8s: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Options suggested include; promotion of Fort Hill as an Iron Age Scheduled Monument, promotion of the A30 as a heritage road (similar to Route 66), importance of letting tourism grow organically, need for the sector to be supported with resilient infrastructure, nature reserves, 'active leisure and destination tourism' and additional hotels.

Question 8t: Do you agree with retaining the current retail hierarchy?

- The vast majority of respondents (12) agree that the current retail hierarchy should be retained.
- However, 3 respondents suggest that it could be premature to make strategies for town centres at this time as the full effects of Covid were not known. It was suggested that the vitality and viability of the centres would need to be monitored, and any contraction managed.

Question 8u: Should any new centres be identified?

- The majority of respondents (9) said that no new centres should be identified.
- However 4 respondents (all promoting strategic scale sites) suggest that the proposed centres on strategic sites should be identified as local centres. This would ensure the retail impact of the centres would not require assessment at the planning application stage, and allow them to easily adapt in the future, thus making those new communities more sustainable.

Question 8v: Do you think the boundaries of any Town, District or Local Centres and Primary Shopping Areas (as defined in the current Local Plan) need to be extended or reduced? If so, which and why?

- 3 respondents consider that no change is required.
- 1 respondent indicates that the retail provision should reflect post-pandemic shopping habits.

Question 8w: Should the Local Plan Update retain the lower threshold for when an Impact Assessment for out of centre retail is required? If not, what should the threshold be?

- 3 respondents support the current threshold (which is set below the nationally-set threshold, and allows the impact of smaller schemes to be assessed). This was justified by the vulnerability of the borough's centres arising from Covid although view also expressed that it is too soon to understand impacts.
- 1 respondent indicates that the threshold should be as low as possible to support local shops and discourage out of centre development whilst another respondent argues that the threshold should be raised.

Question 8x: Would you support the replacement of out of centre retailing to other uses (for example, change of use to residential)?

- The majority of respondents (10, including the landowner of an out of centre retail park), support the principle of replacing out of centre retail floorspace with other uses.
- However, it was noted that this did not apply to local shops (particularly in villages). These provided a benefit to the local community and minimised the distance necessary to travel for essential items.
- The landowner of Brighton Hill Retail Park reported that it is difficult to maintain sufficient occupancy to keep their site viable, and they therefore promote their site for residential development.
- 3 respondents said no (that they did not agree that out of centre retailing should be replaced). 1 cited concerns about infrastructure and two did not give a reason for this.

Question 8y: Do you have any comments on the future role of Basingstoke town centre?

- It was identified that the Local Plan needed a strong town centre first policy to ensure it remained the focus for retail, social infrastructure, and cultural/leisure uses. Any strategy would need to be informed by an understanding of post-Covid shopping and working patterns, and recent changes to permitted development rights.
- Respondents including Cllr Cubbitt refer to the need for a high quality environment, green space, local shops and incentivised rents along with the importance of offering something unique.
- Respondents also refer to increasing the mix of uses, night and daytime entertainment/economy and higher density residential development that is well connected to the town centre so its residents could provide additional footfall.
- Travel was also highlighted such as car parking strategies and MRT.

Question 8z: Do you have any comments on the regeneration of the Basingstoke Leisure Park, including suitable future uses?

- 8 respondents (including Cllrs Cubitt and McCormick) state that the Leisure Park should be retained for leisure uses only as they argue this is important to protect Basingstoke town centre, particularly in light of Covid. A number of respondents suggest that the retail element should be scaled down or be distinctly different to the town centre.

- 1 respondent supports the regeneration proposals with enhanced leisure facilities and a retail outlet.
- A number of respondents support mixed use development with some residential.
- Respondents referred to meeting both local and regional needs and importance of linked public transport.

Section 9 – Natural and Historic Environment

Question 9a: Are there any areas of land which should be designated as a new Strategic Gap? If yes, please explain where and why?

- 8 respondents are in general support for the designation of strategic gaps to prevent coalescence, retain heritage, distinctive character and integrity of settlements.
- East Woodhay Parish Council refers to the issue of unacceptable coalescence and sprawl into the countryside outside SPBs through 'infill' type development within the countryside, some gaining permission through appeal due to the council's lack of land supply..
- 1 respondent suggests that masterplans can be utilised to identify sensitive landscape locations and then plan accordingly (as with North Manydown).
- The following areas were suggested for designation as new strategic gap:
 - Land between North Waltham and South-West Basingstoke
 - Land between the M3 Motorway and Cliddesden
 - The land area of promoted site CLID011 (Upper Swallick Garden Village)
 - The land between the Candovers and Cliddesden
 - Land between Oakley and Deane
 - Land between Oakley and Basingstoke
 - The Loddon Valley
 - The land between Highclere and Woolton Hill
 - The land between the houses on Enborne Row and Wash Water
 - South, west and east of Overton
 - Bramley MOD Camp
- Several respondents oppose the designation of strategic gaps as it would prevent the development of housing on the edge of settlements.
- If new strategic gaps are to be introduced, they must be supported by robust evidence as set out in the PPG. There also must be flexibility in the policy approach to allow for assessment of any harm to the visual and functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a development proposal. Respondents also ask whether policies relating to landscaping and design would be sufficient.

Question 9b: Are there any Strategic Gaps which should be deleted? If yes, where and why?

- 6 respondents including Chineham Parish Council, Bramley Parish Council, SOLVE and individuals comment that there are no gaps which should be deleted.

Question 9c: Should any existing Strategic Gap boundary be updated? If yes, where and why?

- Respondents suggest the following gaps should be reviewed and updated:
 - The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Sherborne St John
 - The strategic gap between Basingstoke and Sherborne St John
 - The strategic gaps between Kempshott and Oakley
 - The Basingstoke-Oakley Strategic Gap
 - Basingstoke/Chineham – Bramley/Sherfield on Loddon Strategic gap –
 - Chineham-Bramley Strategic Gap
 - Basing Fen, Mill Field & Basing Common
- 4 respondents argue existing gaps do not need updating including Overton Parish Council and Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council.
 - Any review of strategic gaps should appropriately take account of proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan.

Section 9.4 Green Infrastructure and Local Green Spaces

- Respondents support the inclusion of policies to improve areas of poor green infrastructure connectivity and to provide an overall increase in GI.
- Natural England suggest a strategic approach supported by the GI strategy stating that the Plan should include policies to ensure protection and enhancement of public rights of way, appropriate quantity and quality of green space. They also suggest widening the scope for LGS to allow the designation of spaces to address environmental impacts from development.
- The Woodland Trust advocate canopy cover targets and protection of accessible green spaces within walking distance of homes.
- Hart DC is currently preparing a strategy to promote a Green Grid across the District and state it would be beneficial, to identify any cross-boundary links and opportunities.

Question 9d: Would you support the designation of Local Green Spaces through the Local Plan Update and neighbourhood plans? If not, why is this?

- 104 respondents are in general agreement with designation of LGS through the LPU.
- Respondents refer to the importance of these spaces for health, wellbeing and wildlife. Parish Councils tend to support the designation of these spaces through neighbourhood plans although some respondents suggest they should be brought forward in conjunction with development.
- Concern raised by others that the designation of Local Green Spaces through neighbourhood planning can often be used as an anti-development tool.

Question 9e: Are there any specific areas that you consider meet the criteria and should be designated?

- The following areas are promoted for LGS
- Land surrounding The Gables, Whitchurch

- Land at the Knowlings, Whitchurch (SHELAA reference: WHIT006)
- Land East of Whitchurch (SHELAA reference WHIT014)
- Fields at the back of Church End / Wildmoor Lane / Moulshay Lane
- Promoted Site SHELAA reference WHIT013
- South East Whitchurch (SHELAA reference WHIT011) –
- Newnham Lane Pyotts Hill
- Promoted Site SHELAA reference WHIT001
- Broadhurst Grove
- Saxon Way
- Promoted Site SHELAA reference WHIT008
- Promoted Site SHELAA reference WHIT009
- Promoted Site SHELAA reference WHIT010
- Area Adjacent to Burney Bit and Georgina Gardens, Pamber Heath (
- St Mark's Meadow
- Mapledurwell Pond
- Up Nately Pond
- Amport Area, Sherfield Park
- Tollhouse Meadow/Flood Plain, Chineham
- Promoted site CLID001
- Areas north and south of Bramley SPB
- East Woodhay draft Neighbourhood Plan also proposes a number of green spaces which will be reviewed by the community at the time of consultation.

Water Quality (paras 9.5.1 – 9.5.5)

- There is general support for the aspiration to protect quality and quantity of water.
- Concerns are expressed that local water quality is below standard in several areas including the river Loddon catchment and river Test and Itchen catchment and that action should be taken to address this which might include nitrate offsetting which should be explored more.
- HCC as LLFA suggest this section should mention catchment based planning which involves all water management whilst Natural England expects the LPU to consider the strategic impacts on water quality and resources.

Flood Risk (paras 9.6.1 – 9.6.2)

- 75 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Cliddesden, Conservation Group and Wield PC, Ellisfield PC and Weston Patrick & Weston Corbett PC refer to substantial surface water problems in Cliddesden, in Winslade and along the A339.
- Tadley Town Council and Upton Grey PC also refer to local flooding issues.
- The County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority are pleased to see flood risk incorporated into the plan making process specifically the reference to groundwater but suggest more emphasis should be placed on surface water flooding, especially with the increase in rain events resulting from climate change and the impacts on the urban nature of Basingstoke.

- Thames Water consider the flood risk sustainability objectives should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain. Thames Water advocate an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system.

Question 9f: Should the Local Plan Update require more than 10% biodiversity net gain?

- 34 respondents including Cliddesden PC, Mapledurwell and Up Nately PC, Newnham PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC, Old Basing PC, Pamber PC and NP Group, Maria Miller Natural England and Cllr McCormick support a requirement of more than 10% net gain although it is recognised that this is likely to be more challenging on smaller sites and needs to be considered on a case by case basis.
- 14 respondents including Sherfield Park PC and Gladman Homes object to a requirement of more than 10% net gain stating it isn't justified, may affect viability and needs to be considered in light of individual site constraints.
- It is also recognised that a future policy will need to allow for off-site biodiversity projects where net gain can't be met onsite.

Question 9g: How should off-site compensation measures be coordinated and/or located?

- A number of respondents suggest the council should take ownership of any offsite compensation scheme.
- Several respondents are concerned about the success of such a scheme.
- There is general agreement that the approach must prioritise on site gain first to retain important habitats and species. Thereafter focus on connections and stepping stones that deliver priority habitats and priority species with greatest longevity and value.
- 1 respondent suggests the LPU should progress in tandem with a borough-wide off-site compensatory strategy that will enable mitigation to be secured and delivered.
- Site promoters suggest the council should support sites for allocation which can demonstrate on site biodiversity net gain, or provision on land within the control of the developer or close to development site especially when in consultation with community.

Question 9h: Are there any other key elements of biodiversity net gain that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update?

- Respondents suggest the following elements should also be reflected; biodiversity improvement zones, networks and corridors, connectivity, water quality (rivers, surface water and groundwater), linkages with Nature Recovery Network, wildlife friendly buildings and canopy cover.
- Respondents also suggest that a checklist of ecological assessment criteria would be helpful along with right to require independent ecological assessment if assessment undertaken by developer is inadequate.

Question 9i: Are there any particular issues relating to air quality that should be reflected in the Local Plan Update?

- General mitigation and improvement to air quality should be recognised within the Local Plan as part of a sustainable approach to development, this is a point raised by a number of individuals including Parish Councils.
- 49 respondents including STaNHd, Ellisfield Parish Council comment that air quality would be adversely affected by any increase in traffic volumes so development should be located in sustainable locations with access to sustainable transport modes
- Well-known and well documented poor air quality ‘hotspots’ should be addressed as a priority
- Policy needs to take into account changing patterns as a result of Covid with a huge increase in home working and reduction in commuting.

Section 9.9 Heritage

- Historic England make a number of comments, referring to published guidance documents helpful for Plan preparation, they also state that the evidence base for the Plan should be proportionate, comprehensive and robust and provided relevant sources of information.
- They go on to state that a good strategy will offer a positive approach throughout the whole plan whereby the historic environment is considered not just as a standalone topic but as an integral part of the plan. They suggest the historic environment should be covered in a strategic policy.
- In addition they would welcome development management policies specifically for Archaeology, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, Heritage at Risk, and the inclusion of renewable technologies within conservation areas.
- Finally, they provide guidance on landscapes of heritage interest, retention of historic shop fronts, streetscape improvements and high-quality design.

Section 10 – Meeting Housing Needs

Question 10a: How much discount should be applied to the rent level on rented affordable homes to ensure they are able to meet local needs?

- The most common response was that the rate of discount should be informed by a housing needs assessment and strategic viability assessment, based upon an understanding of incomes and prices. It was suggested that this evidence would need to take into account the impacts of Covid.
- A number of respondents supported rents being set at 80% value raising concerns about reducing rents lower than this as it could result in viability issues.
- Cllr McCormick suggests 50% would be appropriate whilst others refer to 60%.
- Registered providers comment that it is important to set clear requirements and that shouldn't cap rent in perpetuity.

- Several respondents also commented that the term affordable is misleading and that the council should take a more proactive role delivering homes on its own land.

Question 10b: Which low cost home ownership products could be most suitable in the borough?

- The most common response was that this should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, taking into account the full range of products set out in the NPPF's definition of affordable housing (and emerging products like First Homes).
- Three RPs and one developer commented that shared ownership was a very successful product with high demand in the borough, the developer suggested it should be 40-50% of affordable housing.
- However, one parish council respondent expressed concern about the shared ownership model, and that residents can get locked into unsellable properties. Cllr McCormick suggests council should provide interest free loans.

Question 10c: Are there any principles that should inform the types of products that we seek?

- The most common response was that any policy requirements should be informed by an assessment of local needs and affordability. It should be viability tested as part of the overall Local Plan.
- A key theme in the responses was the need for flexibility. This would:
 - allow developments to respond to changing local housing needs over the plan period.
 - allow the location of development and site-specific characteristics to influence the product type, reflect the size, type and character of different sites; and
 - provide a framework to accommodate new products that could potentially arise in the future. The national definition of affordable housing was likely to be updated more frequently than the Local Plan, so it was suggested that the policy should include direct references to national policy.
- Products should take into account the commercial considerations of RPs and mix of tenures and property types on a site tend to be more successful.
- Cllr McCormick suggested that the cost of mortgage repayments should be less than 30% of the median household income in the borough. An RP suggested using 40% of income as the threshold for testing affordability.

Question 10d: Should the Local Plan do more to support the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas? If so, how?

- Respondents generally recognised the importance of providing affordable housing in rural areas and the contribution that it made to the sustainability and vitality of rural communities. The particular requirement to meet the housing needs of skilled rural workers was identified.
- Four respondents (including Sherfield on Loddon PC and Bramley PC) identified that rural affordable housing was most appropriate where there were

good facilities and services, or in areas with accessible transport being sympathetic to the surrounding rural environment.

- Several respondents particularly site promoters suggest that the Rural Exception Site policy should be less restrictive allowing some market housing to support viability.

Question 10e: Which option would you support for homes for older people and those with support needs? (accessibility standards)

- 15 respondents supported Option 1 which would require all housing to be built to advanced accessibility standards. These included Maria Miller MP, Hampshire County Council Adult Services, North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, and a number of parish councils. This option was considered particularly appropriate in light of the ageing population, and respondents commented that this option would provide flexibility for the homes to meet their occupiers' future needs, and would reduce occupiers' need to move should they develop the need for additional care.
- 15 respondents supported Option 2 which proposed a 20% requirement. Ten of these respondents were house builders/developers/landowners (including the Home Builder's Federation (HBF)).
- Two respondents suggested the standard should be between Option 1 and Option 2 (no specific target stated). Two further respondents suggested that the council could only require the most important aspects of accessible homes to be required (such as having a level threshold) rather than the full standard.

Question 10f: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- An RP stated that more references should be given to seeking opportunities for older people – which could free up under-occupied homes. Could provide a better supply of housing for downsizing and bungalows.

Question 10g: Which option (or combination of options) would you support for specialist accommodation?

- There was a degree of support for all the options set out in the consultation document (and various combinations of them), but there was concern that securing specialist accommodation on windfall sites (alone) would not guarantee that the council would meet its needs.
- Eight respondents, including Hampshire County Council (as adult services), supported a mix of all options, due to the scale of need and the range of needs to be addressed. This would ensure the council was being proactive to ensure a planned supply, but with flexibility for windfall sites to come forward where need exists.
- Three respondents supported Option 1 (delivery via windfall)
- Eight respondents supported Option 2 (provision as part of housing allocations and within/adjacent to settlements). Respondents widely noted that integration would help to support mixed and sustainable communities. A number of developers welcomed the flexibility to develop outside settlements where appropriate.

- Seven respondents supported Option 3 (allocating specific sites) providing an anchor for community facilities, as intended to meet needs of older people not assessed in same way, gives more options on where to live.
- Five respondents supported a combination of Options 2 and 3, one respondent supported a mix of Options 1 and 2.
- Four respondents stated that the Plan's approach should be informed by evidence of need/demand, and the Plan should include clear targets.

Question 10h: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- The Plan should recognise that there are many benefits of providing supported living, including reduced care costs and that it could be appropriate to secure specialist accommodation instead of affordable housing in some instances.

Question 10i: Do you have any views on the following issues: What types of sites are most suitable for specialist accommodation; and should the policy distinguish between different types of specialist accommodation and the needs of different types of occupiers?

- Respondents indicated the following were the most important locational requirements for specialist accommodation:
 - Being accessible to amenities, such as local centres (including medical services) (6 respondents), green spaces and leisure facilities;
 - Being well integrated into communities (2 respondents);
 - Consideration of the amenities of the future residents (for example, not adjacent to main roads) (4 respondents); and
 - Having good transport links (4 respondents).
- A number of respondents stated that the policy should recognise that there is a wide spectrum of products with different levels of care (which is broader than stated in the consultation document). Policy should account for occupiers' different requirements, and this should underpin site selection.

Question 10j: Which option would you support for the size and mix of market housing?

- Respondents were generally seeking a balance of certainty and flexibility, but their responses reflected different ways in which this could be achieved.
- 19 respondents supported Option 1 (using a criteria-based policy similar to current approach)
- 14 respondent supported Option 2 (specifying a mix as a starting point for negotiations) including Cllr McCormick. One RP suggested that set guidance is important to prevent protracted negotiations. This option was also supported by 3 developers/land owners, subject to sufficient flexibility being included.
- 11 respondents supported Option 3 (allowing the market to decide) (including 9 house builders/developers and the Home Builder's Federation). They considered this approach would be most responsive to local needs, however

one other respondent suggested that this would result in decisions being motivated by profits not need.

- Three respondents supported a combination of options 1 and 2. One respondent supported a mixture of options 1 and 3.
- 8 house builders/developers/land owners made specific comments about the importance of any policy approach including sufficient flexibility.

Question 10k: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- The following options were suggested; co-housing communities, and there are particular opportunities on the Manydown site, framework that enables neighbourhood plans to support community-led housing, recognise importance of the growing institutional Private Rented Sector, should include specific provision for homeless people, include purpose-built space for home working and gardens (response to covid).

Question 10l: What considerations should be taken into account in informing an appropriate mix?

- Policy requirements should be underpinned by evidence of local need (6 respondents). This should be based upon an understanding of future need (not the current need), and should take into account information like the projected age of the population.
- Detailed evidence should be provided about needs in local areas, including reviewing market signals and past delivery.

Question 10m: Should the Local Plan Update set out specific policy requirements for Houses of Multiple Occupation? If so, what should these be?

- Hampshire County Council stated that the Plan should recognise that HMOs can make a positive contribution to the local housing market.
- Whilst other respondents suggest that HMOs should be minimised as young people should be able to access a house of their own. Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council indicated that HMOs should be limited in the rural area unless for elderly occupation.
- Respondents suggested that HMOs should be required to be to a high standard and follow models of management set by housing associations.

Question 10n: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for self-build plots?

- 11 respondents supported Option 1 (the delivery of plots on larger housing sites).
- 11 respondent supported Option 2 (to allocate sites in the LP specifically for self build), respondents including developers/landowners.
- 5 respondent supported Option 3 (to deliver sites through neighbourhood planning), including Sherfield-on-Loddon PC and Sherfield Park PC). Other respondents expressed concern over delivery timescales.

- 4 respondents (including one housebuilder) supported a combination of Option 1 and Option 3, and two respondents supported a combination of Option 2 and 3 (which would allow SB in town and country locations).
- 1 respondent supported a mix of all options.
- Six house builders/land owners made broadly similar comments on Option 1 relating to difficulties accommodating plots on larger housing sites, large sites don't meet locational preferences, robust evidence required including test of self-build register for deliverability, not able to provide affordable housing as SB/CB and suggest phased so can revert to market housing if not taken up. In contrast two respondents suggest SB plots help diversify the offer on large sites.
- There were some more general concerns expressed about design and how self-build housing would fit with local character.
- The council should consider SB opportunities on its own land.

Question 10o: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Five respondents (including a mix of individuals and developers) stated that in addition to the options above, rural self-build windfall sites should be viewed favourably where there is evidence of a local demand, and where the design is of a high quality.
- The comments reflected a mix of views about whether such homes should be supported in the open countryside or just on the edge of settlements. On the edge of settlements, the amount could be limited in proportion to the size of the settlement.
- Council should proactively encourage more landowners to bring forward sites for SB/CB to provide additionality.

Question 10p: Which option would you support for how the council should meet its future requirement for gypsy and traveller pitches?

- Responses to this question were fairly evenly spread, with similar numbers supporting options 1 (providing pitches on the larger housing allocation), 3 (specific stand-alone allocations for traveller pitches) and 4 (a mixture of the available approaches), though with a slight preference for option 3.
- 9 respondents supported option 1. This included Cllr Andrew McCormick, Baughurst PC, Chineham PC, Dummer PC, East Woodhay PC and Upton Grey PC.
- 14 responses stated support for option 3 (allocation of stand-alone sites). This included HCC in its advisory role on this issue. Moreover, HCC have stated that in their experience, and in light of other analysis carried out regarding these issues, the other options presented are not effective mechanisms for delivering pitches. Bramley PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC and SOLVE supported this option.
- DWH also supported option 3, they stated that this strategy would allow pitches to be better located close to existing services and facilities, and the sites themselves better master-planned.

- Furthermore, HCC stated that the approach adopted needs to be responsive to the preferences of the Gypsy and/or Traveller community through the allocation of small family-orientated stand-alone sites along with ability to acquire their own land of choice and/or to expand existing sites for family and friends.
- Several respondents refer to the approach being fully justified with an up to date housing needs evidence base.

Question 10q: Are there any other options that should be considered?

- Some general comments were also provided stressing the need to ensure that the council has a robust evidence base and strategy for meeting the accommodation needs of travellers, especially as this is important for preventing inappropriate development of traveller sites in unsuitable locations that do not have the right facilities to support them.
- Cllr McCormick recommends a dedicated site close to the M3 whilst Overton PC suggest consulting the gypsy and traveller community.
- Hart DC advice that it may be necessary to have a discussion under the duty to cooperate to determine if unmet needs can be met.

Section 11 – Infrastructure

Question 11a: Which option would you support for the provision of new infrastructure?

The consultation set out two options for providing new infrastructure:

- Option 1: Continue to plan for the timely provision of infrastructure by working with service providers to meet needs through new and expanded facilities linked to new development.
- Option 2: Seek new ways of providing infrastructure to ensure its provision as early as possible in the delivery of new communities, through external funding and close working with key partners.
- Option 2 received the strongest support with respondents highlighting a range of considerations, including the following:
 - identify new ways of providing infrastructure as early as possible, through external funding and close working with key partners
 - provides the strongest likelihood of future-proofing infrastructure provision as well as minimising additional up-front costs
 - provide as much upfront transport infrastructure as possible, particularly for public transport, walking and cycling to instil sustainable travel behaviours to reduce car dependency.
 - addresses the traffic problem with a Western bypass; solves M3 Junction 7; addresses mains drainage; resolves the railway issues at both the Station and Worting Bridge
 - less unnecessary disruption and inconvenience to existing and new residents

- Option 1 received less support than Option 2 with various comments including the following:
 - Maria Miller MP suggests continue to plan for the timely provision of infrastructure by working with service providers to meet needs through new and expanded facilities linked to new development.
 - The Theatres Trust consider that for cultural facilities this could involve funding improvements to existing theatres and performance venues (e.g. the Anvil, Haymarket and Central Studio).

A combination of both options was also favoured by some respondents, highlights included the following:

- A blended approach involving elements of both options is the best way to deliver new infrastructure to enable timely provision allowing for different options depending on the type and size of development.
- Often infrastructure lags behind the occupation of new houses so Option 2 may be needed.

Question 11b: Are there other infrastructure issues that should be considered?

Other infrastructure issues identified by respondents were wide ranging including the following:

- Cllr McCormick suggests that reduce distances adults travel to work and children travel to school. Seek early provision of a secondary school at Manydown. Also refers to better cycle provision into town centre.
- Cllr Cubitt referred to reopening of Oakley railway station, bridge of railway at Bramley, more parking at train stations, more train capacity at peak times, western bypass, large outdoor Lido, better leisure facilities and addressing water shortages.
- Highways England recognise the need for a collaborative approach
- HCC refer to high travel broadband and local homeworking hubs whilst others refer to post Covid-19 behaviour change
- Early provision of walking and cycling links
- The need to consider the impacts of larger developments on transport infrastructure
- Thames Water recommends that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish if needs can be met.
- NHS North Hampshire CCG highlight a possible need for additional primary care capacity or estates, in particular from developments resulting in population increase of 2,000 or more.
- Providing large scale natural green infrastructure to benefit people and especially wildlife
- Concern about water quality in the Rivers Loddon, Lyde and Test and impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA
- The need for additional local and district waste collection facilities
- West Berkshire Council concerned about possible impact on service provision in West Berkshire for which cross border payments may be needed.
- Ensuring that the infrastructure required is provided prior to new development.

Question 11c: What types of infrastructure are the most important in the future planning of the borough, particularly in thinking about large sites?

Respondents' views were wide ranging including highlighting the following types of infrastructure:

- Cllr McCormick highlighted pedestrian and cycle provision, parking, charge points and local energy.
- Local Highway Authority (HCC) refer to sustainable movement corridors integrated with transport hubs to reduce the overall need to travel.
- Strategic transport solutions (M3 Motorway Junction 7, etc) including addressing the associated environmental impacts
- Efficient and affordable public transport systems (including rural areas)
- Prioritising safe walking, cycling and bus/tram infrastructure
- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- Infrastructure that supports the NHS Healthy New Towns principles
- Community, leisure and sports facilities within walking distance
- A suitable local convenience store in Bramley
- Large scale natural green infrastructure, green spaces and corridors
- Water supply and drainage infrastructure
- District heating schemes
- Waste collection facilities

Question 11d: Are there specific infrastructure issues in your local area to be aware of?

When asked to identify local infrastructure issues, the outcomes included the following:

- A large number of respondents (over 130 responses) highlighted concerns relating to surface water flooding, highway capacity and air quality (due to increased traffic volumes) within Cliddesden and the surrounding area
- The A339 was considered to be at capacity together with many of the surrounding local roads.
- With regards to Whitchurch Railway Station, many respondents (over 50 responses) requested the deletion of site allocated for a new station car park.
- Respondents also raised a number of local concerns with respect to:
 - highway capacity (including within Bramley, Sherfield on Loddon, Overton, Whitchurch and along rural routes);
 - an Eastern bypass;
 - access to public transport (including Sherfield on Loddon);
 - drainage capacity (including within Bramley, Sherfield on Loddon and Tadley);
 - access to schools, health practices, all-weather sports facilities;
 - lack of railway station parking and suitable convenience shopping (including within Bramley);
 - poor mobile phone and broadband coverage.

Question 11e: Which option would you support for the council's approach to essential facilities and services?

- 6 respondents support option 1 (continue with current approach as set out within the current Local Plan) including Sovereign and Old Basing and Lychpit

PC, Baughurst PC, SOLVE, Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd and HCC property services.

- Bell Cornwell obo Basron Developments Ltd. refer to the current approach as sufficient, arguing that blanket protection should not be given if a facility or service is no longer needed or desired, this would prevent unused sites from coming forward for alternative uses.
- 21 respondents support option 2 (Strengthen protection against the loss of a particular facility or service) including East Woodhay PC and Highclere NP, SoL PC, Sheffield Park PC, Overton PC, Bramley PC and MP Maria Miller.
- Sport England, clarify that this is unless it can be demonstrated that a nearby alternative facility is available and has capacity. To ensure there is strong protection of facilities which would only be lost when strategically identified as surplus or facilities are being replaced, this is in line with the NPPF and Sport England's Planning Policy.
- 3 respondents including BDBC, HCC, SMV support both options.
- The following general comments were made on the approach in 11e; it shouldn't be overly restrictive and needs exceptions to allow service providers to respond to changing circumstances. The Water Companies confirm they would look to the local plan to support any upgrades necessary at WTWs or WSWs to accommodate growth or meet stricter environmental standards whilst protecting existing infrastructure.

Question 11f: There is an opportunity for the Local Plan Update to define what would be classified as an essential facility or service. What facilities and/or services do you consider should be defined as essential within the Local Plan Update?

- 2 respondents define essential facilities or services to be in walking or a safe and reasonable distance.
- 3 respondents noted that as a general rule, medical, educational, groceries and/or public transport should be classified as essential.
- HCC, BDBC, SMV state essential/critical infrastructure is where the council or other bodies have a statutory obligation.
- One developer refers to the need to assess the level of service and infrastructure provision in a location to understand what needs to be improved to decide what is essential and what is desirable. How services and facilities are provided will also dictate how important a service might be to an area.
- Specific services and facilities that respondents recommended were defined as an essential facility or service are (number of respondents in brackets); medical services including GP surgery (8), Dentist (1), School/ primary school (7), College (1), Local shop or convenience store (8), Post office (for services including banking) (4), Recreation facility (5), Community hall/building/hub/centre (8), Café (3) Pub, (4), Accessible open space (7), Sports facilities, (4), Play area (2), Meeting rooms (for community activities and

healthcare meetings) (1), Frequent public transport/links (4), Library (2), Foul and surface water drainage (3), Mains water and electrical supply (2), High speed broadband (2), Employment sites (1), Good road network (1), Encouragement to switch to electric cars (1), Cycling and walking infrastructure (1) and Greater policing presence (1).

Question 11g: Are there any uses which you consider to need more specific policy requirements, either for their provision or protection/retention?

- Several respondents refer to community, sports and leisure facilities as crucial in building communities and promoting health, including mental and physical health. They also provide healthcare through clinics and healthcare support groups as many people prefer to attend a community setting rather than a surgery.
- The LPU should reflect the change in community care that is being introduced in the Primary Care Home Model that has been adopted by the CCG and Hampshire Hospital Trust where healthcare is provided by hospitals, GP surgeries and the community, therefore community facilities and the activities that take place within them are critical to the success of the new healthcare model.
- A number of respondents refer to the importance of the ice rink which is not well represented in the plan.
- The Theatre's Trust encourage the plan to promote and protect the area's valued cultural facilities and to guard against loss, reflecting paragraph 92 of the NPPF.
- Sheffield on Loddon PC refer to local shops, bus routes, post offices, pubs, community hubs.
- Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, in line with the Health Infrastructure Plan, refer to the proposal for a new health campus to meet the needs of the population of North and Mid Hampshire.
- Sport England suggests the LPU should contain clear specific policies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities that sets out what facilities are required to meet current and future needs
- Overton PC refer to sustainability in all its forms and reducing carbon by using the latest innovation and technology
- Bramley PC refer to the capacity of facilities being a consideration.

Question 11h: Which option would you support for the provision of new facilities and services on new developments? Is there more that the Local Plan Update could do to ensure that new development fosters strong communities and meets the needs of residents?

- 11 respondents support Option 1 (continue to with current approach of delivering community facilities in most new developments over 400 dwellings)

including Chineham PC, and SoL PC, Old Basing and Lychpit PC, Sherfield Park PC, Overton PC, Baughurst PC, SOLVE who make the following points:

- particularly relevant with increased homeworking
- all communities need facilities
- Sherfield Park PC believe communities need a building they feel is theirs and can use for a wide range of activities, larger centres can lose their identity.
- 2 respondents; Pro-Vision obo Mat Raymond Farming and Sovereign support Option 1 with flexibility to deliver option 2 where appropriate
 - Sovereign are of the view that where a combination of larger development areas come forward, the council should consider opportunities to provide fewer, larger but well-connected local centres.
 - Pro-Vision obo Mat Raymond Farming believe should be assessed on a settlement by settlement basis, to determine if services are suitable and can sufficiently meet the needs of the community.
- 13 respondents made representations in relation to option 2 (concentrate on providing fewer but large new community centres) including Bramley PC and Carter Jonas obo David Wilson Homes. They made the following points:
 - community centres are vital especially in pandemic
 - there are benefits to provide a larger but more flexible space that can accommodate a variety of users
 - local needs should be understood
 - Basingstoke Transition Network oppose option 2 on grounds of needed longer distance travel and consequent encouragement to use cars
 - Bramley PC and Catesby Estates suggest smaller facilities might compete and become unviable or surplus to requirement.
- General comments include:
 - facilities should be reduced to be provided for 250 dwellings, whereas Chineham PC should be reduced to 300 units.
 - facilities should be proportionate to the development and local needs, with developers working with the community to understand need and demand and cumulative impacts.
 - policy needs to be flexible to adapt to individual circumstances
- In terms of how the LPU could ensure that new development fosters strong communities, the following ideas were suggested; more publicity, provide open spaces for communities including allotments and football pitches, make places 'nice' to live, local shop can be a hub, reduce need to travel, opportunities provided by new district centres and through the careful consideration of placing of schools.

Document 2: Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

- Natural England make the following points

- state the Solent and Dorset Coast potential Special Protection Area (SPA) was officially designated a SPA earlier this year.
 - suggest the terms 'nutrient neutrality' and/or 'nitrogen' should be used [rather than nitrate neutrality] so that the terminology is in line with Natural England Solent Nutrients guidance document.
 - recommended the wording for objective 6 is changed from 'Conserve, and where possible, improve biodiversity, including connectivity' to 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, including connectivity' to reflect national planning policy and the intention to achieve biodiversity net gain through forthcoming Local Plan.
 - advise with regards to Objective 7 that Local Plan Policy requires relevant development to carry out site-level Habitats Regulations Assessments in order to ensure impacts on European sites are suitably addressed.
- The detail of the SA Framework, and the site assessment framework that flows from it, needs to be amended slightly in the following ways:
 - Objective 2 needs an additional decision-making criterion to cover the potential to deliver a new regional healthcare facility
 - Objective 3 needs an additional decision-making criterion referring to the ability to deliver new train stations or to re-open stations, and for the ability of sites to deliver on-site facilities. Reducing the need to travel is impractical in semi-rural and rural areas and discriminates against those that would like to bring forward modest organic development.
 - Objective 7: the proposed approach would score nitrate neutral development negatively however by definition a development that is "neutral" would not lead to a negative effect.
 - Objective 7 - It is inconsistent that for the River Loddon water quality it is stated it must not change band status but for the Solent/Test/Itchen catchment any development must be "nitrate neutral to avoid harm". The River Loddon must also be subject to the same rules and the principle of "no deterioration" should be adopted for all rivers. The banding of the WFD is an arbitrary construct and the Borough should be seizing the opportunity to improve water quality.
 - Objective 9: criterion on landscape character and beauty - clarity is sought on whether this criterion will be scored against existing or emerging evidence and whether the assessment will be focussed on landscape sensitivity and/or landscape capacity.
 - Thames Basin Heath Management Plan must be included as well as AONB.
- The assessment methodology should give due consideration to large strategic sites. Linked to this the SA scoping report fails to mention the Government's 'Garden Communities' Prospectus and the associated 'Garden communities toolkit'. The TCPA have produced guidance that would assist the LPA in identifying criteria that cover the strengths and weaknesses of any such Garden Community proposals that are subject to later SA assessment.
 - The impact of Covid-19 is not confined to the retail sector but also impacts on the way in which residential and other development will need to be planned and delivered; with more personal open space, access to formal and informal

well managed green spaces, and the delivery of spaces and places for safe working and start-up enterprises.

- The proportion of dwelling completions on previously developed land has halved in recent years and the relative shortage of available previously developed land for redevelopment is identified as a concerning baseline issue. Allocated greenfield sites are needed to meet additional housing need. There are a number of social and economic concerns associated with urban intensification, increased urban density, loss of urban open spaces, car parks and lower value employment space.
- Concern that the proposed grading in the Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Site Appraisal at Table 22, applies the greatest negative impact to development of any greenfield site – a greenfield site located in accordance with the spatial strategy should be given a favourable weighting. ‘Brownfield first’ is not necessarily the most sustainable solution.
- Burghclere PC is supportive of efforts in respect of water resource management, biodiversity, waste/recycling and renewable energy. Rural communities will continue to rely on private transport. The local grid and road network will need enhancement for all electric vehicles.

Document 3 - Settlement Study (Part 1)

Settlement's included:

- Several respondents agreed with the settlements which are included/excluded including Burghclere PC who agree that Burghclere should be category 5 and two respondents stating that Mapledurwell doesn't have the facilities or transport links to support further growth.
- Oakley and Deane PC state that the vast majority of development in the Borough is taking place in the West and South West of Basingstoke. The 3 villages in this area - Oakley, Dummer and North Waltham - must be protected in terms of their heritage and distinctive characteristics (as expressed in the recently published Draft Vision for the SW area). This can be achieved by ensuring strategic gaps between any new development and these villages are adequate (unlike at North Manydown, for example) and removing any requirement for further housing in these areas, unless requested by the villages themselves. Oakley is at saturation point already.

The matrix – sustainability indicators:

- JPP Land state that population size should not be a determining factor of the hierarchy and it should only focus on issues listed in para 78 of the NPPF.
- They go on to state that it is essential that the study assesses the level of and access to services.
- Thakeham Homes are of the view that the level of services should not define whether or not development should be located in a particular settlement – what happens if a development moves a settlement up the hierarchy and development opportunities support the change? This could also increase demand for other services and facilities.

- JPP Land suggest the approach is insufficiently flexible in terms of how provision of services and facilities vary (para 103 NPPF) between rural and urban areas. Therefore the characteristics are not consistent within the NPPF partially in relation to Highclere.
- JPP Land suggest bus services to other towns/villages should be listed in the matrix.
- Wades Estate suggest should reflect proximity to Newbury (for example Kingsclere) in terms of buses and services.
- JPP Land unclear how distances have been measured for those settlements without an SPB
- JPP Land query why Woolton Hill surgery is not listed as closest GP for Highclere.
- Vistry argue it should consider the availability of modern sustainability – high speed broadband, accessibility for delivery vehicles/drop off and greater emphasis placed on the sustainability benefits that rural/semi-rural locations can provide in terms of access to green and open space and safe environments.
- Linked to this Vistry suggest provides little if any consideration of social, economic and environmental changes which the pandemic has created or accelerated.
- Bramley PC suggest infrastructure needs to be considered more thoroughly – further information and evidence has been submitted to BDBC since October 2019.
- Bramley PC also request that consideration is given to the quality of the existing facilities and services and their position to ensure it is in line with the NPPF. A summary of the services and facilities in Bramley is provided in the response.
- Bramley PC query why the study uses minimum requirements not a scoring system.
- Burghclere PC agree with last two paragraphs on employment facilities in methodology chapter and this will rise in prominence and have other impacts on space and connectivity which should be considered in the study.
- Six respondents including Sovereign are of the view that part 2 should consider local affordable need in smaller settlements.
- Taylor Wimpey expect part 2 to recognise sites on the edge of Basingstoke, but within other Parish areas due to their physical relationship with the town itself e.g. Cufaude Farm relates to Basingstoke/Chineham but is in Bramley Parish.
- Fowler Architecture are of the view that the methodology needs to provide a robust and credible basis to understand issues facing the area including the needs and function of rural communities. It should consider the following additional elements:
 - Assessing evidence of local housing need
 - An understanding of the level of development required to support a thriving rural community by ensuring local services and facilities remain, or become viable;

- Assessing the availability of land (within the SHLAA);
- Assessing the implications of delivery in locations where the Framework indicates development should be restricted;
- Assessing the dual role many settlements provide in delivering services to other nearby settlements, and the benefits of development in one village supporting services in a village nearby; and
- Recognising the value of the plan delivering a greater percentage of the overall LHN within the rural communities.

Assessing options for new settlements:

- New settlements should be included and sustainability principles should be a guiding factor. Areas for new settlements should be able to demonstrate not only how delivery will take place, but how a development builds on what is there already whilst meeting the aims of self-containment as a stand alone settlement. They can also contribute to key strategic infrastructure deficits. Recommends that the Council should follow the below principles when considering opportunities for new settlements:
 - Location of development –consider growth along key modal points, including the strategic road infrastructure or rail line.
 - Proximity to larger centres
 - Scale of development –can it provide all necessary services.
 - Ability to deliver with appropriate lead in times for delivery. Single or very limited ownerships can assist with this.
 - Ability to assist with strategic infrastructure, contributing to a wider strategy for key upgrades to known issues within the District. [Bewley Homes]

Matrix inaccuracies:

The relevant parish councils identify the following inaccuracies:

- Ecchinswell convenience shop closed and has only one Place of Worship.
- Bishops Green has 1 community hall, not 2 and does not have a Place of Worship
- Overton has a dentist

Categories:

- Approach is supported by Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates.
- Fowler Architecture refer to nine of the small villages have greater access to the key facilities than north Waltham which only has access to 4 of the 5 key facilities. In addition 2 small villages contain all 5 key facilities within the village (St Mary Bourne and Preston Candover).

The following points are made about Bramley specifically:

- Bramley PC suggest consider the quality and position of existing services and facilities and their capacity for coping with further development, residents and traffic. Also consider how these can be improved and expanded to ensure quality of life for existing and future residents. Needs to be detailed consideration of what services/infrastructure are needed to accommodate expansion.

- Bramley PC Conservation areas should be protected and are of prime important to the rural, village characteristics of Bramley.
- Wates believe Bramley should be category 2.

SPBs:

- It might be possible to draw an SPB around each of the existing 5 settlements separately, but this could result in pressure for infilling which would destroy character of villages therefore they should remain countryside.

Overall/conclusions:

- Two respondents are in general agreement with conclusions.
- A number of responses referred to the assessment of particular settlements as follows:
 - Burghclere PC request appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/20/3256370 Land at Oxleas House, Ox Drove) on Policy SS1 and SS6 are reviewed and the policy reconsidered to be in line with NPPF.
 - Burghclere PC and East Woodhay PC wish for all development to be considered against the housing requirement – noted a total of 8 dwellings at Whitway are not included against SS5 currently and should feature prominently in category 5 considerations.
 - Dandara provide own assessment of Overton agree with identification in Category 2.
 - Two respondents are concerned about the promoted sites in Whitchurch and how infrastructure (particularly the roads and additional traffic) and services and facilities will cope and large destruction of biodiversity and nature.
 - Study accurately reflects that Highclere partially relies on Woolton Hill but mostly Newbury for essential needs.

General points:

- Burghclere PC requested detail on how SPBs might be identified.
- Those settlements which fall outside category 1-5 should be listed as not subject to further housing growth within the local plan period.
- With regards to Part 2 of the study the following points were made:
 - Trustees of the Portsmouth Settled Estates and BDBC/HCC re Southern Manydown are concerned that no consideration of how the option of a new settlement would be considered and how this is to be addressed in subsequent Part 2 assessments. This does not reflect national policy para 72 – Part 2 needs to capture opportunities for new settlements where suitable sites are being promoted.
 - Part 2 of the study must take into account the “bottom up” availability of sites to consider constraints and opportunities in addition to the baseline indicators collated in Part 1, and factor this into assessments of reasonable alternatives through the Sustainability Appraisal process and wider evidence base studies. Stage 1B of Part 1 needs to be revised so

new settlements and urban extension opportunities are considered in addition to opportunities in top 3 tiers [BDBC/HCC]

Document 4 - Site Assessment Methodology

General:

- One letter of support was received. This stated that the process set out accords with the NPPF. The support was mainly on the basis that the process correctly establishes that Mapledurwell is not suitable for additional development.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) welcome the fact that the draft document also raises the importance and need for large-scale sites (NPPF para 72).
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates considered that the process set out was a clear methodology.
- Burghclere PC stated that the detailed criteria column is confusing and options could be numbered or bulleted for clarity and simplicity.
- Kingclere PC stated that there are two paragraphs 'paying lip service to Neighbourhood Planning' (paras. 2.10 – 2.11), but there is no mention of the role of NP's in the following paragraphs when outlining the call for sites, filtering of sites, prioritising, assessment, selection etc. The document does not make clear how site selection takes account of the role of NP's and in the summary flow chart there is no mention of NP's. They feel the paper should give greater prominence to the role of Neighbourhood Planning in the site selection process.
- Sheffield Park PC stated that they did not consider that there was land available for development in and around the locality. They also expressed concerns about the suitability of the Dixon Road site for development as they consider that it does not accord with a number of the requirements set out in the site assessment methodology.

Filtering:

- CPRE stated that even while focusing on the top 3 settlement tiers, there were still sites within that bracket which would have potentially urbanising impacts upon the countryside. They drew particular attention to WHIT013 (North of the Railways Line, Whitchurch) and OAK016 (Oakley Hall). Their representation mainly focused on particular sites rather than site assessment methodology.
- Douglas Bond on behalf of JPP does not consider that the authority should artificially reject the suitability of sites in villages (i.e. those below tiers 1 – 3), especially where such growth would be consistent with the approach of paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Therefore, the council's justification for its draft approach in Stage 1B of prioritising the most sustainable locations is inconsistent with national advice.

- The categorisation of settlement caused some confusion in relation to filtering, as it was assumed by some that sites with a prefix pertaining to a settlement outside tiers 1-3, but functionally related to Basingstoke e.g. SOL008 or SSJ004, would be excluded from the assessment.
- Similarly, Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby Estates were concerned that the Bishops Green site they are promoting would be excluded from the site assessment process on the basis that it falls outside of the top 3 tiers.
- Support was expressed by various parties for using the SHELAA as stage one in the filtering process.
- Various respondents expressed concern about their sites being excluded from the detailed assessment process on the basis that they would be situated within tier 4 – 5 settlements.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) state that there appears to be no recognition of the potential for new settlements in the filtering process, or the potential for lower tier settlements to move up the hierarchy through strategic scale development.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates agreed with the approach of focusing on the most sustainable settlements. They considered that it is a sound town planning principle to place growth at the locations where the need is generated, and hence to focus development on Basingstoke.
- SOLVE recommend that distribution of allocations should be across the borough including modest small development in villages and hamlets.

Methodology:

- Historic England made reference to their guidance on site allocations and set out the key considerations from a historic environment perspective. However, they did not specifically comment on the proposed methodology itself. They also stated that they would expect to see historic environment considerations incorporated into site allocation policies.
- In terms of the deliverability elements, Douglas Bond on behalf of JPP stated that the sites selected in the current Local Plan have not been able to show that they are able to achieve the overall housing requirements of the document. Consequently, it is not considered that the approach to the assessment of the deliverability of potential sites was robust. They would advocate that the determination and implementation of applications, together with their build programme as demonstrated in the Lichfield's report, are used to inform the authority's assessment. This should consequently be a key output of the appraisal from a robust site assessment.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) state that the promoters request that the potential benefits of large sites, such as Southern Manydown, is recognised. By breaking up the assessment of housing and employment sites the assessment may lose some of the cumulative and synergistic benefits offered by larger sites such as Southern Manydown.
- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) had concerns about the design criteria for new settlements/garden villages, on the basis that it is the

only reference to new settlements and garden villages within the methodology, and only relates to design issues. They stated that the council will need to be careful to ensure that new settlement opportunities are not inadvertently penalised compared to other sites, and that these non-design benefits of new settlement opportunities are adequately captured in the other criteria under the various SA objectives.

- AECOM on behalf of BDBC/HCC (Manydown) request that the assessment methodology and criteria account for larger than local benefits to North Hampshire and the wider Local Enterprise Partnership area.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates considered that the weight should be favoured towards location first, not brownfield first. Furthermore, they felt that the methodology must add weight to the value that an existing brownfield site adds to the social and economic rich tapestry of an existing community. They added that including a community peer review into the process will help establish local value of existing land uses.
- Howard Cole on behalf of Portsmouth Settled Estates also felt that there should be more emphasis on new settlements in the methodology. In this regard they considered that factors such as proximity and accessibility to Basingstoke town centre should also be included as a measure.

Stages 3 and 4 (Refinement and Selection):

- Carter Jonas on behalf of Catesby supports the Council's proposed approach to engage with site promoters and key stakeholders in relation to sites identified for potential allocation.