2018 – 2032

Consultation Statement

(Including a summary of, and response to, the Reg 14 representations)
Consultation Statement

1 Introduction

Hook Parish Council has submitted its Neighbourhood Plan to Hart District Council for Independent Examination.

This Consultation Statement complies with the requirements of Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations and provides the response to the Regulation 14 Consultation held between 8th November 2017 and 20th December 2017.

2 Summary of Community Engagement

Section 5 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan demonstrates how the Steering Group has been open and transparent in its work and provided many opportunities for the involvement of the community of Hook Parish at all stages of the preparation of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, including the collection of evidence on matters such as housing, employment and green spaces. It details the many meetings, surveys and events that have taken place to publicise the plan and reach a wide section of the community. In addition a website was set up to enable people to access all the relevant information, receive updates and comment on the plan (www.neighbourhoodplan.hook.gov.uk). All this information is still available to view.

The considerable amount of engagement with residents, employers and employees over nearly 3 years culminated in the first full draft of the Plan being completed at the end of 2017. The Steering Group then mounted a full public exhibition on the 18th and 20th January 2018 to convey all of the key elements of the draft Plan and ensure all interested people were aware of the objectives and policies being proposed for incorporation in the draft Plan.

The above exhibition was extensively advertised and was provided to encourage community involvement in the subsequent 6-week consultation process. Just over 100 people attended, and a significant number gave positive feedback (a copy of the feedback form is included in Appendix 1A and a screenshot of the relevant webpage showing the information made available, Appendix 1B), with approx. 80% agreement to the proposed policies and 89% agreement to the
concept masterplan for the regeneration of the Village Centre. This was followed by 39 on-line detailed comments received before the closing date of 8th February.

Then on 23rd May 2018 there was the Annual Village Meeting for the residents of Hook and a stand was provided by the Steering Group in the Meeting Hall to provide information on the progress and content of the Neighbourhood Plan. 108 residents attended this Meeting and the Chair of the Steering Group provided a presentation on the outcome of the January Consultation and outlined the forward programme. A copy of the presentation is attached, Appendix 2.

3 Regulation 14 Stage Consultation

Then began the substantial task of ensuring that all of the comments received were considered in preparing the next draft of the Plan, which was then published for a formal Regulation 14 Consultation on the 8th November 2018. It was recognised by the Steering Group that to encourage a good level of community involvement a further public exhibition was required and a new response form was prepared (a copy is included in Appendix 3). The exhibition comprised a large number of display boards, to display all of the figures in the Plan at A1 size and the Objectives and Policies at A3 size, together with several copies of all of the Regulation 14 Documents on a table with chairs. This exhibition was attended by approx. 90 people. All the necessary information was also placed on the website.
From this Consultation, a total of 175 comments were received prior to the closing of the comment period on 20 December 2018. All of the separate comments were documented and actioned by means of additions or amendments to the draft Plan as appropriate. A summary of the key issues and the response is set out in Section 4 below.

In accordance with the requirements, the statutory consultees (as listed in Appendix 4) were alerted to the publication of, and consultation on, the Reg 14 documents. Many of the respondents to this consultation simply supported the draft Plan. However, one aspect that received strong support from a very large number of people was the Masterplan which provides a vision for how the residents wish to see any future development brought forward within the Village Centre. This was seen as a long-overdue initiative needed to promote the regeneration of what has become a rather tired and disjointed central area that is no longer appropriate for a District Centre having some 8300 residents. This order of support for the
whole of the Plan was very encouraging as it is an accepted fact that generally the public only respond to a consultation if they are not in support or have issues to raise.

4 Summary of the Main Issues and how they have been dealt with in the Reg 15 Submission Plan

Below is a summary of the main issues identified by each of the stakeholder groups. All of the respondents and their respective comments have been summarised on a spreadsheet which has been used to identify the key issues. Each comment has then been fully examined for

- relevance to the Plan
- whether similar comments have been made by others
- whether the comment adds to the clarity of the Plan (e.g. terminology, context and impact).

Then the Steering Group collectively decided what changes to the Regulation 14 version improved the plan and better represented the views of the community. Where appropriate, suitable professional advice was sought to ensure that all changes would be acceptable in planning terms.

A full change-tracked version was then circulated to all Steering Group and Parish Council members to seek their agreement before submission to Hart District Council. In addition an update was given to the Parish Council meeting on the 9th January 2019 and it was agreed to authorise the Executive Officer of the Parish Council to submit the plan to Hart District Council once necessary changes had been made.

A summary of the main comments is set out below, the response is set out in italics.

4.1 Statutory Consultees

- Only Historic England raised some minor issues and asked for consistency of terms in Chapter 10 paras 10.20 to 10.23 and minor rewording of Policy HK13.2.

The comments are noted and minor changes made.

4.2 Residents

- Clarify “good quality” and “good design”. Design should be traditional Hampshire, use of flint and brick. Limit height of buildings in Village Centre to 3 storeys and a concern over increasing density of development.
- More emphasis on need for a southern Bypass for the A30 via B3349 and Hook Road. However, some concerns regarding capacity of A30/B3349 Roundabout.
- Support improvements to cycle routes with multiple representations raising the issue. Wish to see cycle paths connecting with surrounding villages such as North
Warnborough. Suggestions of additions to cycle network put forward but also a need to separate cyclists and pedestrian where possible.

- Village Centre / Masterplan – Multiple representations of support for improvements to and modernisation / regeneration of the village centre. More detail required on the type of additional retail provision that would be achieved and a need to ensure any scheme is viable. The area should include more social activities. Need to ensure adequate, convenient and free-period car parking to encourage retail visits. The Market square should be used for parking when not in use.
- Some mis-understanding as to what a local heritage asset is. Suggestions for addition Locally Significant Heritage Assets put forward.
- Need better leisure facilities for this size of Village, including a swimming pool, Arts Centre, Sports Centre, facilities that enhance health of residents etc
- Support for restricting traffic along Station Road within the Village Centre. Concern about current parking difficulties in places.
- Wish to see more support for local groups and the facilities required for Scouts, Guides and youth including Hook United football club. Support for older residents / men’s sheds.
- Suggestions for additional Local Green Spaces put forward.
- Other individual points covered concern loss of petrol stations, the impact of a decked car park at the railway station, a suggestion that housing development should be more prominent in the plan, the need for more employment in Hook, 20mph speed limits, extra capacity at Doctors Surgery, land suggested for a SANG and a wish to see protection of Whitewater Valley strengthened.

The comments including the level of support have been noted and many minor changes made as a result. Design is a subjective matter and therefore the NDP tries not to be too prescriptive, however guidance has now been included on the height of buildings likely to be supported.

A number of suggestions were outside of the scope of the NDP. This included the need for a southern by-pass to the village (which would be a strategic matter to be dealt with by Hart District Council through their Local Plan), cycle routes that extend outside of the Parish and speed limits. Others sought further community facilities. At this point in time no sites have been identified for such facilities but it is recognised that some are being provided as part of the current large housing developments that are taking place and a policy has been included protecting what already exists. Another policy also seeks to ensure that multiple benefits, including providing community facilities where appropriate, are obtained from the development of any larger windfall sites should they come forward in the plan period.
Improvements to the village centre were strongly supported by many. Text has now been included to more clearly express the need to retain parking and for any market square to be multi-functional.

The identification of locally significant heritage assets caused some confusion. It has now been made clearer that this does not duplicate the protection given to Listed Buildings. A supporting document has been prepared setting out the significance of all the suggested assets included on the list and a wider area, Jubilee Green, has also been included.

In a similar manner, the Local Green Spaces were reviewed and a supporting document prepared setting out the assessment. All proposed Local Green Spaces have been removed from the plan as the analysis showed that they were already protected in some way and there was an element of inconsistency between what had and had not been included. It was concluded that the Local Green Space designation did not add anything and might be a considerable impediment to any plans to expand community facilities in the future.

Multiple other minor changes, clarifications and refinements were made to the plan, but none changed the general direction of the policy.

4.3 Landowners / Developers

• This NDP should be delayed until the Local Plan is adopted in order to ensure that housing numbers for Hart District are verified. If the Local Plan is significantly changed, this would result in the NDP being immediately out of date. The allocation of more land will allow for flexibility. The overall level of growth for Hart has not yet been resolved.
• Consider it is confusing to identify sites in the Hook NDP that are not then allocated. Not consistent with the SEA.
• More flexibility required in Policy HK4 (Landscape). Suggest wording to be more positive e.g. ‘avoid, minimise and reduce adverse impact’ rather than ‘ensure there is no adverse impact’.
• Only greenfield development will bring affordable houses. The allocation of land above that required in the Hart Local Plan will help deliver more of the objectives of the NDP e.g. affordable homes, a greater mix of homes, specialist housing.
• Inappropriate to include HK5 (Hook to Newnham Gap) policy as duplicates a strategic policy. If the strategic policy is removed from Hart Local Plan, then HK5 may conflict with the Local Plan.
• Protecting views to the east would conflict with the Local Plan. Views should not be used as part of a strategy to prevent coalescence between Hook and Newham.
• Make it clear what level of protection is afforded to which level of heritage asset. Protection of a heritage asset is a material consideration, but not to give weight over other potential benefits.
- Support the limited references to the area of search for a new settlement as it reduces the risk of policy conflict.
- Suggest land at Murrell Green development will deliver many of the transport and biodiversity objectives in the NDP.

Sites suggested for allocation for housing:

- Land east of Reading Road.
- Land at Murrell Green, which alongside land at Winchfield forms part of the proposed Area of Search for a new settlement in the Hart Local Plan.
- Owens Farm, Hook.

Para 65 of the NPPF states that strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need retesting at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement.

The Hook NDP has been prepared alongside the Hart Local Plan so that it is robust and up to date. Indications are that the housing figure for Hook will remain unchanged and as a result there is no need to reassess housing figures and look to allocate further land for development at this stage. Should this change there will be an opportunity to review the NDP and indeed it is likely that the Hart Local Plan would require a revision. In addition it should be noted that large scale housing sites are currently being built out in the village and a number of additional schemes have recently been permitted.

The identification of views and gaps between settlements that are important for community identity are appropriate and have been underpinned by evidence produced by Hart District Council such as the Urban Characterisation and Density Study.

4.4 Hart District Council
A detailed response to the representation submitted by Hart District Council is attached, Appendix 5.
Appendix 1A: Feedback Form

**Hook Neighbourhood Plan**

In order to help the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group progress to the next stage of the Plan, please give us your views on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (Nov 2017).

| NAME: |
| POSTCODE: |

**SITE ALLOCATIONS POLICY PP/SA.1 –**

1. Do you agree with the exclusion of all sites except brownfield?  **YES/NO**

2. Do you agree with the order of priority of sites listed in the policy?  **YES/NO**

If no, please explain:

**VILLAGE CENTRE MASTERPLAN -** Do you agree with the concept presented?  **YES/NO**

If no, please explain:

**COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PLAN** – Please state the Objective/Policy No(s) on which you are commenting:

e.g.  *O/BE.1 Business & Economy Objective 1……*

Please complete and return this form to Hook Parish Council, Ravenscroft, Hook, RG27 9NN or by e-mail to neighbourhoodplan@hook.gov.uk or complete online at https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/GPB56WW by Thursday 8th February 2018
Appendix 1B: Screenshot of website containing information on the first consultation

Hook Neighbourhood Plan

Hook First Draft Neighbourhood Plan documents published for consultation

Here are the first draft Neighbourhood Plan documents. These will be the subject of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan Consultation on 18 and 20 January 2018.

- First Public Draft of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan
  - Slides showing a Summary of the Plan

- Supporting documents:
  - Site Allocation Report, showing how the housing sites were allocated in the Plan
  - Site Assessment Report, providing the raw material for the Site Allocation Report

- Draft Hook Village Centre Masterplan

Hart’s latest draft of the Local Plan (the “Proposed Submission Local Plan” or PSLP) is available here. If you’re not familiar with the Local Plan you may find it useful to read our Hart PSLP overview.

Please make your comments online here.

Alternatively, you may download a Word version here and email it to neighbourhoodplan@hook.gov.uk – but it would make it much easier to collate comments if you do it online. Please submit all comments by 8 February 2018.
1. Hook Annual Village Meeting 23rd May 2018

Presentation by John Orchard, Chair, Hook Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

2. The Story So Far...

Most people are aware that a dedicated group of residents in the form of a Steering Group have spent the last few years building up an evidence base of what the residents want to see in their Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and have been doing their best to translate that evidence into objectives and policies or community aims. The process has suffered to some degree from the delay by HDC in drafting of the Local Plan - as the NP objective is to “shape and direct development in the context of the requirements of the locality within the overall Strategic Policies of the Local Plan” (from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)).

However, the Steering Group has not previously enjoyed the help and advice of a Chartered Town Planner, so the process has been slow and painful. This is mainly because the residents on the Steering Group are not professional planners have therefore struggled to write Planning Policies.

The situation took a welcome new direction in early 2017 Hook was accepted by Locality, an organisation acting on behalf of the government, as being in need of technical support. This resulted in the Steering Group being given considerably professional assistance by AECOM Ltd, Locality’s expert partners, at no cost to Hook.

Hence, we saw good progress on such aspects as:

- review of the draft NP by a Town Planner
- Site Development Options & Assessment support
- Strategic Environmental Assessment
- Masterplanning of the Village Centre.

All of these are essential parts of the Hook NP.

3. Overview of the Programme

This assistance enabled us to prepare a draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence for a public consultation on 18th and 20th January this year. This was attended by approx.
100 residents and some potential developers, most of whom provided positive feedback. This response provided encouragement to the Steering Group to incorporate the comments in a new version of the NP.

However, it became clear that the next step required professional help to prepare a draft plan that was fit for formal Statutory Consultation which is termed as the “Regulation 14” Stage.

Meanwhile, it was felt that further professional advice was needed to bring the NP together. Hart DC were asked for advice and they referred us to the Planning Team at South Downs National Park (SDNP), as they have assisted with 55 plans for parishes within the Park and have already managed to get over 20 of these adopted into law. There is no doubt they have both the professional qualifications and experience we were looking for. We had a very good presentation from SDNP and have subsequently appointed them to prepare our Reg 14 draft document and to ensure we have all the necessary evidence in place to move towards the 6-week Statutory Consultation in about July of this year.

4. **Priority Sites**

The Priority Sites for Development in Hook follow the detailed assessment by AECOM that was reported in Sept 2017 and also follow the Hart LP policy of “Brownfield first”. The first 6 priority sites are all related to the regeneration of the Village Centre/Station Road and will total approx. 250 dwellings. The two largest sites are already progressing, so this provides Hook with a strong buffer against any further greenfield development being granted in this Parish.
One of the major features of development in Hook is the number of offices that are being converted into flats without need for planning permission under “Permitted Development Rights”. The NP Steering Group welcomes the fact that Hart DC has issued an “Article 4 direction”, that means that within 12 months all such developments will require planning permission.

5. Village Centre
The Concept Masterplan for the Village Centre is a vision prepared by AECOM in consultation with the residents and is welcomed because the expected growth in population in Hook, even if it only comes from current developments and brownfield sites, is not currently catered for in terms of commercial and community facilities in Hook Village Centre.
6. **Market Square**

Many of the responses to the draft NP in January were related to the treatment of the area around Grand Parade and the A30/Station Road Junction. Hence, this area has received particular attention by AECOM with a proposal for a market square. This is facilitated by a small adjustment in the road layout to make the area more pedestrian friendly and to enable some restraint on traffic using Station Road.
7. Hart LP Policy for Hook
This vision for Hook is consistent with the draft Local Plan which shows Hook as a vibrant District Centre of Hart.
8. Current Position

We expect the first list of requirements for the Steering Group to address to come from the SDNP team by 8th June, so the work of this Group is still ongoing and any residents who would wish to assist would be very welcome and should contact the Steering Group via the Parish Council office.

9. Next Steps

During the summer, the Steering Group has to organise the 6-week Regulation 14 Consultation. Then we will have to take account of the responses and amend the Plan as necessary before submitting the new version, together with all the supporting documents formally to Hart DC in the Autumn.

Hart DC will then publicise the draft plan for a further 6 weeks and invite any representations before sending it to an Independent Examiner.

The Examiner will issue a report to Hart DC and the Parish Council. Hart then considers whether any changes are required and, if satisfied, will then seek Cabinet approval to send the Plan to a referendum.
It is hoped that the Steering Group, the Parish Council and Hart DC can organise a referendum in early 2019 resulting in the Neighbourhood Plan being adopted as planning policy for Hook.
The Hook Neighbourhood Plan is nearly complete, as it is at the Regulation 14 Stage. This means that following this formal consultation the Plan will be submitted to Hart District Council for them to progress the Plan to Adoption, when it will become Planning Policy.

Comments from the previous consultation (Jan 18) have been incorporated into the plan or passed to the relevant Authority.

To help the Plan progress to the next stage, of the process, please give us your views on draft Hook Neighbourhood Plan (Nov 2918)

**NAME:**

**POSTCODE:**

1) **Do you support the Plan overall?** (Delete as applicable)  YES/NO

If NO, please explain why is the space below?

2) **Please provide your comments on:**

   a) The Plan overall  
   b) The Policies HK1 – 15

Please include reference to any Figure number if relevant to your comment

COMMENT HERE or continue overleaf .....
**Appendix 4: Regulation 14 Consultees**

**HOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – REG 14 CONSULTEE NOTIFICATION LIST**

| Contact |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| (a)where the local planning authority is a London borough council, the Mayor of London; | Mayor of London  
mayor@london.gov.uk |
| (b)a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority; | See separate spreadsheet |
| (c)the Coal Authority(1); | letter dated 20th March – no consultation needed |
| (d)the Homes and Communities Agency(2); | Area Manager North Hampshire  
Homes England  
2 Rivergate, Temple Quay, Bristol, Avon, BS1 6EH  
mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk; |
| (e)Natural England(3); | 2nd Floor, Cromwell House, 15 Andover Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 7BT  
consultations@naturalengland.org.uk |
| (f)the Environment Agency(4); | Environment Agency Thames Area, Goldcrest House, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, Surrey, GU10 4LQ  
Planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk |
| (g)the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)(5); | Historic Places Advisor  
Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 3EH  
southeast@historicengland.org.uk |
| (h)Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587); | Town Planning Team, Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd, Kings Place, 90 York Way, London, N1 9AG |
| (i)the Highways Agency; | Highways Agency, Federated House, London Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SZ |
| (j)the Marine Management Organisation(6); | N/A |
| (k)any person— | |
| (l)to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and | BT Group plc, BT Centre, 81 Newgate Street, London, EC1A 7AJ  
Waldon Telecom Ltd, Beaver House, York Close, Byfleet, Surrey, KT14 7HN  
enq@waldon telecom.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority;</th>
<th>As above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006\(^7\) or continued in existence by virtue of that section; | Head of Capital Planning  
Hampshire Primary Care Trust, Omega House, 112 Southampton Road, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 5PB  
Partnerships Manager  
NHS North East Hampshire & Farnham CCG,  
Aldershot Centre for Health, Hospital Hill,  
Aldershot, Hampshire, GU11 1AY  
Head of Communications and Engagement  
NHS North Hampshire CCG, Central 40, Lime Tree Way, Chineham Business Park, Basingstoke,  
Hampshire, RG24 8GU  
nhccg.enquiries@nhs.net; |
| (ii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989\(^8\); | Strategic Planner  
SSE Power, PO Box 93, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO6 2PB |
| (iii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986\(^9\); | Network Support Manager  
Southern Gas Network  
customer@sgn.co.uk |
| (iv) a sewerage undertaker; and | Town Planning Manager  
Clearwater Court, 4th Floor West, Vastern Road,  
Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DB  
thameswaterplanningpolicy@savills.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>a water undertaker;</th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area;</td>
<td>Hart Voluntary Action, Civic Offices, Harlington Way, Fleet, Hampshire, GU51 4AE <a href="mailto:info@hartvolaction.org.uk">info@hartvolaction.org.uk</a> Relevant bodies to be determined by Qualifying Body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area;</td>
<td>Relevant bodies to be determined by Qualifying Body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area;</td>
<td>Relevant bodies to be determined by Qualifying Body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area; and</td>
<td>Enterprise M3 <a href="mailto:info@enterprisem3.org.uk">info@enterprisem3.org.uk</a> Hampshire Chamber of Commerce <a href="mailto:info@hampshirechamber.co.uk">info@hampshirechamber.co.uk</a> National Farmers Union (South East Region), Unit 8 Ground Floor, Rotherbrook Court, Bedford Road, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU32 3QG <a href="mailto:south.east@nfu.org.uk">south.east@nfu.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.</td>
<td>Relevant bodies to be determined by Qualifying Body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADJACENT COUNTY, LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES AND PARISH COUNCILS**

**LPA’s and Adjacent County Authorities**
- Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council
- East Hampshire District Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Waverley Borough Council
West Berkshire Council
Wokingham Borough Council

**Parish and Town Councils**
Bentley Parish Council
Blackwater & Hawley Town Council
Bramshill Parish Council
Church Crookham Parish Council
Croadall Parish Council
Crookham Village Parish Council
Crowthorne Parish Council
Dogmersfield Parish Council
Elvetham Heath Parish Council
Eversley Parish Council
Ewshot Parish Council
Farnham Town Council
Finchampstead Parish Council
Fleet Town Council
Froyle Parish Council
Greywell Parish Council
Hartley Wespall Parish Council
Hartley Wintney Parish Council
Heckfield Parish Council
Hook Parish Council
Long Sutton & Well Parish Council
Mattingley Parish Council
Newnham Parish Council
Odiham Parish Council
Old Basing Parish Council
Rotherwick Parish Council
Sandhurst Town Council
Shalden Parish Council
South Warnborough Parish Council
Stratfield Saye Parish Council
Stratfield Turgis Parish Council
Swallowfield Parish Council
Upton Grey Parish Council
Winchfield Parish Council
Yateley Town Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy or paragraph</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Hart Comments:</th>
<th>Hook Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hook Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td>In line with advice we have received from Examiners on other neighbourhood plans we would recommend the following paragraph is included either as an amendment to para 2.1 or as a separate para.</td>
<td>“The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by Hook Parish Council which is a qualifying body as defined by the Localism Act 2011. The Plan applies to the whole of Hook Parish. In accordance with requirements, Hart District Council as local planning authority, publicised the application for Hook Parish Neighbourhood Area and approved the application. The whole of Hook Parish as shown on Figure 2.2.1 was designated as the “Neighbourhood Plan Area” on 2 October 2014. It would also be helpful to set out the basic conditions against which the Plan will be assessed in this section.</td>
<td>Agreed, additional text added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para 2.3 on the new settlement – is not</td>
<td>The Submitted Local Plan is currently undergoing public examination. Following this process, if Policy SS3 on the New Settlement at Murrell Green/Winchfield is retained, then para 2.3 text should be revised. Additional wording could be added</td>
<td>Included text to draw people’s attention to the fact that any new settlement would be planned through the preparation of another Development Plan Document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positively worded.</td>
<td>to outline the planning process for the new settlement. This could also be reflected in the Plan’s vision and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td>Section 3 would benefit from additional text on how the Plan contributes to Sustainable Development. This could be done by referring to some of the key sustainability issues and conclusions identified in the Strategic Environmental Assessment. Reference should be made here or in the next section to the HRA Screening.</td>
<td>Agreed, additional text added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 9</strong></td>
<td>Hart District Local Plan and First Alterations – should add ‘in part’ after ‘superseded’ to clarify that not all policies will be superseded in 2019.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 9</strong></td>
<td>Affordable Housing Informal Guidance – Policies in the Submission Local Plan require affordable housing from sites of 11 or more.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 9</strong></td>
<td>The Hart Biodiversity Action Plan was updated in 2018.</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 9</strong></td>
<td>Is the Hook Biodiversity Action Plan provided as evidence to this Plan?</td>
<td>Yes – It is on the Hook Parish Website as part of the Hook Parish Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General housing</strong></td>
<td>The NP could encourage community groups to consider community-led housing schemes as it is unable to have a Rural Exception site for local people because the settlement is over 3,000 population. The reference to Nationally Described Space Standards in the Plan is supported. This will ensure that new affordable homes will be of a decent size for the changing needs of different households.</td>
<td>Additional text added into Chapter 10, albeit it should be noted that this is just a reiteration of national policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Flood Risk** | There is no mention of flood risk or sustainable drainage in the Hook Neighbourhood Plan. Any development will be covered by the Local Plan flood risk policy. However, as flood risk is an issue in Hook, the NP may want to consider if a policy should be added. This could cover issues such as:  
- Avoiding built development in areas at risk from flooding from any source unless there are overriding sustainability reasons for doing so and where this is in accordance with the NPPF.  
- Promoting the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and rainwater harvesting measures and water butts. | Text added to highlight Hart Local Plan policies and specific issues relating to Hook Parish. |
• Promote development that reduces flood risk or failing this the development must be safe and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How you have shaped this plan</th>
<th>Top of page 11</th>
<th>Reference to CIL should clarify that it is 25% of the CIL funds raised from development in the Parish.</th>
<th>Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision and objectives</td>
<td>Consultation identified the issue of playing a part in providing affordable housing and a wider range of home types to suit the range of needs</td>
<td>Providing affordable housing and a wider range of home types is identified as a key opportunity in para 5.4 but is not reflected in the Plan objectives or policy so it is not clear how it will be achieved. The NP mentions providing a mix of housing to meet the community needs but it is not clear what the need is and the evidence in which this is set out. It would be helpful to include more information about this if it is known. It is good to see that the NP refers to providing affordable housing for those who require it and to enable the provision of a wider range of home types to suit a range of needs. It could provide more detail if it is known if there are any specific types of affordable housing needed e.g. for older people, adaptable homes etc.</td>
<td>The delivery of affordable housing will be in accordance with the policies in the Hart Local Plan. The Hook NDP does not have the evidence to enable it to set a different rate. The vision has been amplified to express need for suitable homes for older people looking to downsize but remain in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Overarching Policy</td>
<td>It might be helpful to have an overarching Policy setting out the principles for the location of development in Hook – for example Odiham neighbourhood plan policy 1, or Rotherwick NP Policy SP02. It is not clear how the preferred Option 1 in the SEA of facilitating potential new development on previously developed sites within the settlement boundary is translated into Policy in the Plan.</td>
<td>New SPATIAL POLICY added in Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development in Hook Village Centre Policy HK1</td>
<td>Consistency with the Submitted Local Plan and masterplan.</td>
<td>The reference to Hook village centre should be amended to reflect the Submitted Local Plan designation as a ‘district centre’. As masterplanning work has been undertaken for Hook Village centre, the policy could go further in allocating key sites for redevelopment, setting out development principles and a quantum of development. This would clarify the mechanism which may enable regeneration of the district centre to occur. Criterion ‘b’ seeks to maintain or increase the commercial space provided on the site. It would be</td>
<td>Amendment made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development principles are set out in policy HK1 and HK2. The NDP group have steered away from allocating sites as this has HRA implications. The sites are brownfield, small and in the centre of the village and therefore there is a presumption in favour of development. They are in private ownership. Therefore allocation is unlikely to make any significant difference to the delivery of the scheme. The aim of the policy is to provide a framework which helps to drive up the quality of the environment of the centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village Square Design Objectives Policy HK2</td>
<td>Delivering a village square</td>
<td>Text should be added to indicate how the objectives will be achieved. Hook centre should reflect the Submitted Local Plan designation as a district centre (Policy ED4). There is a boundary difference between the Hook village centre boundary to that in the Submitted Hart Local Plan. The difference is not explained in the text though the reference to the masterplan is noted</td>
<td>Minor amendments to states that these are principles rather than objectives. Amendment made Text included to explain boundary change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan</td>
<td>Supporting evidence</td>
<td>The cover of the Masterplan for Hook Village Centre on the website is marked as draft. Is this the latest version? The Masterplan should be clearly available as supporting evidence as it is heavily referenced in the</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing the Biodiversity of Hook Policy HK3</strong></td>
<td>Saved policies and flood risk.</td>
<td>Noted, no change made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The policy is not fully in conformity with Submitted Local Plan Policy NBE5 or the NPPF (Para 171) as there is no reference to differing levels of protection given to international, national and locally designated biodiversity sites. It might also be helpful to include an overarching requirement for development to deliver a net gain in biodiversity (Para 170 (d) of NPPF 2018).</td>
<td>The nature conservation designations are shown on Figure 8.1.1. They are also now referred to in the reference to Hart Local Plan policy NBE5. The differing protection afforded to different sites and the need for a net gain in biodiversity is set out in national policy and does not need to be repeated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy criterion 1) Leaving open spaces along river banks is key flood risk management technique. This could be encouraged along all watercourses not just the River Whitewater. The buffer for watercourses is generally accepted to be a minimum of 8 m which could be referenced in Policy or text.</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy criterion 3) Could be reworded to provide clarity in decision making – the term ‘must recognise’ does not make clear what will or won’t be supported. We would question whether the word ‘habitat’ is correct – gardens may contain features that are of raised ecological interest and make a contribution to the overall biodiversity resource in the built environment.

Policy criterion 4) Ponds slow and store surface water runoff and are important in reducing flooding. They are one of many Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). SuDS can provide a multiple of benefits including flood risk, amenity, biodiversity and water quality benefits. As well as protecting existing ponds the neighbourhood plan may want to consider encouraging more ponds and SuDS. You can find out more about SuDS in the Hart District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2016 section 14.3 page 99. However, clearly there is no control over the loss of domestic ponds, and not all other ponds may be of value – are there identifiable ponds that could be

The BAP identifies gardens and parks as a key habitat. Policy amended to provide more detail.

Further detail added
| Environment and Landscape Policy HK4 | mapped to make this criterion clearer and more effective?

Policy criterion 6) We would question how practicable this is, or enforceable and therefore whether it meets the requirements of the NPPF. It is not practical to suggest retaining the soil on site, particularly as retaining it would mean putting it on top of existing soil that will also have a structure and associated invertebrates. It would be preferable (and in line with general policy guidance) to focus on enhancing retained habitats within development proposal boundaries. | Agreed, criteria removed. |
| Settlement Gaps Policy HK5 | Consistency with Submitted Local Plan policy | The Parish Council should be aware that following discussion at the Local Plan examination on Policy NBE2 Gaps, the Examiner identified concerns with the justification for this Policy and for identifying gaps without defined boundaries. The Council is therefore proposing a Local Plan Modification to delete Policy NBE2 and the gap designations on the local plan maps. Additional wording regarding the need to ensure that... | The evidence within the Hart Landscape Capacity Study 2016 has been used to support the identification of a gap between Hook and Newnham. |
**development does not lead to the physical or visual coalescence of settlements, or would damage settlement's separate identity, either individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development** is proposed as a Modification to be added to Policy NBE3 Landscape. Clearly these Modifications are subject to the agreement of the Local Plan Inspector.

If these Modifications are incorporated into the final Local Plan this means that whilst Local Gaps can still be identified in neighbourhood plans they will need to be fully justified and evidenced as part of the neighbourhood plan process. At present it is not clear what evidence is used to justify the gap boundary although clearly this could now include the landscape related studies that form part of the Local Plan evidence. We are happy to provide further information if that would be helpful.

To reflect existing Policy NBE2 and the proposed amendment set out above, the wording of Policy HK5 should be amended to `... is designated to prevent physical or visual coalescence of the village...`. The Amended to incorporate more links to the original Hart evidence base to ensure this underpins the policy.

The map has been increased in scale.
| **Important Views Policy HK6** | map showing the proposed Hook to Newham Gap is too small in scale to identify the area affected by the Gap designation, particularly along the northern edge. It is not clear precisely what area of land is affected by the designation. | Important Views Policy HK6

The protection of these views will need to be properly evidenced – see for example the Rotherwick Neighbourhood Plan.

Are all of these views from locations that are freely accessible to the general public? A modification was made in this regard to the Rotherwick Neighbourhood Plan.

It may be clearer to reword this Policy so that it refers to development not adversely affecting the views at the start of the Policy rather than seeking that they must be protected. | These views were identified in the Hart Urban Characterisation and Density Study (2010) as being important. They have been incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan and view B added to reflect the large development to the east of the village. The views are all available to the general public. Amended text |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Green Space Policy HK7</th>
<th>Justifying Local Green Spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The NPPF identifies that this designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space, suggesting it is applicable only in limited cases. However, the NP proposes 14 areas as local green space.

The NPPF contains three criteria against which sites should be assessed. It is not clear how these sites have been shortlisted against the NPPF criteria and what evidence has been used to support their designation?

When justifying the local green spaces, you will need to have regard to advice in the NPPF (2012 if submitting before 24 January), or 2018 NPPF if submitting to us afterwards. There is also guidance in the NPPG at [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open).

The potential local green spaces have been reviewed and as a result none are proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. The detailed reasoning behind this is set out in the Hook Local Green Space Assessment.
Clear boundaries of each site will also be required.

If you have not already done so you will need to make sure all landowners of the proposed local green spaces have been notified at this draft plan stage. It might be useful to look at the Examiners comments on Local Green Spaces for those Neighbourhood Plans that have already been made in the District (Rotherwick, Winchfield and Odiham and North Warnborough). These are all available on the relevant Parish website at https://www.hart.gov.uk/townsparishes.

If sites are already protected as Common land we would question whether local green space designation is required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pollution Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Consistency with national guidance.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy HK8 is more restrictive than NPPF guidance which seeks to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK8</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. limit impacts of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. mitigate and minimise potential adverse impact of noise from new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The policy wording could be amended to:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><code>Development proposals will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the impacts from light pollution are minimised. Development leading to a significant adverse noise impact will not be permitted. Noise arising from new development should be mitigated and impact reduced to a minimum</code>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some amendments made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Policy HK9** | **Consistency with national guidance.** | **Policy HK9 supporting text should make clear that financial contributions will be sought in line with the tests in national guidance. Planning obligations can only be sought where they meet the following tests:-**  
|**a)** necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms  
|**b)** directly related to the development  
|**c)** fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development  
|It is not clear how the pedestrian and cycle strategy has been derived or what evidence it is based upon. Is this part of the neighbourhood Plan evidence base?  
|It should also be made clear what constitutes a major development.  
|**Addition to policy made to reflect this, detail not needed in a Neighbourhood Plan**  
|**Amended** |**Pedestrian and Cycle Paths** |**Parking Policy HK10** |**No comments.**  
|**HK9** | **HK10** |
| Provision of new homes | Para 10.8 It is unclear whether this is just commentary or the Plan is allocating these two sites. This paragraph has little weight in any planning decision unless there is a specific reference in planning policy. One option open to you would be to include specific site allocations in the Plan although this would potentially result in some updated evidence, in particular a Habitat Regulation Assessment. Clearly sites with a planning application pending may also have a planning decision by the time you prepare the next stage of the Plan which may inform your decision on whether to include allocations.

As this is not set out in this Plan we have not made specific comments on the sites mentioned as potential housing sites but would be happy to do so if you wish to progress more specific site allocations.

See also comments on Appendix 2. | This paragraph is just a paragraph. There is no need or desire to allocate these small brownfield sites. It would also potentially trigger the need for a new HRA screening. The sites are identified as potentially available in the masterplan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master planning large windfall sites Policy HK11</td>
<td>Updating and clarification</td>
<td>Para 10.6 further residential development is likely to come through the proposed regeneration of the district centre. This could be set out in this paragraph for clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table of sites following para 10.8 could be updated. For example, more information is now known about Rawlings Yard. Also, there is no reference to the former Taylor Wimpey office site. Could this be a potential site?

Clarification is needed on the size of site where Policy HK11 applies? Does a large windfall mean sites of 5 or more dwellings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Policy HK12</th>
<th>Consistency with NPPF and saved policies</th>
<th>NPPF para 127 seeks places which are safe but does not stipulate the developments should incorporate Secured by Design</th>
<th>Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of the Nationally Described Space Standards must be subject to justification – see internal-space-standards <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-optional-technicalstandards#">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-optional-technicalstandards#</a></td>
<td>Noted. No changes made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Locally Significant | The policy identifies buildings as local heritage assets (and paras 10.20 – 10.23). However, no assessment of | An assessment was undertaken entitled Hook Neighbourhood Plan Supporting Document: Criteria for |
| Heritage Assets HK13 | the buildings on the current list or as proposed, relative to any local criteria or the criteria identified within the plan by HE, appears to have been undertaken, though the HE criteria are set out in the document. In order that these buildings could be supported as 'assets' and would be considered a material consideration in the planning process, this assessment would need to be undertaken. Such an assessment accompanied by Statements of Significance would need to be drafted by the group and agreed. Otherwise, the proposals list even if adopted within the NH plan would not be able to carry any weight for DC purposes. Other observations on the proposed list are highlighted (by Hart) in red below:

On current local list

2. Church Path Cottage, Church Path; (formerly called Beggars Roost)

The following do not appear to be on the HDC current 'local list'

3. Farmhouse and Granary, Owens Farm, Newnham Road; | the selection of Local Architectural and Heritage Assets. This sets out how the assets have been identified and considered against Historic England’s Local Heritage List Guidance (as adapted for Hook). This study has now been updated and the assets identified have been reviewed. Some further buildings and jubilee Green have been added. An explanation of the significance of the entry to Hook has been included. This updated work is entitled Hook – Local Heritage Assets Assessment and has been prepared with the help and support of the Hook Local History Group.

The inclusion of any building, structure or groupings of buildings on the Local List is not necessary for the application of policy HK13. The Hart Local list is indeed very dated. |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Barn at Scutts Farm, Borough Court Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Granary at Scutts Farm, Borough Court Road;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Barn, Searles Lane;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Searles Farmhouse, Searles Lane;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>St. John’s Church;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>War Memorial; (noted as the Nateley Scures memorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Hook Plough;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Hook Mosaic;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sedges (sculpture), Holt Park;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Boundary Stone between Nately Scures and New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Old School House, Old School Road; (which building is this?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Old White Hart, London Road;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Malthouse Cottages, London Road; (Malthouse Cottages, The Street North Warnborough already on local list) 1 to 2 Malthouse Cottages Greywell (are statutory listed at grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Wellbeing, Sport and Leisure HK14</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment sites within Hook Parish Policy HK15</td>
<td><strong>Consistency with national policy and Submitted local Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Submitted Local Plan identifies Bartley Wood as a Strategic Employment Site protected for B class employment uses. The new Article 4 Direction means that to change the use of the site, a planning application will need to be submitted rather than given assumed consent under the Prior Approval process. Para 12.3 needs rewording to clarify the process of protecting employment land at Bartley Wood.</td>
<td>Supporting text included to refer to this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy HK15 does not conform to NPPF guidance which seeks to support economic growth or Submitted Local Plan policies ED1 and ED2 which seek to retain these employment areas to meet future employment needs. The Policy does not seem to be consistent with the Plan’s objective to maintain and improve Hook’s role as an employment centre.

Figure 12.1.1 should be re-titled Strategic and Locally Important Employment Sites as the Submitted Local Plan designates Murrell Green Business Park as a Locally Important Employment Site.

Object to Policy HK15 as it supports the loss of employment floorspace in the circumstances set out in criteria a)-c). This is contrary to Submitted Plan Policy ED2. Both Strategic and Locally Important Employment Sites are part of the employment land supply identified to meet future employment needs within the Functional Employment Area (includes Surrey Heath and Rushmoor councils as well as Hart).

HK15 is seeking to protect (subject to a range of criteria) small employment locations within Hook Village, none of which are within Strategic or Locally Significant employment sites. This has been made more clear in the policy and therefore no conflicts should remain.

Done
Bartley Wood, Bartley Point and Osborn Way are Strategic Employment Sites protected for employment use and small-scale complementary uses.

Murrell Green Business Park is designated as a Locally Important Employment Site under Policy ED2 and a proposal for a change of use needs to demonstrate its unsuitability for employment use against the policy criteria. The criteria in Policy HK15 are not consistent with those in Policy ED2.

Policy HK15 does not conform with national guidance or Policy ED1 or Policy ED2. Criteria are not consistent with saved policies URB7 or URB6 though these policies will be superseded when the Submitted Plan is adopted.

**Appendix 2**

It is not clear what the purpose or value of this list is which will date over the life of the Plan. These sites are not specifically being allocated and this list has no weight in decision making. It might be clearer to clearly date this list, identify those with planning permission, those with a planning application and others.

Appendix has been dated and text added to set out its purpose.
| Habitat Regulation Assessment | There is no reference in the Plan to the Habitat Regulation Screening. This concluded, based on a draft version of the neighbourhood plan that a full Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) was not required. | Hart District Council as the competent authority have been asked to provide advice and complete a new screening if one is necessary. |