



*Basingstoke
and Deane*



Tadley District Centre and Employment Area Development Brief

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Public Consultation Statement of Compliance

November 2007



CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Introduction	2
2. Purpose of the Development Brief – Supplementary Planning Document	3
3. Initial Consultation	3
4. SA Scoping Report consultation	4
5. Issues and Options consultation	5
6. Formal consultation on the Draft Development Brief (SPD) and Sustainability Appraisal	6
7. Summary	8

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Representations in relation to SA Scoping Report
- Appendix 2: Representations in relation to Issues and Options consultation
- Appendix 3: Formal Notice
- Appendix 4: Notice
- Appendix 5: Representations in relation to Draft Development Brief
- Appendix 6: Representations in relation to Sustainability Appraisal

1. Introduction

- 1.0** In line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Regulations and Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) 'Creating Local Development Frameworks', the Council is required to prepare a Statement of Compliance upon the submission of each Local Development Document (LDD).
- 1.1** The Statement of Compliance states how the arrangements for public consultation have met the requirements of both the Regulations and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- 1.2** The SCI, sets out the Council's proposed standards in relation to informing and consulting the community in the preparation of all Local Development Documents (LDDs). It aims to ensure that all sections of the community and other interested parties have the opportunity to get involved from the earliest stages of planning policy preparation.
- 1.3** This Statement of Compliance sets out details of the public consultation undertaken by the Council in the preparation of the Tadley District Centre and Employment Area Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It sets out:
- i) the names of any person whom the authority has consulted in connection with the SPD;
 - ii) how those persons were consulted with;
 - iii) a summary of the main issues raised in the consultations;
 - iv) how the issues raised have been addressed within the SPD

2. Purpose of the Development Brief - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

2.1 The SPD aims to provide planning guidance for any new proposals regarding the opportunities for a mixed-use development including an enhanced District Centre.

2.2 It provides the background and justification for the Policy D3.16 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan (1996-2011) and will be a material consideration in determining planning applications for the site.

3. Initial Consultation

3.1 Previous consultation on the emerging SPD and SA has included the following:

- i) Consultation on the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal
- ii) Consultation on the Draft Issues and Options

3.2 Both the SA Scoping Report and the Issues and Options Paper were available for public consultation between 13 November 2006 and 18 December 2006.

4. SA Scoping Report consultation

- 4.1** The Scoping Report forms the first stage in the production of the Sustainability Appraisal for the SPD. The Sustainability Appraisal provides an assessment of the economic, social and environmental effects that are likely to arise from implementation of the SPD.
- 4.2** The aim of the Scoping Report was to ensure that the relevant sustainability issues are considered in the production of the draft Development Brief (SPD).
- 4.3** The Scoping Report was sent to the then four statutory consultees (Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency) and key local stakeholders on the 13 November 2006. 7 responses were received. Appendix 1 outlines who responded, the main issues raised and the Council's response.
- 4.4** Responses have been worked in the Sustainability Appraisal.

5. Issues and Options Paper consultation

District Centre.

5.1 The Issues and Options document sought to clarify the issues that should be addressed within the draft Development Brief (SPD). It set out a series of questions relating to the implementation of the allocation under Policy D3.16 in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan (1996-2011).

5.2 Consultation letters were sent to residents and businesses within the allocation site and District Centre boundary as well as other relevant key stakeholders in the area. Tadley Town Council, Pamber and Baughurst Parish Council as well as neighbouring local planning authorities and statutory bodies were consulted. An article was placed in local newspapers, notices were sent to Parish and Town Councils to be put up on their boards, a notice was also placed at the Sainsbury's supermarket. Hard copies of the consultation material were available at Tadley Town Council, the public Library in Tadley and Council offices. Information including a questionnaire was available on the Council's website.

5.3 Following the end of the consultation period on the Issues and Options document, 26 responses were received. Key findings from this consultation exercise have been identified as follows:

- General support in the area for further provision of comparison goods
- General support that some larger industry and warehouses would best be placed elsewhere
- General support for the retention of employment uses
- General support of provision of local community facilities, such as dental practice, GP surgery, Youth facilities
- The option to locate further retail uses along Mulfords Hill to create a stronger retail frontage to the District Centre and provide a better link to the existing shops along Mulfords Hill was favoured, followed by the option to concentrate retail uses around an expanded supermarket to create a new vibrant

- In terms of housing location Option 1 was favoured “to locate new housing adjacent to existing residential areas following the relocation of existing commercial buildings”, followed by Option 2 “to allow further housing as infill development or residential use above new shops/uses within the District Centre”.
- General support to keep employment on the Brick Kiln Yard site
- Need for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists
- Lack of support for One-Way system
- The availability of parking spaces seems to be a problem at times
- General support for an enhanced public focal space

5.4 Appendix 2 outlines who responded, the main issues raised and the Council's response.

6. Formal consultation on the Draft Development Brief (SPD) and Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.1** Basingstoke and Deane's Statement of Community Involvement sets out a list of statutory bodies specified by the Regulations and Government Guidance, that should be consulted in the preparation of LDDs.
- 6.2** Consultation letters on the Draft Development Brief (SPD) and SA were sent to the following:
- Specific and general consultation bodies which includes the statutory consultees, Government Agencies, adjacent local authorities and utilities
 - Town and Parish Councils in and adjoining the Borough
 - Ward Members for Tadley, Baughurst and Pamber, as well as County Council Member for Tadley and Baughurst
 - Those who made representations to Policy D3.16 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan (1996-2011) during the Local Plan Review
- Those who responded to the Issues and Options paper consultation
- Local Strategic Partnership including sub-groups and network partners
- Land owners and other groups and organisations with a potential interest in the site
- Residents and businesses who live/carry out business on the allocation site plus within an area of 150 metres of the allocation site
- Residents and businesses within the District Centre boundary
- 6.3** Prior to the public consultation exercise the Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder and the Head of Planning and Transport, met with representatives of Tadley Town Council on 12 March 2007.
- 6.4** Formal public consultation on the Draft Development Brief (SPD) and SA took place between 11 June and 23 July 2007. Copies of the draft Development Brief (SPD), Sustainability Appraisal and Consultation Statement were sent to specific and general consultation bodies and made available for public inspection at the following locations:
- **Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council** Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke
 - **Tadley Town Council**
2 Franklin Avenue, Tadley
 - **Tadley Library**
Mulfords Hill, Tadley RG26 3JE
- 6.5** A copy of the draft Development Brief (SPD), Sustainability Appraisal and Consultation Statement was also available on the Council's website at www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning/localplan/spd.htm

6.6 A formal notice (see Appendix 3) of public consultation was published in the following local newspapers:

- Basingstoke Gazette
- Basingstoke Observer
- Newbury Weekly News

6.7 Notices (see Appendix 4) were placed on Town and Parish Council notice boards in Tadley, Baughurst and Pamber area.

6.8 Information in relation to the public exhibition and consultation exercise was published in:

- Tadley Town Council Newsletter, which was distributed at the end of May 2007 to residents in Tadley
- Tadley Today (Free Local Magazine)
- Tadley Town Directory

6.9 The Borough Council held a public exhibition from 30 June to 6 July 2007 at the Public Library, Mulfords Hill, Tadley. Planning officers were present on Saturday 30 June to answer any questions and Comments Forms were made available.

6.10 During the 6-week consultation period officers met with:

- Representatives of Tadley Town Council and elected members on 11 June 2007
- Representatives of Baughurst Parish Council and elected members on 21 June 2007
- Representatives of Pamber Parish Council and elected members on 9 July 2007
- Representatives of the Tadley Chamber of Trade (Roundabout) on 10 July 2007

6.11 Following the end of the consultation period, 28 responses were received. Key findings from this consultation exercise have been identified as follows:

- General support of the six main objectives of the Development Brief
- General support of an enhanced public focal space
- General support for addition retail outlets and a stronger retail frontage which would better link to existing shops along Mulfords Hill
- Some opposition against proposed retail units to the north of Sainsbury's supermarket adjacent to back gardens
- General support for offices and light industry. However employment element should be kept separate from housing
- In terms of the long term vision for Tadley District Centre, could consideration be given to include land in West Berkshire (Saunders Field) for an extended District Centre

- Access to the site and parking requirement needs to be assessed.
- Consider transport plans for the area and how this links to the site
- Sewerage problems in the area
- Problems with Youth on the site, need for Youth facility

6.12 In addition the following comments were made by visitors to the public exhibition held at the Tadley Library:

- Suggestion for a bus lay-by along Mulfords Hill as buses sometimes cause congestion along the A340 when passengers boarding.
- Residents along Silchester Road objected to the proposed retail units along their back gardens.
- Some people questioned the need for more retail units and their viability as most people do their shopping elsewhere. Others would like to see more shops in the District Centre.

- AWE provides Leisure/Recreation facilities on their site but there are plans to withdraw these facilities which would leave a big hole for residents in Tadley. To compensate for the loss it was suggested to provide sports facilities on the allocation site.

- Concerns about inadequate infrastructure i.e. sewerage problems new development would have.

- Concerns about car parking provision. At times the existing car park at Sainsbury's is at capacity. Where would all the new parking space go?

- Problems with Youth in the area, they cause nuisance to residence and visitors.

6.13 The table in Appendix 5 outlines the comments made by those that responded to the Draft Development Brief the Council's response and how comments have been incorporated into the final Development Brief (SPD).

6.14 The table in Appendix 6 list the comments made by those that responded to the Sustainability Appraisal, the Council's response and how comments have been incorporated into the final Sustainability Appraisal report. 1

7. Summary

7.1 This statement demonstrates that the public consultation undertaken to date, by the Council, on the Development Brief (SPD), has met the Government requirement for consultation on SPDs as set out in Regulation 17 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

7.2 The Development Brief (SPD) has also followed the Council's standards for community involvement as set out on page 15 of the submission draft SCI.

Appendix 1 – Representations in relation to the SA Scoping Report

Issue	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
Conformity with RPG9	SEERA	No comments to make relating to this document. However, SPDs should be in general conformity with the current RPG9 and also take into account the emerging Draft SE Plan, Part I	Comments noted. The SPD is in conformity with RPG9 and the emerging Draft SE Plan
Land contamination, flood risk Sustainable drainage and water conservation	Environment Agency	Suggested to include key issues such as land contamination or flood risk and to add the wording “environmental enhancements” to on of the objectives. Sustainable drainage and water conservation should also be promoted as part of the sustainability of the development, and a Site Waste Management Plan be drawn up for this development.	These comments have been addressed in the production of the SA and also draft Development Brief (SPD)
Design codes and sustainable construction. Potential impacts of this allocation on Tadley Common	Natural England	Recommendation of design codes and sustainable construction policies. Reference should be made to PPS9 and Local Biodiversity Action Plan objectives. Potential impacts of this allocation on Tadley Common should be a key part of the SA/SEA.	These comments have been addressed in the production of the SA and also draft Development Brief (SPD)
New development needs to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands & take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure	Thames Water	The comments were in relation to the infrastructure new development demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.	Comments noted, have been addressed in the production of the SA and Draft Development Brief (SPD) and SA
Q1. Are the policies/plans/ programmes/ strategies/ initiatives that have been reviewed appropriate?	Mr & Mrs Cull	Concerned that proposed development will be squeezed in on top of what is already there.	The mix of uses including the residential element of 40 units has been approved through the Local Plan process and will help to achieve a more sustainable development.

Issue	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
Q2. Do you know of any further baseline indicators that might provide useful information?		I do not have further baseline indicators to offer. However, from the information provided it seems that there is a need for more development at the higher end of the property scale. Disagree that any new development should focus on “small unit” dwellings and affordable housing.	Comments noted. The provision of a variety of housing types and sizes will have a positive effect on the local economy in terms of meeting the housing needs of a range of income positions and therefore assisting in addressing recruitment and retention difficulties as well as potentially attracting future inward investment.
Q3. Are the key sustainability issues identified the correct ones?		Keeping all the industrial units does not make any space for the new development. Move all the industry to an alternative site and make room for a proper development.	Comments noted. Employment opportunities can be integrated within the new development and should not be lost for residents in Tadley.
Q1. Are the policies/plans/ programmes/ strategies/ initiatives that have been reviewed appropriate?	Baughurst Parish Council	Support the policies/ plans/ programmes / strategies / initiatives that have been reviewed	Supportive comments noted
Traffic issues and community facilities	Jon London, Tadley	Lack of cycle lanes	Comments noted - have been addressed in the production of the SA and Draft Development Brief (SPD) and SA
		Traffic lights. This will not enhance the area. This will deter people from using the A340 and the Silchester Road and will drive traffic down the alternative routes through Tadley to avoid the lights.	Comments noted. Any transport related issues have to be dealt with by a Transport Assessment and Hampshire County Council Highways Department
		Insufficient 24hr security measures.	Comments noted, have been addressed in the production of the Draft Development Brief (SPD) and SA
		The development does not enhance the community. The concept of a flexible community area is poorly conceived, ad hoc to the plan and a token to the community. There are no concrete plans of how to integrate this area eg classical concerts, book fairs, Amateur Dramatic Productions, local Brass Bands, registered buskers etc.	

Appendix 2 – Representations in relation to the Issues and Options Paper

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
1: What type of retail uses should be provided?	<p>1: Provide for more comparison goods shopping</p> <p>2: Provide for more convenience goods shopping</p> <p>3: Provide for additional food and drink establishments</p> <p>4: Provide for additional DIY or other type of retail warehouses?</p> <p>Q1: which of these options do you support and why?</p>	<p>Tadley Town Council</p> <p>Baughurst Parish Council</p> <p>Pamber Parish Council</p> <p>Aldermaston Parish Council</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Lakeside Garden Centre</p> <p>Mrs Hicks</p> <p>N G Williamson</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Armstrong</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p> <p>Mrs H Newton</p> <p>Mr & Mrs O'Donnell</p> <p>Mr J Newton</p> <p>Mrs S Newton</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Hill</p> <p>Mr M.E. Williams</p>	<p>Option 1 was favoured (10 respondents), especially a shoe & clothes shop was considered to be needed in Tadley.</p> <p>This was followed by Option 3a (4 respondents) .</p> <p>2 respondents supported Option 3a (restaurants & bars).</p> <p>1 respondent did not support any of the Options.</p> <p>In general it was considered that there was no need for more convenience goods shopping, which was Option 2.</p>	Comments noted
	Q2: do you think Tadley can support additional retail outlets?	<p>Tadley Town Council</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Baughurst Parish Council</p> <p>Pamber Parish Council</p> <p>Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley</p> <p>Lakeside Garden Centre</p> <p>Mrs Hicks</p> <p>N G Williamson</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Armstrong</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p>	<p>10 respondents supported additional retail outlets. However, 4 of the 10 respondents felt that additional retail outlets could only survive in form of specialist shops.</p> <p>3 respondents would welcome another supermarket to stimulate competition</p> <p>3 respondents did not support additional retail units.</p>	<p>Comments noted - has been addressed in the Draft Development Brief (SPD) by proposing additional retail units to the north of the supermarket</p> <p>The provision of a further supermarket could not be supported</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M.E. Williams		
2: What type and amount of employment should be provided on the site to provide a sufficient range of opportunities for local people?	1: Employment uses should remain in the form of offices / light industry, general industrial premises and warehouse uses. Q1: what is the right proportion of different employment uses?	Tadley Town Council RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey Baughurst Parish Council Pamber Parish Council Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M.E. Williams	Whilst some would like to see no changes to the current employment situation others found offices and light industry acceptable on the site but would place warehouses or larger industry elsewhere. This was contradicted by the view to transform the site into a vibrant district centre and only have retail and office uses within a new development. RPS was of the view that the Industrial Yard may no longer be the best location for employment uses given the surrounding land uses	It is agreed that where possible larger industry or warehouses would best be placed elsewhere and that the SPD should encourage employment uses which would compliment the location and enhancement of the district centre. The SPD refers to the need for any evidence to be submitted in any development proposals which substantiate the comments expressed by RPS to enable a balanced view to be taken on the future of the employment site in accordance with Local Plan Policy.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q2: should any of the business premises be retained?	Baughurst Parish Council Pamber Parish Council RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M.E. Williams	<p>The majority (6 respondents) would like to see the business premises retained as they offer good employment for many local people.</p> <p>Only 3 respondents would not retain the existing businesses premises and would relocate them elsewhere.</p> <p>One respondent felt that only Tadley Engineers (Corner A340 and Silchester Road) should be retained as it is well away from main site facilities. Another respondent felt that car servicing should be retained.</p> <p>RPS was of the view that the Dev. Brief should not identify particular businesses which should be retained on site as this is too specific & does not enable the use to respond to market demand.</p>	<p>Comments noted – in accordance with Local Plan Policy EC4</p> <p>The SPD will not refer to specific business retention as it is outside the scope of the document.</p>
	2: employment uses should be in form of a mixture such as offices incl. financial & professional services and other community uses. live/work units may also be acceptable. Q1: which of these options do you support and why?	Pamber Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey	<p>The majority (7) of respondents supported Option 2.</p> <p>The acceptable employment use is unclear. Given the nature of the site and surrounding land use it is evident that heavy, noisy industrial use is not compatible and offices</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. It is agreed that heavy, noisy industrial use is not compatible. The SPD will encourage offices and light industrial / warehouse uses (B1 and B8 Use Classes)</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		<p>N G Williamson</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p> <p>Mr M.E. Williams</p>	<p>Live/work units are untried locally and may work subject to affordable rents.</p> <p>I favour no development at all, keeping things exactly as they are now. There is no room for Sainsbury's expansion, 40 new dwelling, live/work units and additional parking, would be squeezed in.</p> <p>Live/work units are a non starter. The New Road development has many such properties and there is only 1 that was ever used as a business base.</p> <p>Industrial units should be confined to north of Silchester Road and Youngs opposite AWE on A340.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is likely that the nature of the area will change with regard to the principle land owner intentions. The SPD will provide planning guidance to enable appropriate development to take place in the future.</p> <p>Comments noted. Live work units offer the flexibility for home working within the residential environment which may become more prevalent in the future.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Q2. Are there any other types of employment that should be provided on the site?</p>	<p>N G Williamson</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p>	<p>This should be answered when the final details of the Boundary Hall site are finalised. Local employment opportunities may be satisfied dependant upon the type of business allowed on the site.</p> <p>Keep things exactly as they are now</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. It is likely that the nature of the area will change with regard to the principle land owner intentions. The SPD will provide planning guidance to enable appropriate development to take place in the future.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Mr T Margetts	There should be facilities available in Tadley and could be either on Mulfords Hill or Boundary Hall site.	Comments noted
		Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	Unsure - don't think so	Comments noted
		Mr & Mrs Hill	None	Comments noted
		Mr M.E. Williams	Cleaning & Maintenance staff to ensure site is kept clear of litter and to maintain facilities, shrubs & trees.	Comments noted
3: Are there any facilities or types of development needed to support the community within the Tadley area that could be provided on this site?	Q1: what other facilities are needed to support the community within the tadley area?	Tadley Town Council Pamber Parish Council Baughurst Parish Council Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M. E. Williams	4 respondents identified the lack of a dental practice as well as the lack of Youth facilities. 2 respondents felt that local GPs are overcrowded and would like to see a GP surgery. 2 respondents would like to see a decent central area including a farmers market. 4 respondents felt that Tadley is well supplied with services and facilities. 1 respondent would like to see a country clothing/equestrian shop. 1 respondent suggested to move the PO to the site.	There is an opportunity to consider relocation/provision of local community facilities subject to agreement with the principle parties. The SPD will refer to this option to enable any initiatives to be pursued. The SPD will refer to the opportunity to enhance the public area near the frontage to Mulfords Hill to enable a number of markets / seasonal uses to take place.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey	The Inspectors Report concluded there is no proven need for a community use. Therefore, there is no need for re-examination of the most appropriate uses. Development will have to have regard to PPS6	Whilst the Inspector saw no reason to formally allocate land for community purposes – the SPD identifies the opportunity that may arise to accommodate such uses as a dental / doctors surgery within the district centre as part of proposed development.
4: Where should retail uses be located?	<p>1: Retail uses should be concentrated around an expanded supermarket to create a new vibrant District Centre.</p> <p>2: Further retail uses along Mulfords Hill (within the DC boundary) to create a stronger retail frontage to the District Centre and provide a better link to the existing shops along Mulfords Hill</p> <p>3: Extension of the existing supermarket mainly to the front?</p> <p>Q1: which of these options do you support and why?</p>	<p>Tadley Town Council Pamber Parish Council Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M. E. Williams</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Tudor Dry Cleaners</p>	<p>Option 2 was favoured by 7 respondents. Followed by Option 1 (5 respondents) and Option 3 (2 respondents). 2 respondents did not support any option. 1 respondent did not support expansion of the supermarket as there is not sufficient car parking</p> <p>Retail uses should be located within the DC. The location of retail should not be identified on any plan. Retail units to the eastern part are inappropriate at this stage. Ext. should be to the front.</p> <p>The existing shops have been disjointed from the remainder of the shops on Mulfords Hill. I support any move that enables the DC to be reconnected and enables it to be a vibrant & viable retail centre.</p>	<p>The SPD will refer to both the opportunity to provide additional retail along Mulfords Hill and around an expanded supermarket.</p> <p>Comments noted. The SPD shows indicative ideas for the location of any additional retail which could enhance the district centre status.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Mr J Newton Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley	I would hope that any new development would be one with character and am reluctant to have Sainsbury's as the focus of it. Would opt for a square as opposed to a retail frontage. Sainsbury's should not be developed to the front, in fact to the contrary.	Comments noted. Comments noted.
	Q2: are there alternative locations for retail that you would support?	Baughurst Parish Council Pamber Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M. W. Williams Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mrs S Newton Mr J Newton Mrs Hicks Mr & Mrs Cull	6 respondents did not think that there are alternative locations for retail. 3 respondents suggested the Boundary Hall site 1 respondent suggested the Valentines Wood site 1 respondent suggested the 'Tyre place' Would like to see a paper shop etc. up by Anderson Motors. I can't think of any. Will continue to go to bigger centres for shopping other than groceries and basic DIY	Comments noted. Comments noted. Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
Issue 5: Where should housing be located?	<p>1: Locate new housing adjacent to existing residential areas following the relocation of existing commercial buildings.</p> <p>2: Allow further housing as infill development or residential use above new shops / uses within the District Centre.</p> <p>Q1: which of these options do you support and why?</p>	Tadley Town Council	Option 1 was favoured by 8 respondents.	<p>Comments noted. Either option is viable. The SPD refers to the local plan allocation of 40 units which can be accommodated in a number of ways including apartments above additional retail units which would add to the vitality of the district centre. The housing mix would need to comply with the Council's policy guidance.</p> <p>Any additional parking requirement would need to be accommodated.</p>
		Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre	3 respondents supported Option 2	
		Mrs Hicks		
		N G Williamson		
		Mr T Margetts		
Mr J Newton				
Mrs S Newton				
Mr & Mrs Hill				
Mr M. W. Williams				
		RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey	In general residential would be best located next to existing residential. Planning permission was granted for residential units along Silchester Rd, it is unlikely that this area will be redeveloped	
		Mr & Mrs Cull	Do not support the need for smaller dwellings and affordable housing. May be true for the Borough but not for Tadley. Focus should be at the higher end of the property scale.	
		Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	There should be no additional housing in the centre of Tadley with the possible exception of flats over new retail outlets. Parking is at capacity additional housing would only exacerbate this.	
		Mr & Mrs Armstrong	Tadley does not need any more housing. It urgently needs this District Centre to occupy most of the site	

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q. 2 which alternative locations for residential do you support?	Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr T Margetts Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M.E. Williams	4 respondents suggested the Boundary Hall site 1 respondent suggested Valentines Wood site 4 respondents could not think of any alternative locations for residential	The provision of residential would be in the district centre employment area and additional to the Boundary Hall allocation.
	Q. 3: do you have any other ideas for locating residential development within the district centre/ employment area?	Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr & Mrs Hill N G Williamson Mr T Margetts Mr M. E. Williams	If residential area is kept separate, the retail area could be isolated at night and policed accordingly No This will be dependant on the make up of residential units allowed on the Boundary Hall site Not suitable above shops in the centre. A second storey would best be used for offices.	Comments noted. The vitality of the district centre and security would be enhanced by location residential above / adjacent to any retail provision. Comments noted. Comments noted. Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
Issue 6: Where should employment uses be located?	1: Keep employment on the Stacey's Yard site.	Tadley Town Council Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre	Option 1 was favoured by 6 respondents.	Comments noted.
	2: Concentrate employment uses in an alternative position within the overall site, such as the north of the site, along Silchester Road.	Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	Followed by Option 2 (5 respondents) and Option 3 (2 respondents)	Comments noted.
	3: Locate employment uses at the north-west corner of the site with housing provided elsewhere on the site.	Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill		
	Q. 1: which of these options do you support and why?	RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey Barton Willmore, on behalf of Sovereign Housing Association and the landowner Mr M. E. Williams	It is unclear whether the site is suitable/viable for employment use. Due to land ownership constraints it should not be specified for particular uses. Support in general the relocation of employment uses away from existing residential properties, and for these areas of the site to be redeveloped with new residential uses No industrial units other than the Tadley Engineering Co. I would like to see offices, shops & community facilities in the existing car park area, to right of front car park and to rear of Sainsbury's new extension.	Comments noted. It is necessary to refer to the Local Plan policies in the SPD which seek the retention of employment uses in such circumstances. Comments noted. Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q. 2: are there any alternative locations for employment that you would support?	<p>Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mr M. E. Williams</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p>	<p>5 respondents could not think of an alternative location for employment.</p> <p>1 respondent suggested the Boundary Hall site</p> <p>1 respondent suggested the Valentines Wood site</p> <p>Whitehouse farm is a more suitable site for employment (despite in WestBerks it is within 800m of the site). Also the Boundary Hall site may provide a better location for employment use</p> <p>The old Tadley market site 1/2 mile away would seem to be an option. Or land at the roundabout with Soke Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Boundary Hall has an allocation for some mixed-use employment.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Whilst Whitehouse Farm is an additional employment site, a sustainability case has not been made that it should be seen as an alternative employment site to Mulfords Hill.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
Issue 7: Transport and Parking	Q. 1: is there a need for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists?	<p>Tadley Town Council Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Aldermaston Parish Council Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M.E. Williams</p>	<p>The majority (10) of respondents felt that there is need for improvements and suggested more cycle lanes, covered walkways, improved pedestrian and disabled access or to move the Zebra crossing on A340</p> <p>Only 3 respondents were of the view that there is no need for improvements.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		<p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Tudor Dry Cleaners</p>	<p>Cycle parking stands, safe & clear routes through the site should be provided, but does not mean that separate cycle routes should be created as this would occupy valuable space on the site.</p> <p>Development needs to ensure that connectivity throughout the site and to the remainder of the DC is easily accessible for pedestrians & vehicles.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Q 2: if yes, what improvements would you like to see?</p>	<p>Tadley Town Council</p> <p>Baughurst Parish Council</p> <p>Lakeside Garden Centre N G Williamson Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton</p> <p>Mr T Margetts Mr M. E. Williams</p>	<p>The provision of a bus stop adjacent to the site would be welcomed. The provision of travel links to Mortimer, Bramley & Aldermaston train station needs to be investigated.</p> <p>Wider pavements. Pedestrian areas with no vehicles. A separate cycle lane no exit onto A340</p> <p>The following improvements were suggested: Make crossing safer More cycle parking Connecting cycle lanes</p> <p>To create a bus-only lay-by where the crossing is at present in order to allow a better flow of traffic on the A340.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any future development proposals would require a Transport Appraisal to look at these issues.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q 3: would you support a one-way system?	<p>Tadley Town Council Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks Mr & Mrs Cull Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts RPS Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr & Mrs Hill Mr M. E. Williams</p> <p>Tudor Dry Cleaners</p> <p>Mr J Newton</p> <p>N G Williamson</p>	<p>The majority of respondents (7) did not support a one-way system. Some were concerned that it would put too much pressure on the junction at Silchester Road.</p> <p>3 respondents supported a one-way system. 1 respondent would possibly support a one-way system.</p> <p>Do not support one-way system with short stay parking further away. The short stay parking spaces need to be closer to stores. A One-way system will also increase pressure on the jct. at Silchester Rd</p> <p>I would support a ring road and would suggest upgrading the road that runs along the centre & south of Tadley to the golf course and Hurst School</p> <p>Yes - but this would be subject to apportionment of residential to commercial on site to access the impact on both entrance/exits</p>	<p>The SPD will refer to the need for development proposals to be supported by a Transport Appraisal including an assessment of the best access arrangements.</p> <p>Comments noted. Refer above.</p> <p>Comments noted. Refer above.</p> <p>Comments noted. Refer above.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		<p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p> <p>Mr M. E. Williams</p>	<p>The car park layout will be determined by any development proposal for the site & will be guided by parking standards. It is not an option. This could be an option if a Masterplan could be proposed.</p> <p>The current car park is at capacity at times. Car park will need to be expanded if the store is expanded.</p> <p>Not if the number of car parking spaces were to be reduced</p> <p>Should be completely re-sited away from pedestrian areas</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Any development proposals would require a Transport Appraisal and provision made for any additional car parking.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
	Q 6: if yes, how should it be re-organised?	<p>Lakeside Garden Centre N G Williamson Mr T Margetts Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr M. E. Williams</p>	<p>Across the responses received it was felt that the existing car park is at capacity at peak hours.</p> <p>2 respondents suggested more short stay parking.</p> <p>2 respondents suggested moving or extending parking to the rear of the supermarket.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any development proposals would require a Transport Appraisal and provision made for any additional car parking.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	
Issue 8: What is the right scale of development?	1: To keep the overall building height of up to two storeys. 2: To increase the building height to three storeys or more in prominent locations to act as landmark buildings and make best use of available building land or along the main road to create a more attractive edge. Q 1: which of these options do you support and why?	Baughurst Parish Council RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's and Stacey Barton Wilmore on behalf of Sovereign Housing Association and the landowner	7 respondents supported Option 2. However 2 of which stated that buildings should be no more than 3 storeys and kept to a minimum. 5 respondents supported Option 1.	Comments noted. The impact of any design would need to be judged on its merits – however the principles of good design will be included in the SPD.	
		Lakeside Garden Centre Mr & Mrs Cull Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton			
		Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill			
		Tadley Town Council	No building should overpower existing buildings adjacent to the site.		Comments noted. As above.
		Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley	Great care should be taken when considering the building height. There may be certain circumstances where 3 storeys might be acceptable, but in the main we should stick to 2-storey buildings.		Comments noted. As above.
N G Williamson	No specific opinion other than a quality of design	Comments noted.			
Mr M. E. Williams	Neither. Preferably shops/offices could be 1 or 2 storeys but housing possibly apartment block/s could be 3 storeys if sited away from the main facilities at the rear of the proposed car park.	Comments noted.			

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q 2: are there any alternative scales of development you would suggest?	Mr & Mrs Cull Mr T Margetts Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr & Mrs Armstrong Lakeside Garden Centre N G Williamson	3 respondents could not think of any alternative scales of development. 1 respondent suggested a covered shopping mall More housing on the outskirts of Tadley rather than in the Centre Graduation of scales i.e. set backs or variation in storey heights	
Issue 9: Public open space?	1: The existing open space, incl. part or all of the parking area in front of the supermarket, could with an extension to the supermarket towards Mulfords Hill be turned into a pleasant open space with public seating, landscaping and outdoor seating for a café. The café could be integrated within the supermarket. A landscaped zone should provide a buffer between the open space and the busy main road. Q 1: do you support the suggested option?	Tadley Town Council Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre Mrs Hicks N G Williamson Mr & Mrs Armstrong Mr T Margetts Mrs H Newton Mr & Mrs O'Donnell Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr & Mrs Hill RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey	11 respondents supported the suggested option. Only 1 respondent did not. The existing amenity area has no value to the site. A public realm area should be provided, but the size, location & type should not be restricted. It should not be essential to provide an open space.	Comments noted. Comments noted. The SPD refers to the opportunity to enhance the public open space on the frontage to Mulfords Hill. Any development proposals will need to be considered on their merits but without the presumption suggested.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		<p>Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p> <p>Tudor Dry Cleaners</p> <p>Mr M. E. Williams</p>	<p>Parking to the front of the supermarket should be abolished to transform the area into an attractive public space which could be used as Remembrance day, for Tadley Brass Band to play & French market.</p> <p>The current open space is occupied at night by youth, this can be a nuisance. Until this problem is addressed I am not interested in having a larger area that is likely to result in an amplification.</p> <p>The existing open space area adds no value to the area. If this is replaced it needs to be flexible, attractive in its appearance and is a place where people want to meet.</p> <p>Not exactly. The whole of the car park to the front should go & the public space extended right across to the library & between Sainsbury's and proposed new shops/offices/ community units.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Q 2: do you support the need for an enhanced public focal space?</p>	<p>Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre</p> <p>Mrs Hicks</p> <p>N G Williamson</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Cull</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Armstrong</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p> <p>Mrs H Newton</p> <p>Mr & Mrs O'Donnell</p>	<p>12 respondents supported the need for an enhanced public focal space.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		<p>Mr J Newton Mrs S Newton Mr M E Williams</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey</p>	<p>It is agree that there is a need for an enhanced public focal point on the site. Sainsbury's / Stacey's are proposing to provide a flexible open space area to the front of the site</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Q 3: where would be the best location for a public open space?</p>	<p>Baughurst Parish Council</p> <p>RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey</p> <p>Mr M E Williams</p> <p>Mr T Margetts</p>	<p>Abutting the highway</p> <p>This should not be specified</p> <p>The whole of the car park to the front should go & the public space extended right across to the library & between Sainsbury's and proposed new shops/offices/community units</p> <p>Where the library is located. Demolish the library and move it to the north 25m. Make a landscaped area that can have the War Memorial within it so that the town can remember in November</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. The SPD suggests a design option which would enhance the Mulfords Hill frontage and the status of the district centre.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
Issue 10: Design	<p>Option: Gateways/landmarks could be created at the entrances to the site. The existing library together with an enhanced entrance to the supermarket could make a strong design statement and emphasise the sense of place. At the Silchester Road, entrance, adjoining buildings could be designed to mark the entrance.</p> <p>Q 1: do you support the location of landmark buildings indicated in the map?</p>	Tadley Town Council	5 respondents supported the location of landmark building indicated in the Plan. However did not favour enhanced Sainsbury's entrance.	Comments noted.
		Baughurst Parish Council Lakeside Garden Centre	5 respondents did not support the location of landmark buildings indicated in the Plan.	
		Mrs Hicks		
		N G Williamson		
		Mr & Mrs Cull		
Mr & Mrs Armstrong				
Mr T Margetts				
Mr J Newton				
Mr & Mrs Hill				
		RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey	The location of any landmark feature will determined by any development proposals put forward for the site. Landmark features should be encouraged where possible as they give an identity to a place.	Comments noted.
		Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley	The enhanced Sainsbury's entrance (p.29) was not greeted with enthusiasm. This would dominate rather than enhance the overall town centre. Flat roofs should be avoided at all costs.	Comments noted.
		Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	Not on Silchester Road as it is behind the centre and would offer no visual advantage.	Comments noted.
		Mr M E Williams	Do not need Sainsbury's or Library as landmark building. The proposed Clock Tower, Gateways & mature trees would be a sufficient landmark. Do not want to see the enhanced Sainsbury's entrance.	Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
	Q 2: where would be the best location for landmark buildings?	Baughurst Parish Council	Site entrances	Comments noted.
		RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey	Landmark buildings should not be specified on the plan	Comments noted.
		Lakeside Garden Centre	Maybe slightly further down Mulfords Hill. Agree with Silchester Road option.	Comments noted.
		Mrs Hicks	Near library. Silchester Road	Comments noted.
		Mr T Margetts	On A340 in the form of a Town Clock	Comments noted.
		Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	'Landmark' buildings might be desirable at certain points along Mulfords Hill to define an entrance to a central public square. For example a library, but not the existing one, is a visual monstrosity.	Comments noted.
		Mr J Newton	Where they can be seen	Comments noted.
	Q 3: are there any other aspects of design that should be included in the brief for the site?	Baughurst Parish Council	Not too much neon or bright colour	Comments noted.
		Mrs Hicks	Concerned that Tadley will lose its identity	Comments noted.
		N G Williamson	Would prefer to see a softer design statement rather than landmark buildings or enhanced entrances, as this is a rural town and close to SSSI area	Comments noted.
		Mr T Margetts	Yes, the site and the Boundary Hall site have to be considered together	Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Mr & Mrs O'Donnell	Traditional building designs & material should be employed	Comments noted.
		Mr J Newton	At all costs avoid the one size fits all town centre plan and try to make sure it is individual. Chain outlets should be avoided. A weekly market would be brilliant.	Comments noted.
		Mr M. E. Williams	Flat roofs should be avoided. Buildings should be of traditional design with pitched roofs, traditional materials but should employ energy saving technology.	Comments noted.
Other comments		Tadley Town Council N G Williamson Tadley Design Statement Group, Anne Bentley	A holistic approach needs to be adopted to the development of the Town Centre. Need to consider both Mulfords Hill and Boundary Hill sites, incl. employment use.	Comments noted.
		Aldermaston Parish Council	Have major misgivings re. the adequacy of the infrastructure to support further development, particularly the A340. The Parish Council has adopted a policy of opposing dev. that would have significant traffic impact until a Relief Road is agreed.	Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Environment Agency	Support objective to promote high quality development that meets the needs of the community in a sustainable manner, but recommend that environmental enhancements are also included. Suggest to include key issues such as land contamination or flood risk. Recommend to include reference to SUDS and a Site Waste Management Plan.	Comments noted. SPD reflects advice
		Thames Water	It is essential that the SPD makes reference to the provision of adequate sewerage infrastructure to service development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property and pollution of land and watercourses. SPD should include a section on utilities infrastructure and drainage	Comments noted. SPD reflects advice
		SEERA	No comments. However SPDs should be in conformity with RPG9 and the emerging Draft SE Plan, Part 1	Comments noted.
		Highway Agency	It is likely that an Evaluation of the Transport Impact of the proposals as a whole will be required. Suitable measures i.e. travel plans should be required. The HA would advocate a joint working approach. Maximum parking standards should be set.	Comments noted. SPD reflects advice.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Natural England	Recommend to include design codes and sustainable construction policies. This can include a number of innovative ways of increasing biodiversity through ecological designs within built areas such as SUD's schemes, native street planting, and other enhancements. "Biodiversity by Design" should provide further information or Annex: Getting environmental features into building.	Comments noted. SPD reflects advice
		RPS Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's & Stacey	Due to land ownership constraints it is impossible to specify an area which would be best located for a particular use. Concerned that the Council have opened up debate to what retail uses should be provided, mix of uses emerged from the local plan review. Adequate parking for library visitors, staff & mobile library should be available. There should be no heights restrictions for the mobile library.	The Issues an Options invited views on development mix to enable the SPD to reflect general guidance on local views to potential developers.
		Hampshire County Council		Comments noted.
		Barton Willmore on behalf of Sovereign Housing Association and the landowner	Brief supports a comprehensive approach to redevelopment. However, we see no reason why plot specific applications should not be acceptable if the individual sites can be developed without prejudice to the whole.	Comments noted.

Issue	Option	Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response
		Mrs Hicks	The proportion of disabled parking spaces does not seem to be right. There are too many disabled parking spaces.	Comments noted. Any development proposals would require a Transport Appraisal and provision made for adequate car parking for different users.
		Mr & Mrs Cull	Have major concerns about suggested one-way system. Concerned that Sainsbury's car park not being closed off at night. Also concerned about retail unit close to the back of our house due to overlooking, additional noise.	The SPD will refer to the need for development proposals to be supported by a Transport Appraisal including an assessment of the best access arrangements.
		Tudor Dry Cleaners	I generally support the planning objectives identified in the document. However, I do not agree with all the various layout option plans due to high number of land ownership. I don't think it is possible to bring forward a comprehensive scheme	Comments noted. The provision of masterplanning for the principle land ownership is encouraged in the SPD.
		Mr & Mrs Armstrong	Plans & Options well presented. Very much welcome the initiative. Grateful for opportunities to be involved	Comments noted.
		Mr J Newton	None other than hoping that something is actually done as it really is time for Tadley to change and provide its residents with the sort of town they deserve	Comments noted.
		Mr & Mrs Hull	Concerned about water and sewage impact	Comments noted

Appendix 3 – Formal Notice

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004, (Regulation 17)

Notice of intention to consult on the Draft Development Brief – Supplementary Planning Document and Sustainability Appraisal for Tadley District Centre and Employment Area

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is inviting public representations on its Draft Development Brief on the Tadley District Centre/ Employment Area which provides guidance on future development proposals. The Brief is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal Report. These documents will supplement Policy D3.16 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Adopted Local Plan, 1996-2011. The aim of the draft Development Brief is to promote and guide the development of this key District Centre site to help create and maintain an attractive and vibrant centre for Tadley and employment area. It is the Council's aim to adopt the Development Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which will be a material consideration in determining planning applications for the site.

Representations on the Draft Development Brief and Sustainability Appraisal Report can be made for a period of six-weeks between 11th June and 23th July 2007.

Copies of the draft Development Brief and related documents will be available to view at the Borough Council offices in Parklands Reception, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Monday to Thursday 8.30am to 5.00pm and Friday 8.30 to 4.30pm

These documents can also be viewed and downloaded from the Council's website at www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning/localplan/spd.htm and they can be made available in other formats on request.

Copies will also be available to view during normal office hours at:

- Tadley Town Council, 2 Franklin Avenue, Tadley
- Public Library, Mulfords Hill, Tadley

Anyone who submits a representation can request that they are subsequently notified of the adoption of the SPD.

Representations should be made by 5pm on Monday 23th July 2007 and addressed to:
Forward Planning and Transport
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices
London Road
Basingstoke RG21 4AH
Or by e-mail to
heike.wetzstein@basingstoke.gov.uk
For further information, please contact Heike Wetzstein on 01256 845469

Nicky Linihan
Head of Planning and Transport
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices
London Road
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4AH

Appendix 4 – Notice

Tadley District Centre and Employment Area Mulford's Hill

Public Consultation – Your views are important

The Borough Council has produced a Draft Development Brief for the area and is keen to hear your views on future improvements and development opportunities.

The 6 Ha site has been earmarked in the Borough's Local Plan and the Council has produced the Brief to identify constraints and opportunities for the area which includes the library, supermarket and adjoining commercial and residential properties. Your input into the Brief will help guide future planning for the area in providing for enhancement of the existing supermarket and mixed use including future retail, residential and employment uses.



The 6 week consultation period starts on Monday 4th June and closes on Monday 16th July. Further details of the Development Brief can be found on The Council's website at <http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning/localplan/spd.htm>

Hard copies can be inspected during normal office hours at:

- The Council Offices, London Road (reception in Parkland building)
- Tadley Town Council, 2 Franklin Avenue, Tadley
- Public Library, Mulford's Hill, Tadley

The Borough Council is holding a public exhibition from 30 June to 6 July 2007 at the Public Library at Mulford's Hill during normal opening hours. Comments Forms will be available. Members of staff will be present on Saturday 30 June from 9.30am to 4pm to answer any questions.

Please contact Heike Wetzstein on 01256 845469 or email heike.wetzstein@basingstoke.gov.uk should you require further information.

Appendix 5 – Representations in relation to formal consultation on draft Development Brief

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Tadley Town Council	The tone of the document looks at Tadley as part of the Basingstoke hub as a primary focus: The focus should be Tadley from the start. Basingstoke should be a secondary consideration later in the document.	The Regional Economic Strategy for the South East has identified the Borough of Basingstoke & Deane as one of the 21 Regional Hubs as centres of economic activity. The Draft Development Brief acknowledges that Tadley has the opportunity to contribute towards this growth initiative.	Amend the wording to say “The Borough of Basingstoke and Deane” (para. 5.3)
	Needs to look longer term: Will housing be allowed on Saunders fields? This would join Falcon Field, Kestrel’s Meadow & possibly Strawberry Field into on conurbation. How does this all gel with West Berkshire plans for the area?	Comments noted. A long term vision of the site or cross boundary working with West Berkshire needs to be investigated as part of the Core Strategy work on the LDF	Refer to the possible future option to be investigated as part of the LDF Core Strategy work (para. 7.7.5)
	How much of the area do BDBC mean by “Brick Kiln Yard” – needs defining on map.	Comments accepted	Amend the SPD Figure 7
	Strongly support the key findings: “The option to locate further retail uses along Mulfords Hill to create a stronger retail frontage to the District Centre and provide a better link to the existing shops along Mulfords Hill was favoured, followed by the option to concentrate retail uses around an expanded supermarket to create a new vibrant District Centre”.	Comments noted	No changes
	“The availability of parking spaces is a problem at times”.	Comments noted – this issue will need to be addressed through the Transport Assessment that accompanies any development proposals as referred to at para. 7.3 of the SPD	No changes

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Tadley Town Council	Reiterate the need for sustainable drainage and water conservation	Comments noted. Referred to para. 7.4 of the SPD	No changes
	Figure 1 Town Centre boundary no longer includes Tadley Town Council, Ambrose Allen Centre and Holmwood Health Centre. Why were these removed without any consultation with Tadley TC?	Comments noted. The Inspector concluded that the separate cluster of banks, Holmwood Health Centre and Ambrose Allen Centre to the north-west are remote from the main concentration of shops and services at Mulfords Hill, and are physically separate from it by the busy A340. There are not, therefore, perceived as being an integral part of the district centre grouping of shops and services. Consequently the Council has modified the District Centre boundary for Tadley in the Local Plan.	No changes
	Shops ...within proximity of the site ... add Holmwood Health Centre & Fire Station. Shops – add pharmacy on Franklin Ave.	Comments accepted	Amend SPD to include Homwood Health Centre, Fire Station and pharmacy (para 6.3)
	Vehicular movement Bus to Newbury takes 80 minutes Should include impact on A339 no longer being a trunk road in the future How far away is Aldermaston Station?	Comments accepted	Amend SPD to include distance to Aldermaston Station (para. 6.5)
	Biodiversity Shows the importance of the future of the unfenced part of the Common. Some could be under threat in the long-term.	Comments noted. Additional recreational pressure on Tadley Common has been referred to at para. 6.9 of the SPD	No change
	Sustainable development & design Can we go further and have a green centre to Tadley.	Comments accepted	Amend SPD to refer to the general aspiration for sustainable development within Tadley District Centre (para 7.2)

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Transport Needs to link into West Berkshire plans, not done in isolation</p>	Comments noted	Amend SPD to include information on proposed transport improvements around the site (para. 7.3.3)
	<p>Infrastructure/Drainage Parking is significant as this site is on the top of a hill occupied by large number of homes, already prone to floods/sewerage overflow.</p>	Comments noted	No change. SPD refers to the need for SUDS (para. 7.4.5)
	<p>Sainsbury's extension plans Notwithstanding – any new retail outlets outside the boundary of Sainsbury's plot should also be allowed to attract food outlets – eg butcher/ delicatessen etc.</p>	Comments noted. The SPD seeks the promotion of future retail units where there is an opportunity in chapter 9 and para. 10.2	No change
	<p>Boundary Hall application Note presence of Barclay's bank and some "recreational" facilities, scout den, air cadets etc. Close enough to complement the Mulfords Hill/ Silchester Road site.</p>	Comments noted.	No change
	<p>Land ownership constraints NB – because of available car parking local people and through traffic use banks – may lead to closure of branches if they are forced to become part of centre.</p>	Comments noted	No change
	<p>Housing mix Question provision of 1 bedroom dwellings in light of Tadley Community Survey results</p>	Comments noted. SPD refers to Housing Mix Policy at para. 10.10.	No change
	<p>Can we secure underground parking for residents?</p>	It is not clear whether underground parking for residents would be needed and viable	No change
	<p>Tadley Balloon story – idea could be commissioned as a piece of street art</p>	Comments noted – provision for public art will form part of any discussions with the developer as highlighted at para. 10.17	No change

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Baughurst Parish Council	<p>The Council would wish their original comments provided for the earlier Issues and Options consultation to stand.</p> <p>Summary of earlier comments: Support provision of more comparison goods shopping (i.e. clothes, shoes, household goods).</p> <p>The current parking area to the front of the supermarket is not sensible, abused and difficult to access.</p> <p>Re employment: employment uses should remain in the form of offices/light industry, general industrial premises and warehouse uses to 50/50%. Any of the business premises should not be retained as purpose built and better planned development would be usually more acceptable.</p> <p>Employment uses should be kept separately.</p> <p>Locate new housing adj. to existing residential areas following the relocation of existing commercial buildings.</p> <p>There is need for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Support proposed One-Way system, entry A340, exist Silchester Road. No exit onto A340.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Comments contained within key findings of Issues and Options consultation (para. 2.3)</p> <p>Comments noted – this issue is to be addressed in the Transport Assessment for future development proposals. Contained within para 7.3 of SPD</p> <p>Comments noted. Contained within para. 8.3, chapter 9 (6), para. 10.3 of SPD</p> <p>Comments noted, although there may be an opportunity to mix offices with retail and residential development.</p> <p>Comments noted. Contained within para. 11.5 of SPD</p> <p>Comments noted. Contained within para. 11.21 of SPD</p> <p>Comments noted. The majority of comments made earlier on the Issues & Options consultation did not favour the proposed One-Way system and thus was omitted from the Draft Development Brief.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Would like to see wider pavements. Pedestrian areas with no vehicles. A separate cycle lane.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Comments reflected in para. 6.7.2 regarding enhancement of Public Realm and para. 10.21</p>	<p>Comments reflected in para. 6.7.2 & 10.21</p>
	<p>Keep the overall building height of up to two storeys.</p>	<p>Comments noted, although there may be an opportunity for an element of 3 storey development, such as residential town houses</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Support the need for an enhanced public focal space abutting the highway</p>	<p>Comments noted. Comments contained in chapter 9 (3)</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Consideration should be given to the slight movement or extension of the proposed area to the north of the existing site, which would then include an area of recreational ground (Saunders Field), and several other facilities which help to make Tadley a cohesive town. These facilities include two banks, Holmwood Health Centre, the Ambrose Allen Centre and Tadley Town Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference has been made to the possible future option to be investigated as part of the LDF Core Strategy work</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 7.7.5)</p>
Pamber Parish Council	<p>Concerned about the size of the proposal. Has a survey been carried out to assess whether there is a need for such a large Sainsbury's store?</p>	<p>Proposals for retail uses will be determined in accordance with the current policy framework and advise in PPS6</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>It was felt that there was not an adequate car parking provision in the scheme.</p>	<p>Comments noted – this issue is to be addressed in the Transport Assessment for future development proposals as highlighted at para. 7.3 of the SPD</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Concerned that there is not sufficient infrastructure in place to cope with this development.</p>	<p>Comments noted and highlighted as an Development Issue (para. 7.4)</p>	<p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Careful consideration should be given to traffic management, especially to the matters raised at the meeting about the pedestrian crossing (it was suggested that the pedestrian crossing in front of Sainsbury's has to move. Alternatively the road should be widened by a few metres to allow lorries with wide loads to go along the A340.)</p> <p>Concerned that this would have an adverse effect on the area.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to restricting the new proposal to retail only instead of including light industry/ residential/ offices. A retail park could be created with existing retail units in the area being relocated to the site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This matter would need to be considered by Hampshire County Council Highways</p> <p>Comments noted. To this end an Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out.</p> <p>The proposed land uses (retail, employment, residential) have been approved through the Local Plan process as part of the mixed use allocation and will help to achieve a more sustainable development.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comment (para. 7.3.4).</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
Cllr Robert Musson	<p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Create a number of mixed size business premises, particularly smaller than Calleva Park to allow for small business start-ups. Locate these above the retail premises.</p> <p>Keep the cost of the retail premises as low as possible to ensure affordability and therefore viability of district centre.</p> <p>Provide outside seating area for coffee shops.</p> <p>Provide better connection between shops on Mulfords Hill and the Sainsbury's area – some say they feel intimidated by the proximity of the busy A340 and the wide entrance exit of Wheelgame.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Comments contained in SPD, para. 2.12</p> <p>This would be a market decision</p> <p>Comments noted and highlighted in SPD in para. 10.16</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Views of Tadley & District Chamber of Trade have been included (para. 2.12) and which reflect Cllr. Musson's comments</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>The SPD highlights the option of an enhanced public realm within the District Centre boundary (businesses along Mulfords Hill) and the opportunity to create a better continuous shop frontage and environmental improvements (para. 6.7.2)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	Relocate the Skate Park from the site next to the Tennis Court to this complex and provide better facilities – this should alleviate the current trend of youngsters gathering to use the hard surfaces for Skating/ Skate Boarding. Many parents do not like their children to visit the existing skate park because it is too remote from the centre of Tadley which places their children at higher risk. Most parents would be more comfortable with a more central location for this.	Explore the option of improving leisure facilities within the allocation site to allocate youth provision.	Amend SPD and include under other considerations the option of providing a facility for youth's (para. 7.7.6)
SEERA	No comments	Comments noted	No change
Environment Agency Groundwater, Hydrology & Contaminated Land	<p>We are happy to see that SUDS proposals will be considered for incorporation into the development design to mitigate the risk of flooding and risk to controlled waters.</p> <p>Nearby receptors (Silchester Brook, Pamber Forest & Silchester Common SSSI) are in close proximity to the development and have also been considered. Every effort should be made to ensure that these areas are not affected by the development.</p> <p>The proposed development is not in a Source Protection Zone. The development poses a minimal risk to controlled waters (i.e. rivers, streams, lakes, ponds, ditches and groundwaters.)</p> <p>Regarding the Brick Kiln site the developer may wish to carry out a site investigation to mitigate any land contamination that may be present on the site. If SUDS / soakaways are to be considered for the development then these factors would need to be considered to protect groundwater quality.</p>	<p>Supportive comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This issue has already been identified as a constraint and that contributions towards implementing the Tadley Common Management Plan may be sought if impact of development is justified. (para. 6.9)</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change, already identified as an issue and the need for a site investigation (para. 7.5)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
RSPB	<p>Concerned about the appropriateness of some of the additional development proposed in the Development Brief, including the residential development, additional parking provision and proposals to improve the accessibility of Tadley Common.</p> <p>Recommend that any applications for residential development on this site should only be permitted if they include a comprehensive package of mitigation measures that eliminate or minimise effects on adjacent heathland areas.</p> <p>Recommend the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision of substantial alternative open space within or near to the new housing - strict control of parking spaces close to the SSSI to ensure they cannot be utilised for wider public access to the heathland - financial contributions towards wardening of the SSSI and - control of access points from the development site into the common 	<p>Comments noted. The residential element has been approved through the Local Plan process as part of the mixed use allocation and will help to achieve a more sustainable development</p> <p>Policy E7 states that development will be permitted where it will not have an adverse effect on protected species or the conservation status of priority species, harm the nature conservation interest of a statutory or non-statutory wildlife nature conservation site or lead to the loss or deterioration of a key habitat type or harm the integrity of linkages between such sites and habitats. Proposals will be expected to conserve and, where possible, enhance the biodiversity of the receiving environment, taking into account the aims and targets of the UK and Local BAP. Where appropriate, planning conditions and obligations will be used to secure these requirements. The SPD also makes reference to developer contributions towards implementing the Tadley Common Management Plan.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Policy E7 has been listed under Planning Policies (Table 2). Add: "Developers will be expected to demonstrate that their proposals will not have a significant adverse impact on the SSSI or the species or features for which it is designated." (para. 6.9)</p>
Natural England	<p>Supports objective 2 and would wish the comments to be expanded to include benefits not just for the town but for the environment in general. This can be achieved by following guidance given in "Biodiversity by Design"</p> <p>Endorse Planning Policy A2</p>	<p>Comments accepted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>SPD amended to include comments (para. 10.8)</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Advocate the need to ensure that current and future transport policies and infrastructure projects contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</p> <p>Trees: The retention of trees with any development is to be encouraged and NE supports this statement</p> <p>Biodiversity: Would wish to be closely involved in the development of the Tadley Common Management Plan.</p> <p>Support 'Sustainable development and design' (para. 7.2). Would encourage the use of guidance given by TCPA "Biodiversity by Design"</p> <p>Waste Management: Would expect the final plan to have been guided by PPS10. This Government Policy should also be included in Appendix B and at Table 2 of the SA Report</p> <p>Pleased to see the comments contained in para. 5.5 (SA Scoping Report) and the fact that the potential impacts on Tadley Common have been recognised as playing a key part of the SA/SEA</p>	<p>Comments noted. Reference is made that a Transport Assessment needs to be carried out. Any assessment in relation to future transport impact in the area would need to be carried out as part of the LDF Core Strategy work.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted. Natural England and RSPB will be consulted on the Management Plan and, if necessary, a supplementary plan of mitigation measures specific to the development brief will be prepared in conjunction with the consultees</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments accepted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Contact Wildlife Trust to seek agreement to consult on the Management Plan</p> <p>See Comment above (para. 10.8)</p> <p>PPS10 has been included in Appendix C and Table 2 of the SA</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
<p>Hampshire County Council, Estate Practice</p>	<p>Dedicated (Able-bodied and Disabled) car parking provision for library staff. Adequate parking for the library visitors should be ensured (6 staff and 2 disabled bays). Tadley Library staff are continually having problems with Sainsbury's customers parking in the dedicated staff car park. This means as a result, staff are forced to double park and then to leave the Library to move their cars, leaving the facility understaffed.</p> <p>The mobile library cannot reverse onto Mulfords Hill from its compound but requires forward facing access via the library car park. It is vital that any development proposals for this area, covered by the SPD, ensure the mobile library has sufficient space to manoeuvre. It is also important that vehicular routes within and out of the SPD area are without any height restrictions.</p> <p>HCC considers that the library building provides an important existing landmark to the locality and would encourage and support inclusion of a reference to the library building as a key landmark building.</p> <p>HCC would like to be kept informed of both various consultation opportunities in relation to the SPD and notified of planning applications submitted within the area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Transport Assessment is to cover the car parking provision for library staff.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Consultation procedures on both emerging planning document and planning applications is set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. HCC as the landowner will be kept informed about progress of the SPD and will be notified about planning applications within the vicinity of the library.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include car parking provision for library staff (para. 7.3)</p> <p>Amend SPD to include comments (para 7.3.1)</p> <p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 10.12)</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>We note that whilst planning policy (EC4) seeks to retain existing employment uses, supported by the Tadley Employment Study, the Brief states that the existing employment area is considered appropriate for mixed use development including residential.</p> <p>Support the intention to retain and redevelop the existing employment area to include an appropriate mix of offices, light industrial/warehouse uses and start-up units for small businesses, but we question whether it is necessary or appropriate to include residential development in this part of the site, particularly when there are opportunities to provide residential accommodation within the District Centre and elsewhere within the site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The residential element has been approved through the Local Plan process as part of the mixed use allocation and will help to achieve a more sustainable development</p> <p>As above. It is suggested in the SPD that residential units could be located to the southern and eastern border of the site to integrate better with the existing residential area or by providing flats above shops.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
Hampshire County Council, Highway Development Control	<p>The County Council supports the main objectives of the draft brief.</p> <p>There will be a need for future developers to work closely with the County Council and its agents.</p> <p>It is good practice to secure travel plans from any substantial development, including residential development, depending on the amount of units proposed.</p>	<p>Supportive comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Amend paragraph to say that developers need to work closely with County Council (para. 7.3.2)</p> <p>Change that a Travel Plan will be required for any substantial development incl. residential (para. 7.3.2)</p>
Highway Agency	<p>Any development associated with the re-provision of commercial buildings should be subject to an evaluation of the transport impact (ETI) which must consider access to and from the site and parking provision.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD makes reference to the need that any new development proposal will require a Transport Assessment (para. 7.3)</p>	<p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>In addition, and as acknowledged in para. 7.3, proposals should incorporate measures which encourage sustainable movements such as walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Comments noted and reflected in para. 10.21 & 10.22 and objective 6</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>The HA is satisfied that policies set out in the Local Plan 1996-2011 are in accordance with the objectives of PPG13. Any future development must accord with policies outlined in PPG13 in order to be developed in a sustainable manner for the benefit of the economy, social and the environment.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Where necessary, the impact of future development on the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) will need to be identified. This may require an Evaluation to ensure that future development and an increase in associated trips will not adversely impact on the safe operation of any part of the SRN.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD makes reference to the need that any new development proposal will require a Transport Assessment. The impact of any future development will need to be considered as part of the LDF Core Strategy work</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>The HA supports the requirements for a Travel Plan. These should have measurable outputs and should set out the arrangements for monitoring the progress of the plan, as well as the arrangements for enforcement, in the event that agreed objectives are not met. However, the HA also recommends that developers are encouraged to have parking provision less than the maximum standard.</p>	<p>Comments accepted.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 7.3.2)</p>
	<p>In addition to the guides encouraged to be viewed in paragraph 11.10, maximum parking standards outlined in PPG13 need to be applied to ensure unnecessary trips are not encouraged.</p>	<p>Comments accepted.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include reference to the Council's Parking Standard SPD (para. 10.25)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Thames Water Property Services	<p>Infrastructure/Drainage</p> <p>Pleased to see that a section on “Infrastructure/ Drainage” has been included in the SPD which accords with previous representations we have submitted.</p> <p>The scheme in Rowan Road is to resolve an existing known sewer flooding problem. We have requested that no development happens upstream of this location until the flood relief scheme is in place. This is not to say that all other development in Tadley can go ahead regardless as the combined effect of development in Tadley will have to be assessed once exact locations and scale of development have been identified.</p> <p>A section should be included after the Drainage section on “Water Supply” and the following para. Should be added to the SPD: “With regard to water supplies to brownfield sites within the area there may be existing water mains crossing the site. In such cases the developer would be required to pay for any mains diversions. The developer would also have to pay for new off-site infrastructure. Once the magnitude of new development has been confirmed the water undertaker will need to investigate the impact on the existing network. Even small scale development can have a significant impact on the infrastructure and, if necessary, developers would be required to fund associated studies and upgrading of the network.”</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comment accepted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Amend SPD to include suggested wording re Water Supply (para 7.4.3)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>SUDS</p> <p>It should be recognised that SUDS are not appropriate for use in all areas, i.e. areas with high ground water levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage. SUDS also require regular maintenance to ensure their effectiveness.</p>	<p>Comments accepted</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 7.4.5)</p>
<p>RPS on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd and Stacey Development Ltd</p>	<p>Title of the Document</p> <p>Title of the Document continues to be misleading. The purpose of the Brief is to clarify the policy framework for future development on the D3.16 site which is allocated in the adopted Local Plan for mixed-use development including retail, residential and employment use. It therefore relates to more than the District Centre and Employment Land. The site does not lie within a defined Employment Area on the proposals map and therefore employment use should not carry any more weight than the other uses proposed on this site. The Brief should be re-titled to refer to the location of the site and the policy allocation. The title of the document should be amended to read: "Development Brief for Site D3.16: Land between Mulfords Hill and Silchester Road, Tadley".</p> <p>Aims of the Development Brief</p> <p>The aim of the Brief will be to promote the integrated and properly planned redevelopment of the area. We support the aim and objectives identified in section 4 of the Brief. However, due to landownership constraints development on this site is unlikely to be taken forward in one comprehensive scheme. However, our Clients have always recognised the need to ensure development on</p>	<p>Comments noted. The title of the document relates to the location and there is not any slant towards one particular land use. To re-title the Brief would lead to confusion.</p> <p>Comments noted. In the section Other Development Issues / Constraints (para. 7.7.3) reference is made to land ownership constraints. It is acknowledged that due to recent development proposals, fragmented land ownership along Silchester Road it is considered that the opportunity for further redevelopment / expansion of the District Centre is limited in the region of Silchester</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>a perceived basis does not prejudice any further development on the site. One of the aims of the Brief states 'clarify development constraints to help landowners and developers make informed decisions'. This does not go far enough to indicate that there are constraints to a comprehensive development. The objectives should note that the Council are aware that a number of separate applications are likely to be submitted for development on this site.</p> <p>The following planning objective should be inserted: "Avoid prejudicing the future development potential of the site in bringing forward development proposals for the site".</p> <p>Planning Policy Context for the SPD</p> <p>There is little reference to Local Plan Policy D3.16 in the Brief. The Policy has been summarised in Table 2. The full terms of the policy should be set out and continue to be referred to throughout the Brief. This policy is the purpose of this SPD and therefore should be clearly defined with the Brief.</p> <p>Reference should be made to National Policy as well as Regional Policy, Local Policy and other relevant guidance which maybe a material consideration when considering development on this site within the main content of the document.</p>	<p>Road and unlikely to come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme. However, a comprehensive proposal for land in ownership of Sainsbury's and Staceys is vital to achieve a high quality development of this central site for the benefit of the town. A phased implementation of an agreed strategy / masterplan may be acceptable.</p> <p>Comments noted. The full terms of the policy are contained within Appendix C under Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan Planning Policy. It is agreed that Policy D3.16 is the purpose of this SPD and therefore should be clearly defined with the Brief.</p> <p>Para 5.1 sets out that SPDs must be consistent with national, regional and local planning policies. A review of relevant planning policies is provided in Appendix B. It is agreed that in the final Development Brief reference should be made to relevant National, Regional and Local Policy and other guidance within the main text which may be a material consideration when considering development on this site.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include the full terms of Policy D3.16 within the main text (para. 1.4)</p> <p>Amend SPD to include reference to relevant national, regional and local planning policies (chapter 5)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Description and Context of the Site</p> <p>The diagrams provided should be improved to be clear and complete</p>	Comments accepted	Amend diagrams in SPD where appropriate
	<p>All photos should have titles</p>	Comments accepted	Provide text to photos
	<p>The text should be clearly set out under the sub headings 'Site' and 'Surrounding Area'. Whilst reference has been made to the wider context in Appendix D it is recommended that Section 6 has an introduction which provides a clear indication of where the site lies within Basingstoke and Deane area. It would be beneficial to include a context map, which identifies Tadley, surrounding roads, and neighbouring towns.</p>	Comments accepted.	Include section re. 'Wider site context' including context map within SPD (para. 6.1.1 & 6.1.2)
	<p>There needs to be consistency with the plans used in each section. Currently, the diagram for shops includes the wider District Centre area, but the diagrams for vehicular movement, business, pedestrian movement etc. only include the D3.16 site. The Council's objective is to secure a viable and vibrant District Centre. Therefore, all of the diagrams should include the entire District Centre.</p>	Comments accepted.	Amend diagrams where appropriate
	<p>Fig 5 identifies parking area but there is no reference to parking within the text.</p>	Comments accepted	Amend SPD to include reference to parking (para. 6.5)
	<p>The text for the pedestrian movement throughout the site needs to be expanded to discuss movement and circulation to other key uses on the site such as the Library, industrial units etc. Reference should also be made on how</p>	Comments accepted.	Amend SPD to include additional comments in relation to pedestrian movement (para. 6.6)

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>pedestrians can easily move around the District Centre.</p> <p>A key is required for all plans which is clear and complete</p> <p>Figure 4 is currently inaccurate in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All business units on the site are not identified - The arrows should clearly point to the business units only. - A key is required - The picture of the Brick Kiln employment uses board should be removed as it is inaccurate <p>Biodiversity (paragraph 6.9) The paragraph should be deleted. Policy C1 of the Local Plan ensures that the Council can negotiate to secure planning obligations for community facilities if there is a need arising from the development. It seems inappropriate to include this in the Brief when the Council have a policy to address this issue.</p> <p>Development Issues / Constraints The existing Sainsbury's supermarket, Library, and residential properties etc. should be identified as a constraint. Reference should be made to existing planning permissions for Old Kiln House</p>	<p>Comments accepted.</p> <p>Comments accepted. The buildings highlighted in the diagram are those shown in the photographs.</p> <p>Comments noted. This paragraph outlines the close proximity of the allocation site to Tadley Common and the impact new development could potentially have on this area. It is important information to be included in the SPD.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Reference to existing planning permission for Old Kiln House has been made in the section "Concept" under no 4, but can also be included in this section "development issues/ constraints"</p>	<p>Update key for diagrams</p> <p>Amend diagram (Figure 7)</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Include a diagram showing Issues/Constraints (Figure 15)</p> <p>Amend SPD to include reference to existing planning permission for Old Kiln House (para. 7.7.3)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Section 7.7. should be deleted in its entirety</p> <p>Site Analysis incl. Development Options Propose to delete: “Consider any proposal to expand the existing supermarket in regard to the comprehensive planning for the area and a strategy/ masterplan for future phases”. There is no reference or requirement in Local Plan Policy D3.16 for comprehensive development of the site. The Inspector acknowledged “On a site of this size in multiple ownership it is highly likely that a number of separate proposals will come forward that cumulatively satisfy the policy. It should therefore be acknowledged that these are potential constraints for comprehensive redevelopment of the site. Subject to a number of constraints which prevent a comprehensive redevelopment of the site.” The Council have provided no justification for their approach, other than reference to the Employment Study being undertaken which recommends that a mix of uses should be considered on the site including leisure.</p> <p>The land use allocations under Policy D3.16 were the subject of the full Local Plan consultation process, incl. a Local Plan Inquiry. The allocation does not include leisure. The Development Brief</p>	<p>Comments noted. This section provides useful information on ‘other considerations’ and should form part of the SPD</p> <p>Comments noted. The draft Brief has been prepared in conjunction with a full Sustainability Appraisal, as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which indicates that the Development Brief makes a positive contribution to the future development of the allocation site. The Brief provides a masterplanning approach to the implementation of Policy D3.16 as opposed to a piecemeal approach through submission of individual planning applications which without the Brief (SPD) would be unlikely to achieve the vision for the site “to achieve a high quality development of this central site for the benefit of the town”, or to achieve a comprehensive development. It is acknowledged in section “Development Issues/Constraints” of the Brief that due to fragmented landownership it is unlikely to produce a Development Brief for the whole of the allocation site. However, it is considered that a comprehensive proposal for land in Sainsbury’s and Staceys ownership is vital to achieve a high quality development of this central site for the benefit of the town.</p> <p>Comments noted. The recommendation of the Employment Study “... that a mix of uses should be considered which could also include some provision for residential, retail, leisure and</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>cannot change policy and reopen the allocated uses on this site.</p> <p>Concepts Concerned about the inclusion of Figure 8 (Concept Diagram) in this section of the document. If the Council consider the inclusion of this Figure to be essential, it should be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retitle the plan to “Opportunities and Constraints” - To identify all of the constraints on the site which include mature trees to the north of the site; the height of the development on the site; the existing library and supermarket. - The plan should acknowledge the wider District Centre Area - The parking layout plan would be better located in Section 11 “Design Guidance”. <p>The constraints and opportunities identified in Appendix E should be included in this section of the Brief.</p> <p>The SSL specification for car parks whilst advocating the use of shrubs and trees within the</p>	<p>community use” is only repeated in the Brief but ‘leisure’ has not put forward as a preferred use under section “Concept”, rather “...the area has potential for mixed use incl. residential (to integrate better with existing adj. residential area), flats above shops, and other employment uses which would compliment the location and enhancement of the District Centre.”</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments agreed</p> <p>In order not to overload the Brief with detailed information and to keep it brief it was considered appropriate to include the detailed analysis within Appendix E and only provide the main findings within the main text of the Brief.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>A diagram Development Issues/Constraints has been added (Fig. 15)</p> <p>Move parking layout plan to section “Car Parking” (para. 10.26)</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>car park where appropriate, advocates a more restrained approach to shrub beds between car parking spaces in order to ensure that 'Secure by Design' issues take precedence.</p> <p>The proposed position of the additional retail units within the car park would further increase the need for parking whilst making its provision more difficult.</p> <p>Figure 9 also advocates long rows of parallel parking which contradicts concept 9.1, item 7.</p> <p>Development Principles The indicative Masterplan should be deleted. The Development Brief should focus on the aims and objectives of the development, which covers the entire Policy D3.16 site and not just that in Sainsbury's and Staceys ownership. The boundary for Old Kiln House has been amended to include car parking. Old Kiln House has permission to develop this site for residential use. The proposals would result in a loss of a number of mature trees. No indication of height in the context of the surrounding development and access improvements.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>The proposed retail unit has been reduced in size, requiring less car parking (Fig. 16 & 17)</p> <p>The indicative masterplan is only intended to show an indicative layout plan. However, it has been updated and renamed 'Development Framework' (Fig. 17)</p> <p>The indicative Masterplan has been updated and renamed 'Development Framework'. It deals with development principles rather than detailed design</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Objective 1 – providing a mix of uses to secure a viable and vibrant District Centre</p> <p>Proposed Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The mix of uses is subject to the local plan allocation under policy D3.16, which is residential, retail and employment use. This should be clearly stated. - Agree that a viable and vibrant District Centre needs to be created in Tadley. However, it is important to note that the District Centre boundary includes land along Mulfords Hill and the Sainsbury's site. It does not include the Brick Kiln site or other land within the D3.16 allocation. This should be stated or made clear. - The images provide a potentially false impression of what could be achieved in Tadley given the nature of the site. They should therefore be removed. - Reference to the Sainsbury's application should be deleted 	<p>Comments noted. This section has been split in the different uses "retail, employment and residential" and it should be clear for the reader that these uses are being encouraged for future development of the site.</p>	No change
	<p>Objective 3 – to ensure that an appropriate mix of housing types is provided on this site.</p> <p>Reference to the draft SPD on Housing Mix should be made in Section 5 of the Brief</p>	<p>Comments noted. Fig. 3 of the SPD shows the District Centre (DC) boundary and the allocation site boundary.</p>	No change
	<p>Objective 4 – to provide a coherent, distinctive and attractive development incl. gateway buildings, active frontages and provision of open space.</p> <p>Landmark buildings: Proposed Change Definitive height restrictions should not be imposed</p>	<p>Comments noted. One example of office buildings has been deleted and the example of flats above shops has been changed</p>	Delete one example of office buildings, change picture for flats above shops
		Comments accepted	Delete reference to Sainsbury's application
		Comments accepted	Reference to SPD on Housing Mix has been included in section Planning Policy Context (para. 5.5.2)
		Comments accepted.	Amend SPD to include suggested wording (para10.13)

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>on the site. A statement should be added within this section to state: "The height of any development on this site should be considered in the context of the surrounding area and Landmark buildings should be developed where possible".</p> <p>Active Frontages: Proposed Change It is essential that an active frontage is created on the site fronting Mulfords Hill The following text to be inserted into this section of the Brief: "A new vibrant retail frontage is to be created along the Mulfords Hill elevation to strengthen the link between the site and the existing retail units on Mulfords Hill. New development towards this frontage should seek to take advantage of the street frontage and to improve the connectivity to the District Centre".</p> <p>Public Space: Proposed Change The Brief should note that the current open space on the site is underused and has no real benefit to the locality in its current form. Policy D3.16 does not require the provision of open space on site. However, improvements to the public realm should be encouraged where possible.</p> <p>Objective 6 – to provide improved vehicular access, pedestrian and cycle links through the site and links to nearby services and facilities. Proposed Change A plan should be provided by the Council which seeks to improve these points of connectivity in the wider area</p>	<p>Comments accepted. A paragraph highlighting the importance to create vibrant elevations fronting Mulfords Hill and the open space has been included</p> <p>Comments noted. It is mentioned in para. 6.7.1 that the open space is underused and in section 9 noted that there is potential to enhance the open space in front of the supermarket.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 10.14)</p> <p>No change</p> <p>A diagram showing the planned highway and foot/cycleway improvements in the area has been included (Fig. 11) in the Brief and reference is made in section 7 that there is potential to carry through improvements to the foot/cycleway and to connect with the District Centre (para. 7.3.3)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Section 11 – Design Guidance Proposed Change: The source of the guidance should be clearly referred to in section 7 of the Brief and throughout this section</p> <p>With reference to para. 11.7-11.13 should refer to the relevant local plan policy for clarity and consistency on car parking and cycle standards</p> <p>Section 12 – Possible Planning Obligations Proposed Change: Reference should be made to the Council's SPG 106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>Section 13 – Delivery and Implementation Proposed Change: The sentence "...including the preparation of any future strategy/Masterplan" should be deleted from para. 13.1. Whilst Sainsbury's and Stacey's are committed to working together to develop land in their ownership, development proposals should not be refused for the lack of a Masterplan for any land in their ownership. The test is to ensure that any proposed development does not prejudice development on the remainder of the site.</p> <p>Recommend that the structure of the Brief is revised.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Reference has been made to the Council's Interim Planning Guidance on Section 106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure in Table 2 and section 11.</p> <p>Comments noted. See earlier comment under "Aims of the Development Brief"</p> <p>Comments noted. The Development Brief has been revised following responses to consultation and further consideration. As a result the Structure of the Brief has slightly changed.</p>	<p>The Design Guidance has been integrated within section "Development Principles"</p> <p>Amend SPD and refer to the Council's Parking Standard SPD (para. 10.25 & 10.28)</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Anne Bentley, Tadley Design Team	Concerned that the frontage of the supermarket will not leave sufficient space to constitute a Civic Centre.	The Development Brief promotes a car free space in front of the supermarket and makes reference that any extension of the existing supermarket to the front should leave sufficient space for a usable and attractive public open space. [section 9 (3)]	No change
	Concerned about the design of the actual building. The design and materials used for the Sainsbury's supermarket could well lay the foundation for any future development. Do not believe that the current style of white plastics, covered in verdigris, creates the image that the Tadley Design Statement prescribes.	Comments noted. The Development Brief makes reference to the Tadley Design Statement and that buildings should be of traditional design, and harmonise with the environment by using suitable building forms, styles, colours and textures and quality material. However, traditional design approaches should relate to clear local influences, not pastiche. (para. 10.19 & 10.20)	No change
	Point out good examples in Tadley i.e. Tadley Swimming Pool and the refurbished shops in Bishopswood Road. Also the Sainsbury's supermarket at Kempshot is closer to meeting the aspirations set out in the Tadley Design Statement.	Comments noted.	Include picture of refurbished shops in Bishopswood Road (para. 10.4)
Mr & Mrs Hill, Tadley	Does not support the six objectives of the Development Brief	Comments noted	No change
	The Draft Development Brief does not express the principles and design issues that are important for the site	Comments noted	No change
	Feel very strongly against proposed retail units to the north of Sainsbury's car park. Any retail units would cause us extra noise, lights, and overlooking our property.	Comments noted	The proposed retail unit has been reduced in size and moved away from the back garden of the property (Fig. 16 &17, section 9 (2))

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Mrs Margaret Weston, Tadley	Any development should retain the existing trees on the boundary. Would like to see a 2m close boarded fence constructed before development commences so that any lighting is directed away from the property.	The SPD makes reference to existing mature trees and that they should be retained within any development (para. 6.8). Normal development procedures would secure boarding around the boundaries under Health and Safety Regulations.	No change
	Preference for development height would be 2 storey, and either offices or houses.	Comments noted, although there may be an opportunity for an element of 3 storey development, such as residential town houses	No change
Alison Priestley, Tadley	A Youth Club needs to be provided as kids hang around the Sainsbury's / Library site. Whatever improvements are done, the gangs of kids need to be dealt with first, otherwise anything new will be wrecked.	Comments noted.	Amend SPD to include the option of providing Youth facilities (para. 7.7.6)
Ron Jewers, Tadley	What Tadley really needs is a decent Tesco store with a petrol filling station on the Boundary Hall site. Retail improvements and eyesore cured in one.	Comments noted. The need for a supermarket on the Boundary Hall site was examined through the Local Plan inquiry in 2005, by an independent Inspector, who concluded that there was not a quantitative need for an additional supermarket in Tadley, and that the existing Sainsbury's store has the expansion capacity to soak up any excess demand in Tadley. The site was therefore allocated for residential use.	No change
R. Kendall-Jones, HCC Tadley Library	In theory supports the six objectives of the Development Brief.	Comments noted.	
	The draft Development Brief does express some of the principles and design issues that are important for the site.	Comments noted.	

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	In theory the development is very good and would improve this area of Tadley. Unfortunately the area would be “wrecked” by the youth of Tadley very quickly. Large groups of “Hoodies” gather in this area and leave large amounts of rubbish. They skateboard on benches, steps and at times harass the public. Older residents do not like coming into this area during the evenings. The library roof is used as a skateboarding rink and the car park as a race track. Graffiti often has to be removed from library windows and signs. How would this area be policed monitored?	Comments noted	Amend SPD to include option of providing Youth facilities (para. 7.7.6)
Marnie Foden, Tadley	Do not believe objectives 3 & 4 meet the wishes of people within the local area [Obj. 3 “To ensure that an appropriate mix of housing types are provided on site” Obj. 4 “To provide a coherent, distinctive and attractive development incl. gateway buildings, active frontages and provision of public space”] Objectives 1, 2, 5 & 6 need to be more accurately described and diagrams should be easier to understand.	Comments noted. It is important to provide an appropriate mix of housing types to provide for all housing needs. This is also reflected in planning policy C3.	No change
	The example of landmark buildings seem too large and quite garish.	Comments noted. Examples of landmark buildings show 3 storey buildings with emphasised corner features or a glazed extension to a building. It is considered appropriate for the purpose of this exercise.	No change

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Michael Williams, Tadley	Does not believe light industry/warehousing or start-up units for small businesses are compatible with a pleasant and vibrant Centre. The argument that such employment is necessary to support Basingstoke's Council figures seems unsustainable, as it should not be the criteria to determine that industry be sited in the Tadley Centre. After all, many Tadley residents are employed at AWE in Berkshire, so it is the vicinity of the employment that really matters, not the border. I strongly support Stacey Development Ltd in their bid to move the current industrial and warehousing units, away into Berkshire.	Comments noted. The employment area is not part of the District Centre. However, it is considered that start-up units, Live/Work units and other compatible uses would be appropriate on the Brick Kiln Yard site.	No change
	I support the Sainsbury's extension, but not necessarily nearer to the A340. To extend towards the road does not allow for a suitable pedestrian open space, as it would be too small and mixed with car parking (however small) and delivery access. The argument that the existing public space is little used is correct, but the reason why is that it is small, unattractive and, more importantly, on its three sides are the A340, a car park and the entry/exit road past the Library.	The SPD refers to the opportunity to enhance the public open space on the frontage to Mulfords Hill and to create a more active public open space preferably without car parking provision. Any extension of the existing supermarket to the front and additional retail units should leave sufficient space for a usable and attractive public open space [section 9 (3)].	Comments contained in chapter 10 (3)
	To integrate the library and the potential new retail units with the Sainsbury's store, and to make the Centre vibrant, the road leading to the existing car park from the A340 should be made pedestrian. To achieve a pleasant public open space and integrated area it is really necessary to move the entry for cars and delivery vehicles to where Wheelgame and the Vehicle Hire company are	Comments noted.	No change

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>currently situated. They are within the designated site plan for re-development, therefore compulsory purchase of their site should be considered if necessary – I believe this change is so important for the site as a whole and would be key to any plan. An alternative to have an entry and exit to the car park from the Silchester Road, I believe, would not be practical due to traffic volume.</p> <p>Car parking on the original Sainsbury's planning application and your Indicative Masterplan is insufficient. With the significant expansion of Sainsbury's, additional retail, and office space, the car park area needs to be expanded greatly.</p>		
Mrs Elaine Barnes, Tadley	<p>Does support the six Objectives of the Development Brief.</p> <p>Draft Development Brief does express the principles and design issues that are important for the site.</p> <p>Please ensure that the needs of young people particularly the 14-19 age group are built in. Consultation must include discussion with 14-19 age group as a parent of two teenagers in the area I echo their sentiments. There is little for them to do in Tadley and nowhere for them to congregate in groups without being labelled anti-social.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Investigate option to include youth facilities on the site (para. 7.7.6). As part of the Core Strategy work the Council has recently carried out consultation with primary and secondary school children in schools to find out their likes and dislikes and future needs.</p>
David Read, Baughurst	<p>The 6ha area covered is too small for a town centre, given the size of town of Tadley. Suggests looking for additional land, possible to the north in Berkshire, to allocate for town centre development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The possibility of a new or extended District Centre to the north (in Berkshire) is to be investigated as part of Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Amend SPD to include comments (para. 7.7.5)</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	Does not want to have more housing on the allocation site. The site should be dedicated to retail and community buildings. Residential and employment uses should be found elsewhere.	Comments noted. However, the site has been allocated for mixed use including residential during the Local Plan review	No change
	Re transport: the bigger picture needs to be considered in conjunction with this plan, and traffic travelling from one part of Tadley to another, or in and out of Tadley, needs better and faster routes that avoid the centre, leaving the centre for the traffic visiting it.	Comments noted. A Transport Assessment is to be carried out for any new development to assess access and parking issues for the site. Any assessment of the future transport impact within Tadley need to be investigated as part of the Core Strategy work.	No change
	Believes Tadley can support additional retail outlets. Would like to see a second large food shop to provide some choice and competitiveness.	Comments noted. The proposal for a supermarket on the Boundary Hall site was examined through the local plan inquiry in 2005, by an independent Inspector. After looking at all of the evidence presented to him on this issue he concluded that there was not a quantitative need for an additional supermarket in Tadley, and that the existing Sainsbury's store has the expansion capacity to soak up any excess demand in Tadley.	Comments re additional retail outlets in Tadley are reflected in section 9
Harry Downs	Does support the six Objectives of the Development Brief	Supportive comments noted	No change
	The draft Development Brief does express the principles and design issues that are important for the site	Supportive comments noted	No change
	Other comments: I detect that RPS, representing Staceys and Sainsbury's would like carte blanche as far as development is concerned. They wish to give us what they want. This should not be allowed. We should end up with what is best for Tadley not what is best for RPS / Stacey / Sainsbury's; unless they are the same.	Comments noted. The aim of the Brief (SPD) will be to promote the integrated and properly planned redevelopment of the area to make best use of the site and achieve a high quality development of this central site for the benefit of the town	No change

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Tom Keefe	Would like to see echelon parking for the new car park layout. Echelon parking can both reduce fuel consumption when parking and aid traffic flow when the parking is near capacity.	Comment noted.	Amend SPD to include Echelon parking [para. 10.26]
Nigel Williamson	Has read the development brief and for the purpose that this brief is intended has no further comments to make	Comments noted	No change
Mr & Mrs Searle, Tadley	Would be in favour of allowing my property to be utilised as part of the development in anyway that is required i.e. for new houses or new access points. Can also advise some of the neighbours are also in favour of complete redevelopment.	Comments noted. The Council in its enabling role will work with interested parties and stakeholders to bring forward the development brief for the allocation site.	Amend SPD to include comment [section 9(4), Fig. 16]
Public exhibition	<p>General comments received as part of the manned public exhibition on 30 June 2007</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion for a bus lay-by along Mulfords Hill as buses sometimes cause congestion along the A340 when passengers boarding. • Some residents (Silchester Road) were concerned about the proposed retail units to the back of their properties as this would cause additional noise and smell. • AWE provides Leisure/Recreation facilities on their site but there are plans to withdraw these facilities which would leave a big hole for residents in Tadley. To compensate for the loss it was suggested to provide sports facilities on the allocation site. • Concerns about inadequate infrastructure i.e. sewerage problems new development would have. • Concerns about car parking provision. At times the existing car park at Sainsbury's is at capacity. Where would all the new parking space go? • Problems with Youth in the area, they cause nuisance to residence and visitors. The police move them on, but don't seem to get the grips with the problem. 	<p>Current national thinking is to discourage the use of a bus lay-by as the 'congestion' caused by a stopped bus is seen as traffic calming</p> <p>The proposed retail unit has been reduced in size and moved towards Sainsbury's supermarket</p> <p>Leisure Provision and Open Space may be negotiated as part of the Section 106 Planning Obligations</p> <p>This has been reflected in the SPD in section 'Development Issues/Constraints'</p> <p>The SPD makes reference to the need for a Transport Assessment</p> <p>The option of providing a facility for Youths as part of a comprehensive scheme for the site could be taken into consideration in discussion with a developer</p>	

Appendix 6 – Representations in relation to consultation on Sustainability Appraisal

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
RPS on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd and Stacey Development Ltd	The following sentence should be deleted: "The draft Development Brief provides a masterplanning approach to the implementation of Policy D3.16 as opposed to a piecemeal approach through the submission of individual planning applications."	Comments noted. This sentence is a summary of the findings/ outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal and therefore is vital information.	No change
RSPB	<p>The appraisal did not consider the additional recreational pressure that may be exerted on the Pamber Forest and Silchester Common SSSI as a result of improving the accessibility to sensitive parts of the site.</p> <p>The SA failed to identify a potential negative impact associated with the provision of additional parking close to the SSSI. Concerned that additional parking, particularly associated with the proposed extension to the supermarket, could provide an opportunity for easy access to Tadley Common and other areas of the SSSI, which could exacerbate existing problems associated with the recreational use of the heathlands.</p> <p>Table 6 of the SA identifies a large number of 'uncertain effects' which should have been further evaluated.</p> <p>Policy E7 of the adopted Local Plan should be included in Table 2 of the SPD</p>	<p>Comments noted. An improved accessibility to Tadley Common has not been promoted in the SPD, rather improved accessibility to the allocation site to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Tadley Common Management Plan has been prepared by Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. It is the Council's intention to seek agreement from the Wildlife Trust and to consult Natural England on the Management Plan with the view to cover additional mitigation measures. It is hoped to append an updated Management Plan.</p> <p>Comments accepted</p> <p>Comments accepted</p>	<p>Amend SPD to clarify improved accessibility (para. 10.21 and footnote to objective)</p> <p>Append Management Plan to SPD</p> <p>Review Table 6</p> <p>SPD amended and Policy E7 in Table 2 included</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
	<p>Recommends that a more thorough SA of the SPD be undertaken that addresses the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the effects of increased accessibility of Tadley Common and other sensitive areas of the SSSI, particularly including the effects of the provision of additional parking close to the heaths; - the contribution towards assess management, such as wardening, on Tadley Common and other sensitive parts of the SSSI, and; - the provision of alternative open space to further reduce pressure on the SSSI 	<p>See comments above. It is hoped to consult with Natural England and RSPB on the Management Plan to cover the raised concerns.</p>	
Natural England	<p>Biodiversity: Would wish to be closely involved in the development of the Tadley Common Management Plan.</p> <p>Waste Management: Would expect the final plan to have been guided by PPS10. This Government Policy should also be included in Appendix B and at Table 2 of the SA Report</p> <p>Pleased to see the comments contained in para. 5.5 (SA Scoping Report) and the fact that the potential impacts on Tadley Common have been recognised as playing a key part of the SA/SEA</p>	<p>See comments above. It is hoped to consult Natural England on the Plan</p> <p>Comments accepted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Appendix B and Table 2 of the SA have been amended</p> <p>No change</p>

Consultee	Comments Received	BDBC Response	Change
Highway Agency	The Agency is satisfied that the SA Report has been robustly created in accordance with further guidance document 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks, (Nov. 2005) and satisfies Test of Soundness 4.24 iii – 'the plan and its policies have been subject to sustainability appraisal'. However, an evaluation of transport impacts associated with future development may be required.	Comments noted. An evaluation of transport impacts associated with future development will form part of the LDF Core Strategy work	No change
Tadley Town Council	Document underlies the importance of Tadley Common but provision of easy maintenance plan is vital Para. 2.2.10: Burnham Copse Primary school not infant/junior MUGA on tennis courts would fit in well Put Tadley on the map as a green Town Centre	Comments noted The tennis courts lay outside the boundary of the allocation site	Amend para 2.2.10



