

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Comment ID	PM	Proposed Modification	Summary of Comments	Proposed Changes	Officer's Response
Mr Terry Davies	Scottish and Southern Energy	2		General Comment	Provides comments on general guidance on the provision of electricity infrastructure for new developments. Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and Distribution Network Operator. To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead lines should be formally agreed with Southern Electric Power Distribution prior to submission of a planning application.		Noted
Planning Team Marine Management Organisation	Marine Management Organisation	3		General Comment	No further comments on the proposed modifications.		N/A
Mr R Cornford		4		General Comment	Respondent does not provide any additional comments but supports the plan in being legally compliant and sound.		Noted
Ms Victoria Potts	East Hampshire District Council	5		General Comment	No comments on the proposed modifications		N/A
Dr Pauline Holmes	Natural England (Main Contact)	24		General Comment	Supports the changes made specifically to policies EM1, EM4 and the implementation and monitoring of policy EM4. We also concur with the findings and conclusions of the HRA addendum and the SA addendum.		Noted
Charlotte Mayall	Southern Water	39		General Comment	Southern Water do not wish to make any representations on the proposed modifications.		Noted
Heidi Clarke	Sport England	88		General Comment	Sport England does not wish to make any specific comments on the proposed main or minor modifications to Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan.		Noted.
Mr Daniel Chalk	Network Rail	91		General Comment	Network Rail provide general comments on the preparation of the Local Plan. Development proposals affecting the safety at level crossings are an extremely important consideration. An increase in the volume of traffic using a level crossing should be taken into consideration. We welcome the duty of cooperation so that the impact of additional numbers of people using level crossings can be considered.	We believe that proposals that impact upon level crossings should include S106 or CIL contributions to mitigate the impacts of those developments. Wherever possible Network Rail will seek closure of level crossings, and either replacement with a footbridge or inclusion of a diversionary route. We believe that S106 developer contributions should be used to fund footbridges and where this is not possible developer contributions should be used to fund any mitigation works at a level crossing as a result of increased type or volume of user. As Network Rail is funded by public remit we believe it is unreasonable to expect Network Rail to fund mitigation measures on railway infrastructure as a result of third party commercial development. We believe that the above comments should be integrated as policies within the Local Plan. Planning obligations for railway infrastructure should be included in the same manner as planning obligations for highways, local facilities etc. as developments can impact the railway and developer contributions should be levied to mitigate such impacts.	Noted and no change proposed. The local planning authority will consult with Network Rail on planning applications where the development proposal is within proximity to the railway and/or it is of a scale to impact on the level crossing. Each case will be considered individually and the local planning authority will need to consider whether it is appropriate to seek contributions towards the closure of level crossings through S106 meets. Planning obligations must meet the three tests set out in the NPPF paragraph 2014 and CIL Regulation 122.
Mrs Gillian Lincoln		94		General Comment	Respondent believes there will be large amounts of traffic associated with Hounsome Fields (SS3.12) which ensures that public transport, cycling and walking routes will not suffice.	The A30 into Basingstoke from the south is already full to capacity. It is vital that this is taken into account and in this respect provision should be made within Hounsome fields for a major road to either link any proposed South Manydown development or to provide a western bypass. This will then free Old Down from the threat of a road across this vital conservation site and enable the long awaited LNR status to be realised.	Noted and no change proposed
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	229		General Comment	Concern that the impacts of the anaerobic digestion facility at Farleigh has not been properly considered. There are a number of issues with the existing facility such as odour.	Add "Anaerobic digestion facilities should provide an accurate plan for production and storage of digestate; a clear plan of the area on which digestate can be spread; accurate plan of the size and number of vehicle movements, their routing and restrictions on hours vehicle of movements." "Anaerobic digestion facilities should not be constructed within one mile of a residential property. "Anaerobic digesters must conform to BSI PAS110"	No change proposed. This level of detail on anaerobic digestion facilities is not required in the Local Plan. Policy EM8 will provide the policy framework for the matters raised to be considered fully through the decision making process of relevant planning applications.
Mr Albert W.R. Allwood		249		General Comment	The plan should focus on allocating housing on smaller greenfield sites rather than large greenfield sites, which will create unsustainable development. Concerned that this will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and will impact upon the landscape and biodiversity.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Kate Mabbott		252		General Comment	The plan should focus on allocating housing on smaller greenfield sites rather than large greenfield sites, which will create unsustainable development. Concerned that this will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and will impact upon the landscape and biodiversity.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Gary Power		266		General Comment	Concerned about the potential impact that the proposed development at Upper Cufalde Farm will have on the existing traffic patterns and will increase the amount of congestion that currently takes place between Bramley and Basingstoke.	Serious attention should be given to the road infrastructure before the building of any further new homes are approved within this area, traffic along Cufalde Lane is already a serious problem and by adding additional homes without looking at the road infrastructure will be disastrous for the existing residents.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.

Mr Gary Power		267	General Comment	Concern about the impact of the proposed development at Upper Cufaude Farm on the existing infrastructure.	Serious attention should be given to the road infrastructure before the building of any further new homes are approved within this area, traffic along Cufaude Lane is already a serious problem and by adding additional homes without looking at the road infrastructure will be disastrous for the existing residents.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Patrick Blake	Highways England	284	General Comment	No comments on the proposed modifications.		Noted
The Mayor of London	Greater London Authority	289	General Comment	No specific comments to make. The mayor would welcome a reference to crossrail 2 acknowledging its potential benefits, which could have a role in supporting wider development objectives.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Joan Ashton	Winchester City Council	305	General Comment	Winchester City Council has no comment to make in respect of the Proposed Modifications.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Clive Fletcher		337	General Comment	The plan should focus on allocating housing on smaller greenfield sites rather than large greenfield sites, which will create unsustainable development. Concerned that this will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and will impact upon the landscape and biodiversity.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mrs Carol Jane Fletcher		342	General Comment	The plan should focus on allocating housing on smaller greenfield site throughout the borough and in villages rather than large greenfield sites.	With national policy taking account of building on greenfield sites not just larger developments - a level playing field. Understandably the large sites tickets the councils box with regards to numbers of houses in one g but from a landscape point of view more questionable.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Kate Kerrigan	Tetlow King	343	General Comment	Housing target has not been fully informed by the borough's affordable housing needs. Site available at Dixon Road to meet need.	Housing target should be increased and land at Dixon Road should be allocated.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	348	General Comment	Acknowledge that OAN is not a matter for the main modifications, but reiterate that the HBF considers that housing need is higher than the housing target proposed by the council.	Increase housing number	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Robert Deanwood	Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK	354	General Comment	No comments to make on the proposed modifications.		Noted
Mr Peter Dutton	Gladman Developments	357	General Comment	Proposed housing number does not meet the council's need.	Suggest housing target should be increased to at least 1,050dpa.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Peter Dutton	Gladman Developments	362	General Comment	Housing delivery places significant reliance upon the delivery of a number of large scale strategic allocations on the edge of Basingstoke. Such schemes often provide housing at a slower rate than originally anticipated. This would further undermine the council's ability to maintain a five year land supply. To ensure development comes forward as expected and to provide a more balanced spatial strategy, suggest that additional housing should be provided in Sherfield on Loddon and Tadley. Tadley is suitable for development as the extremely small risks associated with an off-site accident at the AWE would be outweighed by the benefits of housing delivery.	Suggest allocating sites in Sherfield on Loddon and Tadley.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr John Richards	Dandara Ltd c/o Daniel Watney LLP	370	General Comment	The representation reiterates the principle reasons why Dandara consider the Local Plan, including main modification, does not satisfy the NPPF tests of soundness. Dandara consider that the 850 dpa housing target remains unsound. In addition, they consider that the Plan fails the positively prepared test of soundness by being unable to reinstate a five year supply of housing land following adoption. Dandara also continue to maintain that the Plan is overly reliant on Basingstoke for housing delivery. Dandara conclude that the Hearing Sessions and associated Statements provided the Council with an opportunity to propose Main Modifications to the emerging Local Plan to assist the Inspector with his consideration of soundness as required by para. 182 of the NPPF. However, rather than take this opportunity, the Council has continued with its original pre-determined position on housing delivery. Therefore the emerging Local Plan clearly remains unsound.	Dandara Ltd considers that in order for the Local Plan to be found sound, it is necessary for the Council and Inspector to identify short to medium term deliverable housing sites which are able to reinstate and maintain a five year housing land supply following adoption of the Local Plan.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Donatella Cillo	Environment Agency (West Thames Area)	378	General Comment	In terms of Policy EM6 we wish to suggest the following text is removed to provide greater accuracy and consistency, which includes 'likely to be' and 'will prevent further development within the relevant catchment'.	The second paragraph of policy EM6 should be changed as follows: "Should the monitoring indicated that there is likely to be a deterioration in an individual element's band status of the borough's water body(ies); Policy SS4 <del>will prevent further development which exacerbates such deterioration within the relevant catchment</del> will ensure that development proposals in affected areas will have to demonstrate that they would not exacerbate such deterioration in the relevant catchment and intervention mechanisms will be required to improve the quality of the relevant catchment prior to the release of any further allocated sites or granting of planning permissions".	No change proposed. The council understands that the Environment Agency's intention with the modification is to add certainty regarding actions to be taken if deterioration of band status is identified through monitoring. However, the council is keen to ensure that the policy acts in a precautionary manner to ensure water quality is protected and band status is not breached. Therefore, the council considers no further modifications to the policy is required. However, it is appreciated that in the context of the NPPF requirements, the policy should be positive and provide clarity and therefore the council welcomes the Inspector's view on this issue via his Report.

Planning Team Transport for London (TFL)	Strategic Planning Team	380		General Comment	The TFL have recommended that the borough council consider adding an additional criterion and supporting text to Policy CN9 which supports the crossrail 2 project.	The council will work in partnership to promote a safe, efficient and convenient transport system which will: a) Build on the boroughs strategic location, through improvements to strategic road and rail connections to the wider area, for example supporting capacity enhancements on the South West Mainline such as those enabled by Crossrail 2; b) Promote transport choice, through improvements to public transport services and supporting infrastructure, and providing coherent and direct cycling and walking networks to provide a genuine alternative to the car and facilitate a modal shift; c) Improve access to Basingstoke town centre and rail station by all modes of transport and ensure good integration between transport modes; d) Manage congestion and provide for consistent journey times; and e) Promote and improve safety, security and healthy lifestyles. Possible additional supporting text: Transport for London and Network Rail are currently developing the Crossrail 2 regional scheme which runs between Hertfordshire and Surrey. Whilst the current scheme is not currently planned to directly serve network rail stations in the borough, the additional capacity that Crossrail 2 would help release capacity on the South Western Mainline, for the benefit of borough residents and businesses. As such, the Council supports the project and will seek to explore and maximise the opportunities it could offer.	Noted and no change proposed. The Borough Council supports proposals to develop the Crossrail 2 project, including the benefits that it could deliver to the borough. However, as this is only at an early stage, with trains not due to commence until 2030 at the earliest, inclusion of references in the Local Plan are not considered to be appropriate.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	109	9a	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification as agreed in the Statement of Common Ground.		Noted
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	309	9a	Main Modification	Identifies a typo. Start date for Manydown should be 2017/18 (not 2017/19)	Correct typo to change start date to 2017/18	Noted. This has been checked and confirmed that the noted error only occurred in the schedule of changes rather than the updated version of the Plan itself. Therefore no changes are required.
Miss Nicola Hume	Persimmon Homes Thames Valley	332	9a	Main Modification	Suggest housing number could be increased to take account growth from neighbouring authorities, as Basingstoke and Deane is relatively physically unconstrained. Concerns about the deliverability of Basingstoke Golf Course (SS3.11)	None	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	345	9a	Main Modification	This proposed modification makes various changes to Policy SS3 which allocates the main housing sites across the Borough. By far the most strategic allocation is at Manydown where a total of 3,400 dwellings is expected to be delivered in the period 2016-2029. Enterprise M3 is fully supportive of this allocation since it has the potential to open up business opportunities in the medium and long term alongside housing development. We acknowledge the need to ensure infrastructure is in place to support development and are supporting that process across the Borough. We have pressed for acceleration of housing in our Growth Deal which we signed with government in July 2014 and would want greater emphasis placed on getting houses built in support of Basingstoke's labour market and it's ability to fulfil its economic role. Enterprise M3 is therefore keen to work closely with the local authority to bring the development forward as quickly as possible.		Noted
Mr Dominik Veasey		371	9a	Main Modification	Updated phasing in Policy SS3 shows that the strategic allocations fail to apply justified and effective delivery rates (and unrealistic first completions dates), and do not give consideration to associated delivery/market capacity implications. It is suggested that this would result in a shortfall in delivery across the Plan Period. Suggest a more balanced distribution between west/south-west and east/north-east of Basingstoke. Lodge Farm and Hodds Farm could help to address this shortfall and provide critical mass to deliver a sustainable new neighbourhood to the east of Basingstoke.	Application of Taylor Wimpey's suggested delivery rates would result in 2,250 homes being delivered at Manydown over the Plan Period, and the Golf Course and Hounsome Fields not finishing development until 2028/29 (and changes are required to SS3 to reflect this).	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	381	9a	Main Modification	Identifies a typo. Start date for Manydown should be 2017/18 (not 2017/19)	Correct typo to change start date to 2017/18	Noted. This has been checked and confirmed that the noted error only occurred in the schedule of changes rather than the updated version of the Plan itself. Therefore no changes are required.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	108	11b	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification which reflects a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure delivery.		Noted
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	215	11b	Main Modification	Respondent notes previous errors made with the Beggarwood development whereby land was released for additional housing. In order to be successful additional wording should be added to the policy as " The space for provision of social and physical infrastructure should be retained for at least five years after completion of the housing development."	Add "The space for provision of social and physical infrastructure should be retained for at least five years after completion of the housing development."	Noted and no change proposed as the wording is not considered necessary.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	110	13a	Main Modification	We support proposed modification PM13a to provide greater focus on site accessibility by walking and cycling.		Noted
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	147	13a	Main Modification	Additional text is required to the proposed modifications in order for the Local Plan to be sound, in particular references to information in the cycle strategy is required.	Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes, including direct, convenient cycle access to the town centre, improved access towards Dummer and the provision of internal walking and cycling routes linked to existing and potential external routes and the Public Rights of Way network in accordance with the Borough Cycle Strategy , improving the links to the existing Winchester Road bus stops and providing safe and convenient crossing points to facilities provided on Hounsome Fields (SS3.12);	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.

Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	216	13a	Main Modification	Respondent notes that the policy requires further clarification and a map. Respondent notes that bus stops should also be placed within the Basingstoke Golf Club site at masterplanning stage. Suggested policy wording should be altered by deleting the words "improving the links to existing Winchester Road" and adding "establish well located accessible bus stops on bus routes within the development."	Provide a map of the proposed cycle track and rights of way routes. Delete the words "improving the links to existing Winchester Road". Add "establish well located accessible bus stops on bus routes within the development."	Noted and no change proposed. A map showing the off-site routes would be unduly detailed. Criterion (j) and the new criterion (j)(i) provide flexibility to ensure that public transport is provided in the most appropriate and viable manner. The bus routes (and location of bus stops) will be informed by the operator's viability considerations (influenced by patronage and journey times) which may or may not include the provision of bus stops within the sites. In any case, it will be necessary to ensure the bus stops are convenient and accessible for residents.
Mr Pete Errington	HCC	295	13a	Main Modification	HCC suggest the inclusion of cycle and pedestrian crossing points on the A30 which need to be added onto the map. These should be clearly shown on the map with clearly marked appropriately coloured arrows.		Noted and no change required. The number and location of crossing points on the A30 between the south-west sites will be informed by the Transport Assessments submitted with the sites' planning applications. The policy criterion provides an appropriate basis to secure the required measures.
Mrs Vera Bateman		304	13a	Main Modification	Opposes the timescale of delivery for infrastructure, notes this should be delivered at a faster rate, particularly in relation to Kennel Farm. Notes that bus stops, routes are not clear on maps.		Noted and no change proposed. The delivery rates reflect the outcomes of annual monitoring and the inset maps are indicative only and therefore do not show suggested detail at this stage.
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	222	15b	Main Modification	Respondent notes that the current wording does not indicate that masterplanning should aid successful sustainable businesses. Respondent notes the wording should be amended to "master planning of sustainable community and shopping facilities".	Add wording to indicate "master planning of sustainable community and shopping facilities".	Noted and no change proposed as the wording is not considered necessary. This is inherent to the requirement for comprehensive planning.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	111	34	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification which refers to the inset map.		Noted
Mrs Vera Bateman		303	34	Main Modification	Opposes the timescale of delivery for infrastructure, notes this should be delivered at a faster rate, particularly in relation to Kennel Farm. Notes that bus stops, routes are not clear on maps.		Noted and no change proposed. The delivery rates reflect the outcomes of annual monitoring and the inset maps are indicative only and therefore do not show suggested detail at this stage.
Mrs Gail Tomblin		93	38a	Main Modification	Respondent wishes to see policy wording which seeks public and open space along Cufaude Lane.		Noted and no change proposed. The proposed change to SS3.8 (PM125) states that the hatched area will ensure sufficient mitigation of development on the surrounding area and therefore already includes the housing along Cufaude Lane.
Edward Dawson	on behalf of John Lloyd	346	38a	Main Modification	Further land should be added to the site allocation at Upper Cufaude Farm in order to ensure viability and delivery of the site. Also, additional land is required to account for the mitigations needed on site. The current proposed amendment to the boundary of the site is incomplete and therefore unsound.	The inclusion of additional land is helpful, but is not sufficient. Its inclusion is intended primarily to provide better mitigation and the avoidance of conflict with land in the ownership of the National Trust, and therefore of significant historic and heritage interest. The site in question, to the north of the main modifications, is well contained and a natural extension of the existing allocation. Inclusion of this land in the modification for the Cufaude Farm housing allocation would form a logical rounding-off and further mitigation of development. Insert: The boundary of allocation SS3.8 Upper Cufaude Farm has been further extended to include land to the north. This is to allow for a comprehensive scheme to be brought forward in conjunction with Cufaude Farm. It would ensure that the listed buildings are given proper consideration, with improved development layouts and landscape, and enabling higher level mitigation measures, as part of an overall master plan. Timescales for delivery also need to be updated in Policy SS3, in order to bring forward land in a timely way reflecting the need for increased housing supply. The Housing Supply Statement will require revision on an annual or more regular basis to ensure consistency with national policies for sustainable growth.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Tim Vincent	Reside Developments Ltd	388	54	Main Modification	We welcome the inclusion of the land north of Redlands into strategic site allocation SS3.7. However, Redlands itself and land south east of Redlands House has not been included, with no explanation as why this land has been excluded. The extra land has capacity for some 155 dwellings and is deliverable and achievable.	Redlands House and land south east of the house should also be included in the allocation boundary. The inclusion of this land will enhance the allocation and the extra land has capacity for approximately 155 dwellings.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	409	54	Main Modification	CW request that the pollution control limits and the extent of the BPA and flood zones 2 and 3 within the site be included in the Inset Map to match Appendix 2 revised illustrative masterplan for East of Basingstoke contained in SoCG ref. PS/02/40 If the outer extent of the odour constraint is to be effective, then the eastern section of the two fields north of Whitmarsh Lane need to be excluded from development, in the Inset Map, and the existing vegetation and hedgerows retained. The map does not include the changes that Country Watch requested in our note to the Programme Officer dated 4th September 2015. This note was included in the list of documents for the Hearings. We need to request the Borough to incorporate our proposed changes.	Changes to inset map to show pollution control limits, BPA and flood zones (and any others previously suggested).	No change proposed. A masterplan will be produced for the East of Basingstoke site (policy SS3.9) and is expected to be finalised by the end of 2016. The additional detail requested to be added to the Inset Maps are constraints which will be further considered through masterplanning. The masterplans will include additional detail to that shown on the Inset Map. Masterplanning work will be subject to public consultation. The phasing areas identified on the Inset Map, including the eastern section of the two fields north of Whitmarsh Lane, will be further considered through masterplanning and also the detailed planning application stage.

Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	410	64	Main Modification	CW request that the pollution control limits and the extent of the BPA and flood zones 2 and 3 within the site be included in the Inset Map to match Appendix 2 revised illustrative masterplan for East of Basingstoke contained in SoCG ref. PS/02/40 If the outer extent of the odour constraint is to be effective, then the eastern section of the two fields north of Whitmarsh Lane need to be excluded from development, in the Inset Map, and the existing vegetation and hedgerows retained. The map does not include the changes that Country Watch requested in our note to the Programme Officer dated 4th September 2015. This note was included in the list of documents for the Hearings. We need to request the Borough to incorporate our proposed changes.	Changes to inset map to show pollution control limits, BPA and flood zones (and others suggested in previous correspondence).	See response to Mr Alan Read (Ref. 409)
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	221	69a	Main Modification	Respondent notes that it is unclear as to how land safeguarded for a 'western bypass' is distinguished from land for a link road. Respondent wishes for further clarity or for the wording to be removed.	The wording should be clarified or removed.	The link road and the western bypass are separate pieces of infrastructure, and separate requirements are set out in the policy and the supporting text.
Miss Lucie Stone		277	69a	Main Modification	Concern that the extent of the safeguarded land on the inset map is excessive. The reference to a crossing between two points (e.g.. A and B) the should be determined at planning permission level so that it does not prejudice the delivery of housing numbers during the current plan process.	Proposed Amendment PM225 refers to the Inset Map and specifically states that the precise location of a railway crossing will be determined through future planning applications. The reference to a crossing between two points (e.g.. A and B) the exact point to be determined at planning permission level should be sufficient and would not prejudice the delivery of housing numbers during the current plan process.	Noted and no change proposed. The inset map provides an illustrative layout rather than a detailed land use map. As safeguarding land for a railway crossing is a key element of the policy, it is appropriate that an indicative area should be shown. The precise location of the railway crossing will be informed by detailed technical work undertaken by the landowner to inform their outline planning application. The council therefore considers that the current approach is reasonable and would not prejudice housing numbers.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	310	69a	Main Modification	Reference to the bypass should be removed as it is not required in this plan period.	Reference to the bypass should be removed	Noted and no change proposed. As discussed at the Local Plan hearings, the requirement to have regard to a potential future western bypass was removed from the policy. However, the bypass is still a longer term aspiration for the council, that may be required to support development on future phases of Manydown. Therefore is considered appropriate to include it in the supporting text.
Councillor Paul Harvey		324	69a	Main Modification	Opposed to wording of policy as respondent is concerned that it could be used to prevent or hold up development of the Manydown site.	Proposed wording as follows: The wider Manydown site offers longer term potential for further development as a component of this, consideration should be given to the future provision of a western by-pass connecting the A339 and junction 7 of the M3. In undertaking master-planning of the wider Manydown area, regard should be given to safeguarded land for the railway line, as identified on the Inset Map, and the need to avoid prejudicing the delivery of the current proposed housing.	The railway crossing and the western bypass are important considerations in the masterplanning of the new community at Manydown, and should be considered as part of any planning application. No change to the principle of the text is proposed, but a further minor modification is proposed to clarify the wording to state: 'In undertaking masterplanning for the wider Manydown area, regard should be given to safeguarded land for crossing the railway line...'
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	326	69a	Main Modification	Opposed to wording of policy as respondent is concerned that it could be used to prevent or hold up development of the Manydown site.	Proposed wording as follows: The wider Manydown site offers longer term potential for further development as a component of this, consideration should be given to the future provision of a western by-pass connecting the A339 and junction 7 of the M3. In undertaking master-planning of the wider Manydown area, regard should be given to safeguarded land for the railway line, as identified on the Inset Map, and the need to avoid prejudicing the delivery of the current proposed housing.	See response to Councillor Harvey (Ref.324)
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	382	69a	Main Modification	Reference to the bypass should be removed as it is not required in this plan period.	Reference to the bypass should be removed	Noted and no change proposed. As discussed at the Local Plan hearings, the requirement to have regard to a potential future western bypass was removed from the policy. However, the bypass is still a longer term aspiration for the council, that maybe required to support development on future phases of Manydown, so it is considered appropriate to include it in the supporting text.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	105	71a	Main Modification	We support PM71a but require the inset map to be amended to make minor corrections to the alignment of the Basingstoke Golf Course site's north-eastern boundary and southern boundary. The proposed alignment of the Basingstoke Golf Course site's north-eastern boundary and southern boundary is shown on the enclosed Site Location Plan and Schedule of Main Modifications Plan.	To make the proposed modification sound, the inset map needs to be amended to make minor corrections to the alignment of the Basingstoke Golf Course site's north-eastern boundary and southern boundary. The proposed alignment of the Basingstoke Golf Course site's north-eastern boundary and southern boundary is shown on the enclosed Site Location Plan and Schedule of Main Modifications Plan.	The proposed change would lead to the inclusion of an additional area of land covered by a band of trees (the 'Coachroad belt') on the northern boundary and exclude a small area of land adjacent to the M3. It is not considered suitable to make the change to include the additional land on the northern boundary at this stage as it would be a main modification that would require further consultation. In any case, the council considers that it is of limited significance whether the land is included within this boundary or not, as it would be considered within the urban area for the purposes of considering any future planning application. There is no specific requirement for the allocation to precisely match the land ownership and the exclusion of this land from the site boundary would not prevent the landowner including it within their red line when an application came forward. The change to the southern boundary is considered negligible and does not warrant a modification at this stage. Again, this change can be addressed through the planning application process.

Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	291	74	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council do not agree that BDBC has the right to override or change a published Neighbourhood Plan in the special case in subsection f). Note that further clarification is necessary for the policy to be sound.	Clarification is needed on the proposed wording as per our note in 4. above.	Noted and no change proposed. The wording does not suggest that the council will override a Neighbourhood Plan but rather the new criteria provides a supporting framework for sites allocated in neighbourhood plans and therefore provides further clarity.
Mr Alan Johnson		166	74	Main Modification	Objects to the implications that BDBC can only permit new housing outside of the SPB where the development is allocated in a neighbourhood plan 'made' by BDBC.		Noted and no change proposed. The policy sets out that an allocation in a neighbourhood plan is just one of the circumstances where development will be permitted outside of SPBs
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	149	75	Main Modification	Concern that the proposed modifications will not be implemented.		Noted and no change proposed. Any applications for development at Basing View will be assessed against the policy criteria.
Councillor Paul Harvey		327	75	Main Modification	Basing View should be developed as employment first with ancillary uses supporting the employment use. Residential shouldn't be included unless led by the council as part of securing the wider employment. Do not support an explicit policy of residential use on Basing View until it could be shown that all avenues of business use on the site had been exhausted.		See response to BDBC Labour Group (Ref.330)
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	330	75	Main Modification	Basing View should be developed as employment first with ancillary uses supporting the employment use. Residential shouldn't be included unless led by the council as part of securing the wider employment. Do not support an explicit policy of residential use on Basing View until it could be shown that all avenues of business use on the site had been exhausted.		Noted and no change proposed. The policy reiterates that the site will be protected as a high quality strategic employment site and that the provision of residential development at Basing View is part of the overall approach of creating a mixed use modern business location. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	351	75	Main Modification	Policy SS8 Basing View is supported, as proposed to be modified. The broader range of uses proposed in addition to B1 office space is welcomed, and may help to underpin the viability of the employment uses. The detail around the Enterprise Zone for the site is still being developed but in addition we would like to explore whether the site could be augmented with a reasonable allocation for a high grade office campus. Basingstoke is in danger of losing its ability to fulfil its prominent role as a Regional Centre in the M3 corridor. A major B1 site allocation is needed to provide for the offices of the future. Enterprise M3's Land and Property Action Group is currently overseeing work on the development of a commercial sites study for the Enterprise M3 area which is due for completion in May/June 2016. The results from this study may assist in assessing what is needed, and we will share these with the Borough to help shape future plans.	A major B1 site allocation is needed to provide for the offices of the future.	Noted
Councillor Paul Harvey		331	82a	Main Modification	Opposes the removal of sentence in relation to Basing View ' upon completion that a regenerated Basing View would contribute up to a further 4,000 jobs to the local economy during the plan period.'	Basing View.. ' upon completion that a regenerated Basing View would contribute up to a further 4,000 jobs to the local economy during the plan period.' Believe sentence should remain.	Noted and no change proposed. The use of floorspace rather than a job numbers is considered a more appropriate approach and the updated text better reflects the current position.
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	334	82a	Main Modification	Opposes the removal of sentence in relation to Basing View ' upon completion that a regenerated Basing View would contribute up to a further 4,000 jobs to the local economy during the plan period.'	Basing View.. ' upon completion that a regenerated Basing View would contribute up to a further 4,000 jobs to the local economy during the plan period.' Believe sentence should remain.	Noted and no change proposed. The use of floorspace rather than a job numbers is considered a more appropriate approach and the updated text better reflects the current position.
Councillor Paul Harvey		335	94	Main Modification	Opposes the first sixteen gypsy and traveller pitches being allocated to the largest 4 housing allocations.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	336	94	Main Modification	Opposes the first sixteen gypsy and traveller pitches being allocated to the largest 4 housing allocations.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	228	96	Main Modification	Respondent supports the proposed change however requests a change in the monitoring clause. Respondent notes that the monitoring clause should be strengthened with additional wording suggested as 'A maintenance plan for SUDS must be prepared and funding secured. The effectiveness of the system must be monitored regularly.'	Add " A maintenance plan for SUDS must be prepared and funding secured. The effectiveness of the system must be monitored regularly."	Noted and no change proposed. National Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 7-085-20150323) includes guidance on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) including on operation and maintenance. As noted in paragraph 6.56, government has also published guidance on technical standards for SUDS.
Mr Pete Errington	HCC	294	96	Main Modification	Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority note the Additional text at end of Policy EM7 and support the inclusion of this sentence to reflect the importance of incorporating sustainable drainage systems in new developments as highlighted in the Written Ministerial Statement December 2014, the NPPF and NPPG.		Noted.
Ms Donatella Cillo	Environment Agency (West Thames Area)	377	96	Main Modification	We support the additional text to Policy EM7. We believe the new text strengthens the policy to reflect the importance of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).		Noted
Mr James Stevens	Home Builders Federation	352	98	Main Modification	Proposed amendment is unclear. It will not provide clarity for applicants for residential development in terms of what they are required to do in terms of building energy efficient homes.	Instead, council should refer to the need for development to comply with Building Regulations which includes Part L for energy.	No change proposed. The proposed additional text provides useful background information on the council's wide commitments to helping to achieve the UK Climate Change Programme. The modification will not cause confusion to applicants on what energy efficient standards are required for new homes - these requirements are in policy EM9 (Sustainable water use) and criterion 1. f) of policy EM10 (Delivering high quality development).

Mr Martin Heath		10	99	Main Modification	Respondent refers to The North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study and suggests that new homes should have an energy performance rating of 'A' and that new developments should demonstrate how they will contribute to BDBC Low Carbon Strategy.	Ensure new homes are built to a better standard than the existing Part L of the building standards. For example ensure all new homes have an energy performance rating of 'A' and that before planning permission is granted for existing homes I energy efficiency measures are included to increase energy performance by one grade e.g. from D to C. Insist that all new developments demonstrate how it they will contribute to the Councils Low Carbon Strategy and its goal of delivering 20% of energy from renewable sources by 2020.	No change proposed. As set out in the NPPG, LPAs can only set additional housing technical requirements exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Policies for the allocated housing sites (SS3.1 to SS3.11) require development proposals to incorporate and/ or promote renewable and low carbon energy technologies. Applicants will need to demonstrate how their proposals accords with this requirement. In addition, microgeneration is often permitted development.
Mr Martin Heath		14	102	Main Modification	Respondent believes that wind turbines should be included in the plan. Notes that new planning policy is being introduced which disregards wind turbines.	Remove the words "excluding wind turbines"	No change proposed. Proposed modifications PM102 and PM103 are in direct response to the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) entitled 'Local Planning' that was published on 18 June 2015. The council's written statement for Issue 10 (Environment) includes further information on these proposed modifications. Policy EM8 will not apply to wind turbines, however the identification of areas suitable for wind energy development will be considered through the Allocations and Settlement Policy Boundary DPD. In the meantime, wind turbine proposals will be considered against relevant national policy including the WMS. The council's approach is very similar to the approach taken in the recently adopted Knowsley Core Strategy (January 2016).
Sheila Peacock		26	102	Main Modification	Respondent refers to modifications restricting the use of wind turbines. Believes that the Local Plan should be open to other alternative renewable energy including wind turbines.	I believe that if the Local Plan were to include a strong endorsement of the 2010 report on renewable energy in the Borough, "North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study AECOM Ltd. for Basingstoke and Deane, Hart, and Rushmoor, Borough Councils, March 2010", then it is opened to the possibility of wind turbines. Any turbine proposal would have to meet the Government's criterion (referred to in the Plan) of being acceptable to the local community, and would have to go through planning enquiry as at present, but that is appropriate whereas excluding proposals implicitly from the Local Plan with no opportunity for local communities to deem them acceptable is not.	See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14).
Mr Michael Bound		40	102	Main Modification	Respondent notes the exclusion of wind turbines from the policy text. Respondent doesn't believe there is justification for exclusion of wind turbines.	The legality here I will leave to others but whilst I don't doubt that a minister can produce statements that direct local authorities where the statements can be seen to be unsound in the results they bring about they should be challenged- wind generation is and should remain part of the armour to overcome or at least neutralise climate change. I can't believe that it is legal to so obstruct on-shore wind such as to make it virtually impossible for the industry to progress. Is it legal for a minister to force a position where the benefits of what they are virtually banning can and will affect the world climate, peoples health and wellbeing. BDB residents deserve better.	No change proposed. The borough council is not in a position to comment on the legality issues raised by the respondent, however it is important to note that the requirements set out in the Written Ministerial Statement were added to the National Planning Practice Guidance in June 2015.
Rob Score		159	102	Main Modification	Respondent notes the exclusion of wind turbines from the Local Plan. Respondent notes the assets of using wind farms as an alternative resource of green energy to reduce emissions.		See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
Mr Martin Biermann Martin		273	102	Main Modification	Opposes the policy wording to exclude wind turbines, and lists the merits of wind turbines. Respondent suggests that the policy change should not occur.	I submit that the suggest policy change should not be fulfilled	See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
Mrs Caroline Statham		302	102	Main Modification	Opposes the change to exclude wind turbines and wind farms from the Local Plan. Suggests Manydown as a possible site for a wind farm and notes the addition they have to the landscape and energy costs.		See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
Councillor Paul Harvey		338	102	Main Modification	Opposes the exclusion of wind turbines in this revised policy.		See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	339	102	Main Modification	Opposes the exclusion of wind turbines in this revised policy.		See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
Heather Rainbow		350	102	Main Modification	Opposes the exclusion of wind turbines from the Local Plan. Notes there has been no opportunity for consultation, furthermore the ministerial statement is not legally binding.		See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)
Mr Martin Heath		15	103	Main Modification	Respondent questions why the council are 'ignoring' some forms of renewable technologies; believes that wording should be changed to "Policy EM8 will apply to all types of renewable energy".	Either remove the reference to the WMS or include references to all other planning related WMS throughout the planning document. Revise the first sentence of the proposed change to "Policy EM8 will apply to all types of renewable energy" and remove the rest of the changes.	See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14). In addition, the requirements set out in the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) were added to the NPPG in June 2015. As the NPPG refers to the WMS it is considered appropriate and relevant for the Local Plan to refer to the WMS.
Sheila Peacock		28	103	Main Modification	Respondent refers to modifications restricting the use of wind turbines. Believes that the Local Plan should be open to other alternative renewable energy including wind turbines.	report on renewable energy in the Borough, "North Hampshire Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development Study AECOM Ltd. for Basingstoke and Deane, Hart, and Rushmoor, Borough Councils, March 2010", then it is opened to the possibility of wind turbines. Any turbine proposal would have to meet the Government's criterion (referred to in the Plan) of being acceptable to the local community, and would have to go through planning enquiry as at present, but that is appropriate whereas	See response to Mr Martin Heath (Ref. 14)

Mr Michael Bound		41	103	Main Modification	Respondent notes the exclusion of wind turbines from the policy text. Respondent doesn't believe there is justification for exclusion of wind turbines.	The legality here I will leave to others but whilst I don't doubt that a minister can produce statements that direct local authorities where the statements can be seen to be unsound in the results they bring about they should be challenged- wind generation is and should remain part of the armour to overcome or at least neutralise climate change. I can't believe that it is legal to so obstruct on-shore wind such as to make it virtually impossible for the industry to progress. Is it legal for a minister to force a position where the benefits of what they are virtually banning can and will affect the world climate, peoples health and wellbeing. BDB residents deserve better.	No change proposed. The borough council is not in a position to comment on the legality issues raised by the respondent, however it is important to note that the requirements set out in the Written Ministerial Statement were added to the NPPG in June 2015.
Mrs. Maria Miller MP		407	103	Main Modification	I welcome the proposed modifications to meet national targets for carbon reduction and provision of energy demands from renewable sources. However, there is no clear strategy to show how the targets will be achieved.	There should be a clear policy that all new developments must demonstrate how they will contribute to achieving the council's carbon reduction and renewable energy provision targets.	No change proposed. Policy EM10 (Delivering high quality development) criterion 1.f) requires all development proposals to minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design. As set out in the NPPG, LPAs can only set additional housing technical requirements exceeding the minimum standards required by Building Regulations in respect of access and water, and an optional nationally described space standard. Policies for the allocated housing sites (SS3.1 to SS3.11) require development proposals to incorporate and/ or promote renewable and low carbon energy technologies. Applicants will need to demonstrate how their proposals accord with this requirement. In addition, microgeneration is often permitted development.
Mr Martin Heath		9	104	Main Modification	Respondent believes that government standards could be used for energy efficiency in the borough and suggests the use of sustainable homes level 4 (residential) or BREEAM excellent (Non-residential).	All new buildings should be built to an standard equivalent to code for sustainable homes level 4 (residential) or BREEAM excellent (Non-residential)	No change proposed. Following the technical housing standards review, the government issued a written ministerial statement (WMS) in March 2015 withdrawing the code for sustainable homes, aside from the management of legacy cases. The government stated in the WMS that energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 in 2016. The approach taken in the Local Plan to not include an energy efficiency standard is in line with the government approach for Building Regulations to drive housing standards. Policy EM9 already requires new non-residential development of more than 1,000 sq m or more to meet BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption. Policy EM10 criterion f) also requires development proposals to minimise energy consumption through sustainable approaches to design.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	417	107	Main Modification	5L per day outdoor use. How can this be enforced?	None	The water efficiency standard for new homes of 110 litres per person per day in policy EM8 will be regulated through Building Control. Applicants will need to demonstrate what methods are going to be used to ensure new homes meet the water efficiency standard. Recycling of rainwater, for example through the use of water butts, will reduce the amount of mains potable water used for outdoor water uses.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	408	118	Main Modification	OK	None	Noted
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	142	119	Main Modification	Reference to the cycling strategy is required to make the proposed modifications sound.	Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car modes, the ability to service the site by public transport and ensuring connection of the site with the existing and proposed cycle and pedestrian routes, including the Public Rights of Way network in accordance with the Cycling Strategy . This will include improving direct cycle access to the town centre, stations and local services and the pedestrian/crossing facilities across the adjacent section of the A30, to enable access to services to the east, and the provision of a link to the east.	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	143	123	Main Modification	The proposed modifications require additional text in order for the Local Plan to be sound, in particular a reference to the cycle strategy.	Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car modes, the ability to service the site by public transport and ensuring connection of the site with the existing and proposed cycle and pedestrian routes, including the Public Rights of Way network in accordance with the Cycling Strategy . This will include improving direct cycle access to the town centre, stations and local services and the pedestrian/crossing facilities across the adjacent section of the A30, to enable access to services to the east, and the provision of a link to the east.	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.
Mr Keith Oborn		7	126	Main Modification	Respondent doesn't agree with the inclusion of additional land at Upper Cufaude Farm. Respondent is also concerned with potential of increase traffic through Cufaude Lane.	Provide clear and detailed plans to ensure future traffic along Cufaude Lane is reduced as part of the plan.	Noted and no change proposed. The inclusion of additional land responds to issues raised at the examination and is explained in MF17. The additional land will be retained for landscaping and open space. The change does not increase the yield of the site and therefore will not lead to additional traffic to that already considered through the examination.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	411	128	Main Modification	OK	None	Noted

Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	144	128	Main Modification	Additional text is required to the modifications for the Local Plan to be sound. This includes reference to the cycle strategy and direct access to Basingstoke Town.	Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes including direct cycle access to the town centre, the provision of internal walking and cycle routes linked to existing and proposed external routes including the Public Rights of Way Network in accordance with the Borough Cycling Strategy and the provision of public transport from the outset.	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	312	129	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	384	129	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	314	130	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Councillor Paul Harvey		317	130	Main Modification	Suggests change in wording of policy to include Worting and remove other text.	Suggesting wording amendments as follows: 'Retain the separate identity and character of Worting and Wooton St Lawrence, and restrict coalescence between these villages and the new development and retain the separate identity and character of Winklebury, including conserving the ancient boundary of the Roman Road as a green boundary. [Worting] Wooton St Lawrence and Oakley and restrict coalescence between new development and these villages. The development will also retain the separate identity and character of Worting and Winklebury, including conserving the ancient boundary of the Roman Road as a green boundary.'	See response to BDBC Labour Group (Ref 317)
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	323	130	Main Modification	Suggests change in wording of policy to include Worting and remove other text.	Suggesting wording amendments as follows: 'Retain the separate identity and character of Worting and Wooton St Lawrence, and restrict coalescence between these villages and the new development and retain the separate identity and character of Winklebury, including conserving the ancient boundary of the Roman Road as a green boundary. [Worting] Wooton St Lawrence and Oakley and restrict coalescence between new development and these villages. The development will also retain the separate identity and character of Worting and Winklebury, including conserving the ancient boundary of the Roman Road as a green boundary.'	Noted and no change proposed. At the Local Plan hearings, there was concern that the requirement to restrict coalescence between the new development and Worting would not be effective as the allocation would effectively surround the village to the north, south and west. The proposed amendment reflects the LPA's position set out in MF18.
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	385	130	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	315	131	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	386	131	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Miss Lucie Stone		280	132	Main Modification	It is excessive to safeguard, and effectively sterilise, a strip of land along the length of the railway for the "potential" railway crossing to enable development beyond the plan period. The potential to cross the railway in the optimum location should be a consideration of the masterplanning of the site and should not impact detrimentally on the delivery of housing for the current plan period.	Remove reference to safeguarding and replace with an appropriate and deliverable location for the potential for the crossing of the railway will be identified and worked into a master plan of the allocation for the current plan period.	Noted and no change proposed. The inset map provides an illustrative layout rather than a detailed land use map. As safeguarding land for a railway crossing is a key element of the policy, it is appropriate that an indicative area should be shown on the inset map. The inset map shows an area within which land will be safeguarded, and the precise location of the railway crossing will be informed by detailed technical work undertaken by the landowner. Only the necessary land would be safeguarded as part of the planning application. The council therefore considers that the current approach is reasonable.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	316	132	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	389	132	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	318	133	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	390	133	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	146	134	Main Modification	Additional text is required to the proposed modifications in order for the Local Plan to be sound, with particular reference to the cycle strategy and access to the town centre, rail stations and services.	including the provision of direct, convenient cycle access to the town centre, rail stations and services, internal walking and cycling routes linked to existing and proposed external routes and the Public Rights of Way network in accordance with the Borough Cycling Strategy, and the provision of public transport from the outset.	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.
Mr Peter Wilson		219	135	Main Modification	Development to the south of the railway line and Pack Lane within the Manydown site allocation should be limited to 300 dwellings due to the potential impact of traffic on the road network, which was demonstrated in the transport modelling work. The reference to workable transport solutions in the policy should be deleted.	Policy SS3.10 (u) should be further amended as follows: 'On the land south of the railway line and north of Pack Lane, development will be limited to a yield of up to 300 units, unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated to support a higher yield.'	Noted and no change proposed. The revised wording provides certainty that no more than 300 units will be delivered on the site unless workable transport mitigation measures can be demonstrated. However, it solutions can be found in due course then the policy allows for this to be taken into account. This is considered a robust approach.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	319	135	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	391	135	Main Modification	No objection	None	Noted
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	112	136	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification to seek the provision of public transport.		Noted
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	224	138	Main Modification	Dummer Parish Council supports the modification.	This modification must be retained.	Noted

Mr Pete Errington	HCC	296	139	Main Modification	HCC acknowledges that this modification has been made to ensure that the policy is sound and does not impose a blanket ban on development in conflict with the NPPF and that it is meant to ensure consistency with Policy EM6 (Water Quality), suggests slight amendments to the policy (in full representation).	Any planning application for allocated County Council sites will be accompanied by an environmental assessment where required and strategies to ensure appropriate mitigation of the environment, consistent with the NPPG (paragraph 016 Water Supply, Waste Water and Water Quality ID ref: 34-016-20140306) and in acknowledgement of the Environment Agency's permitting responsibilities. These will be developed through consultation with the relevant stakeholders and regulatory bodies. NPPG (paragraph 019, ibid) advises that planning conditions or obligations may be appropriate to phase development or mitigation where water quality is a concern and this is considered to be a more justified and effective approach than withholding planning permission. Therefore the final sentence of this policy should also be removed: Intervention mechanisms will be required to improve the quality of the relevant catchment prior to the release of any further allocated sites or granting of planning permissions .	No change proposed. The council accepts the process in relation to planning applications, but the policy has been designed to recognise the particular issues with water quality in the borough and the potential cumulative effect of development and is intended to provide a robust monitoring mechanism.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	322	139	Main Modification	The NPPG advises that planning conditions or obligations may be appropriate to phase development or mitigation where water quality is a concern and this is considered to be a more justified and effective approach than withholding planning permission.	Object to change and also suggest removal of final sentence of Policy SS4.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Donatella Cillo	Environment Agency (West Thames Area)	373	139	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification. However, we suggest that the word 'likely' is removed from Policy SS4.		No change proposed. The council understands that the Environment Agency's intention with the modification is to add certainty regarding actions to be taken if deterioration of band status is identified through monitoring. However, the council is keen to ensure that the policy acts in a precautionary manner to ensure water quality is protected and band status is not breached. Therefore, the council considers no further modifications to the policy is required. However, it is appreciated that in the context of the NPPF requirements, the policy should be positive and provide clarity and therefore the council welcomes the Inspector's view on this issue via his Report.
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	394	139	Main Modification	The NPPG advises that planning conditions or obligations may be appropriate to phase development or mitigation where water quality is a concern and this is considered to be a more justified and effective approach than withholding planning permission.	Object to change and also suggest removal of final sentence of Policy SS4.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	412	139	Main Modification	'Do not like change but NPPF presumably rules'	None	Noted
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	106	140	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification.		Noted
Mr Pete Errington	HCC	297	140	Main Modification	HCC acknowledges that this modification has been made to ensure that the policy is sound that it is meant to ensure consistency with Policy EM6 (Water Quality) following the EiP. HCC suggest additional wording to the policy ' development proposals in affected areas will have to demonstrate that they would not exacerbate deterioration in the relevant catchment . ' and remove Then the council will resist the granting of further planning permissions or release of Greenfield sites where the Environment Agency indicates that this is likely to contribute to the situation.	The development of County Council sites will be accompanied by a suite of relevant infrastructure measures to ensure appropriate mitigation of the environment. These will be developed through consultation with the relevant stakeholders and regulatory bodies. The possible restriction of granting planning permissions could severely delay housing supply should the Council not have an agreed strategy and therefore the County Council recommends that this amended wording at the end of the policy should be removed entirely. prior to the release of any further allocated sites or granting of planning permissions .	No change proposed. The council accepts the process in relation to planning applications, but the policy has been designed to recognise the particular issues with water quality in the borough and the potential cumulative effect of development and is intended to provide a robust monitoring mechanism.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	325	140	Main Modification	Possible restriction to granting planning permissions could severely delay housing supply should the council not have an agreed strategy.	The proposed addition, 'prior to the release of any further allocated sites or granting of planning permission', should be removed.	Noted and no change proposed. The policy provides a suitable balance between supporting growth and protecting the borough's water environment. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Ms Donatella Cillo	Environment Agency (West Thames Area)	376	140	Main Modification	We support the proposed modification. However, we suggest that the phrase 'is likely to deteriorate' is removed from the paragraph. The new wording implies that if a deterioration in individual elements band status is detected through our routine monitoring, then the developer would need to provide evidence that the proposed development would not exacerbate the observed deterioration.		No change proposed. The council understands that the Environment Agency's intention with the modification is to add certainty regarding actions to be taken if deterioration of band status is identified through monitoring. However, the council is keen to ensure that the paragraph acts in a precautionary manner to ensure water quality is protected and band status is not breached. The council does not accept the suggested change to para 4.48 as this might suggest that action would only be taken once the change in band status had occurred. Therefore, the council considers no further modifications is required. However, it is appreciated that in the context of the NPPF requirements, the paragraph should be positive and provide clarity and therefore the council welcomes the Inspector's view on this issue via his Report.
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	395	140	Main Modification	Possible restriction to granting planning permissions could severely delay housing supply should the council not have an agreed strategy.	The proposed addition, 'prior to the release of any further allocated sites or granting of planning permission', should be removed.	Noted and no change proposed. The policy provides a suitable balance between supporting growth and protecting the borough's water environment. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mrs. Maria Miller MP		404	140	Main Modification	It remains disappointing that action will only be taken when there is already 'likely deterioration' in water quality, and that annual reporting of monitoring is deemed to be sufficient. It is unacceptable that there remains no ambition to improve water quality.		Noted

Mr George Elkin		19	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to change 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		Noted and no change proposed. The council has sympathy with this argument and the change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' has been made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. The use of 'at least' is common practice in Local Plans and should not equate to an unlimited amount of further development. The level of development set out for Bramley specifically reflects a number of factors including level of services/facilities in the area, housing need etc. and any development will need to meet draft Policy CN6 which requires development to provide towards additional infrastructure at a rate, scale and pace to meet the needs and requirements arising from developments.
Mr Nick Paterson-Nield	Barton Wilmore (acting for Mr Dominic Guinness, Mr Christopher Guinness and Mrs Annabel Rollo)	20	141	Main Modification	Concern that there is still ambiguity in the wording of Policy SS5 that may impact upon the delivery of the allocations in SS5, within a reasonable timeframe should the neighbourhood plans not be delivered.	We consider that the final paragraph of Policy SS5 should be amended, to provide further clarity as follows: <del>the council will consider the need to allocate additional sites</del> the council will allocate at least the level of development set out above, in the Neighbourhood Plan Areas where no Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted by April 2018.	Noted and no change proposed. The proposed modification wording is considered to provide sufficient clarity and outlines the council's intentions to address any shortfall. This approach allows a judgment to be made, taking into account relevant monitoring, regarding whether additional allocations are required. Where sites have come forward through the planning system to meet the requirements of SS5, further allocations may not be necessary.
Mr Ian Blair		43	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Revert to original wording or set limit in the settlements individually and in aggregate.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Patrick Murphy		44	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Revert wording to say approximately	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Fausta DiMascio		45	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent also believes that Bramley would not cope with additional dwellings.	To leave the local plan as 'approx.' keeps the development 'in check' for the period and grants some respite from the excessive expansion. The agreed 200 houses more than meet the requirement for 72 houses cited by you as the housing need for Bramley therefore provision for any more is not justified nor positive for the village.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Murray-Cox	Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)	46	141	Main Modification	The Fogarty Group Ltd welcomes and supports the change to Policy SS5 (change PM141) which seeks the delivery of 'at least' 150 homes at Oakley (as opposed to 'approximately' 150 homes as previously stated within the draft Local Plan).		Noted
Mr Chris Greenhow		47	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Clarity from the Local Government on their plans and how they plan to address infrastructure and utility issues within the villages prior to starting any development work.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Kriss Roberts		51	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent refers to Bramley where there are other large developments currently with permission granted.	Amend to 'no more' than 200 houses which have already been allocated at Minchens Lane	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Paul Holland		52	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Believes Bramley needs better infrastructure to support additional houses.	Set a maximum number of houses for Bramley in the plan with support for infrastructure in roads, schooling and doctors to support this maximum number of houses	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Ward		53	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Suggests change of wording to 'expected build of x homes with agreed margin of +/- 10%'.	The change of wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' effectively removes a perceived upper limit of new home building. A more appropriate change would be 'expected build of x homes with agreed margin of +/- 10%'	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Paul Moulton		54	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	The wording should be left at 'approximately' This allows for more than 200 but not significantly more. This is in line with the development that the area can sustain and allows control of said development.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Paul Holland		55	141	Main Modification	Respondent believes that the wording change of 'approximately' to 'at least' allows the amount of dwellings to be increased. Respondent doesn't believe that all locations are subject to the same conditions under the policy.	The changes required are that all locations use the same terminology with the recommendation being that it is a maximum number of houses in each location which clearly can not be breached, if this number is exceeded the developer can be taken to court, at least or approximately can be argued in court to the detriment of the NDP.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Christopher Wilgar		56	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent believes that the character of Bramley will alter with further development.	I feel that it should say a maximum of 200 but I feel that this is too many for the reasons already cited and question where Stratfield Saye is involved in the local development plans and who have roads more likely to cope with this level of development.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Les Bridge		57	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Would you therefore delete this amendment until such time as all services can be put in place to support the proposed changes.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Mrs Lucy Halgoa		58	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Keith Oborn		59	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Rachel Barclay Smith		60	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Believes that Bramley is unable to cope with further development.	To say "at least" 200 homes is far too open ended. Bramley will struggle to cope with 200 homes unless the infrastructure is improved and it is therefore unreasonable to include this vague wording which could mean 600, 700 800 houses. If the amended wording is to remain it must go on to say 'up to a maximum of.....'.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Emma Hill		61	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes the railway crossing in Bramley which is already congested.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Valerie Monger		62	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes that Bramley already has developments with planning permission granted.	Please re-think this latest development.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Sara Weller		63	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Notes Bramley needs improved infrastructure to support further development, suggests additional of a footpath over the railway line among other amendments.	The proposed modification should EITHER revert to "up to 200" houses (which is still significantly more than the number required by Bramley itself, OR provide concrete commitment to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to support this growth, which needs to include: commitment to the additional Chineham station with sufficient parking, addition of a footbridge over the railway line at Bramley, additional parking for users of Bramley station, extension to the existing school and healthcare facilities, an additional shop with appropriate parking, and guaranteed protection so existing green spaces within the village (e.g. Clift Meadow, Forge Field)	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Gary Styling		64	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording for Bramley should be decreased rather than increased. Notes poor traffic in Bramley	I must insist that this revision be stopped and building in Bramley minimised not increased.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Mark Harding		65	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Notes poor infrastructure in Bramley that would be unable to cope with increased development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Sandra Hornblow		66	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Believes there should be further consultation with those living in Bramley.	Adequate consultation should be made to hear the views of Bramley residents. Once heard due consideration should be given to these opinions and concerns before any change in wording is made to the planning documents.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Ms Jackie Goulding		67	141	Main Modification	Respondent opposes additional increase in building in Bramley. Respondent believes that the character of Bramley would change.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Tony Walton		68	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' in relation to Bramley		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Hornblow		69	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should provide an upper limit.	Define an upper limit and allow a facility for all residents and facility providers within the affected villages to adequately assess and comment upon potential outcomes.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Sarah Heaton		70	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes an already rapid increase in housing in Bramley and notes that infrastructure is poor, particularly in relation to the level crossing in which traffic builds up.	Such a high percentage increase is not viable with current roads and infrastructure	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Captain Thomas Exelby		71	141	Main Modification	Respondent disagrees with any further housing developments.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr James Boshier		72	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should provide an upper limit.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Daniel Young		73	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes Bramley and that expansion should be measured.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Sue Barnes		74	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Furthermore Bramley has poor infrastructure and parking issues that development would not aid.	I believe that the Council should review very carefully its thoughts around planning in rural areas like this, and take into account the wishes of the residents who place their trust in councillors to do their best for the people they represent. These wishes and this trust should be placed above the representations made by commercially interested parties such as developers and landowners. We accept that Bramley must take its fair share of new housing alongside the rest of the country, but this should not mean that we are laid open to unlimited exploitation, which would ruin the rural nature of the village, and create chaos and danger to all residents who choose to live there (both present and future).	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Schedule of Representations - Proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan 2011 - 2029 - February 2016

T Thuy		75	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Bramley is noted as having traffic problems.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Daniel Young		76	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent believes that the character of Bramley would change with increased development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Robert Henry Brobson		77	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance to potential of unlimited housing. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes Bramley has already had development which has caused negative impacts on the village.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Philip McCorry		78	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent also notes poor infrastructure in Bramley.	At the very least, reinstate the wording "approximately " as regards Bramley	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Carol Sturgess		79	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' in Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Ian Cameron		80	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Keep the wording as it is i.e. "Bramley approximately 200"	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Peg Keane		81	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes a number should be set in regards to Bramley.	In my opinion a maximum number must be set so that all parties are aware of the number of new houses that can be built rather than having court action being taken to define "At least".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Chris Clarke		82	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Notes that the policy is in conflict with the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and additional dwellings will put strain on infrastructure.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Deborah Holland		83	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers unlimited development. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	In my opinion a maximum number must be set so that all parties are aware of the number of new houses that can be built rather than having court action being taken to define "At least".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
C R Shimell		84	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes in relation to Bramley increased dwellings would negatively impact the local area and infrastructure, which is already struggling.	For these reasons I am strongly opposed to changes to the Local Plan to allow further housing development.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Carol Clarke		85	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes that Bramley has insufficient infrastructure and conflicts with the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Halgoa		86	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' in relation to Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Jane Walton		87	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes Bramley in relation to developments already granted permission and notes existing infrastructure is already at full capacity.	Leave the local plan as it was, there is no justification to amend it.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Asiya King		89	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Notes in relation to Bramley infrastructure is already at full capacity and increased dwellings will not aid this.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Gail Tomblin		92	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent believes the character of Bramley will be dramatically changed from village to town.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)		95	141	Main Modification	We believe the housing target should be increased to a minimum of 16,200 dwellings (900dpa) and the plan should identify additional land in sustainable villages such as Oakley, and a site specific allocation to accommodate 250 dwellings at Park Farm, Oakley.	We believe the housing target should be increased to a minimum of 16,200 dwellings (900dpa) and the plan should identify additional land in sustainable villages such as Oakley, and a site specific allocation to accommodate 250 dwellings at Park Farm, Oakley.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position with regards to the overall housing number and spatial strategy is reflected in the submission Plan with proposed modifications.
Mr Andrew Oliver		96	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in reference to Bramley. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' or 'a maximum of 200 homes'.	Revert to the original statement of 'approximately 200 homes' or better still 'a maximum of 200 homes'	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Mr Geoffrey Hunt		97	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes that PM9a PM135 and PM141 are in conflict. The respondent notes that the plan can not assign allocations as "approx.", "up to" and "at least" for expressions of allocations in the same context and be considered as a consistent approach.	As the plan in total has a specific target then each sub section should also receive a specific target lest the plan in effect permits unlimited development that would cause the plan to be ineffective.	Noted and no change proposed. The wording used is considered suitable, reflecting the specific issues associated with different policies and therefore is not in conflict. Approximately is a suitable term for allocations as site issues identified through detailed masterplanning may lead to a degree of variation in the final yield achieved on a site. Similarly the phrase 'up to' was introduced for Policy SS3.10 (PM135) due to potential constraints associated with development south of the railway line at Manydown. 'At least' in SS5 promotes flexibility and will help to ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. The plan has an inbuilt flexibility to ensure that the housing target is met.
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		100	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance and the council are unable to account for the Local Plan making it ineffective.	Retain the use of "approximately" when referring to allocations.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		101	141	Main Modification	The respondent believes that all dwellings in the plan should be allocated and notes that if there is no definitive allocation then they should be allocated or removed.	For the avoidance of doubt the plan should remove reference to these 150 homes or allocate them.	Noted and no change proposed. The representation does not relate to a specific change as the 150 was already in the submitted plan and has been discussed through the examination.
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		102	141	Main Modification	Respondent believes that settlements that are inside and outside of settlement policy boundaries should be noted with increments of +/- 10 against them. Respondent believes the wording is not precise and does not give the reader a definitive figure of dwellings that could be provided.	Identify the settlements with "defined Settlement Policy Boundaries" and document their allocation	It is considered that this change is not required in terms of soundness issues as settlements with SPBs are shown on the policies map. However, it is accepted that listing the relevant settlements would add clarity to the policy and the council therefore proposes the following minor modification: '....in addition to other developments outside of these areas where growth will reflect local needs and ambitions. <u>Settlements with a defined Settlement Policy Boundary are listed below:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ashford Hill</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Burghclere</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Cliddesden</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Dummer</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">North Waltham</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Old Basing</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Preston Candover</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Sherfield on Loddon</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">St. Mary Bourne</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Sherborne St John</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Tadley/ Baughurst/ Pamber Heath</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Upton Grey</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Woolton Hill</a></li> </ul>
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		103	141	Main Modification	Respondent believes that as some settlements have allocations in the Local Plan they should not receive any more. Respondent believes that "For the five named settlements, if a neighbourhood plan/ neighbourhood development order (Regulation 16) has not been submitted by April 2017, the council will consider the need to allocate additional sites" should be removed.	Remove "For the five named settlements, if a neighbourhood plan/ neighbourhood development order (Regulation 16) has not been submitted by April 2017, the council will consider the need to allocate additional sites."	Noted and no change proposed. The Council will only consider the need to allocate sites if a submission neighbourhood plan has not identified sites by April 2017 or sites which contribute towards the housing figures set in SS5 have not come forward through other means. The more sustainable settlements in the borough have an allocation and a housing figure in SS5, taking account of the relevant evidence base.
Mrs Laura Harley		104	141	Main Modification	Concern that the wording of Policy SS5 has changed from 'approximately' to 'at least' where there is the danger that the number of houses built in Overton could be unlimited. Parish Council feels that they are having to make up for the ensuring that there is a five year housing supply.		Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Mr Joe Robertson		113	141	Main Modification	Respondent supports the change of wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' and believes that more low cost rental and local housing stock is necessary in Basingstoke.		Noted
Mr Christopher Toon		114	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows unlimited development in settlements. Respondent notes that infrastructure is weak particularly in relation to sewers and roads through villages. Believes a maximum number should be noted.	The proposed changes to make the plan sound would be to revert to the former language, or at least identify a maximum number. The terminology 'at least' is open ended and unsound.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Philip McCallum		115	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' particularly in the case of Bramley where infrastructure is weak. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance, furthermore it is not clear on numbers to be delivered. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	As stated above to fulfil the needs of a plan the document needs to be clear and specific. The use of open ended language "at least 200 homes" fails this test. The plan needs to be clear on how many homes and over what period of time. Without this there is no basis for planning decisions in the future and the plan will simply be an encouragement to local landowners and large developers to target the area for expansion which would be uncontrolled, undemocratic and unacceptable. Even at 200 homes the expansion in Bramley on top of significant developments which have already happened threaten to change the nature of Bramley from a village and stretch local infrastructure beyond tolerance.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Mrs Gillian McCallum		116	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent refers to Bramley where infrastructure is weak and roads are congested. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance and change the character of the village. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	The proposed developments within Bramley are already going to put huge pressure on local amenities so that the suggestion of a minimum of 200 properties with no upper limit seems totally impractical. Such huge change would irrevocably alter the character of Bramley for ever.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Jan Wright		117	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in regard to Bramley. Respondent believes that negative impacts will occur as a result of increased dwellings as infrastructure, notably green open spaces will be lost as a result.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Stephen Richards		118	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers unlimited allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	The wording should revert to "approximately 200 homes".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Austen		119	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Believes 'at least' is open-ended and unjustified. Respondent notes that Bramley has one C road which is used as a cut through and blocked by the level crossing. Believes developers will see the proposed new wording as a license to make mass planning applications for every patch of local agricultural land.	Retain the word "approximately 200", which cannot be interpreted as 300 or 400 by greedy developers. In fact, "not exceeding 220" would be preferable, giving just a 10% margin.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Dr Pippa Clarke		120	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes Bramley and believes that increased expansion will be of negative impact to current residents with infrastructure currently weak.	Level crossing to be replaced with bridge, more trains per hour, new schools, new pub, improved bus schedule, improved road crossings, improved levels of policing	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Ian Hadland		121	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes Bramley and believes that proposed development will mean that infrastructure is unable to cope. Respondent suggests that the level crossing be replaced with a bridge among other infrastructure improvements.	Level crossing to be replaced with bridge, more trains per hour, new schools, new pub, improved bus schedule, improved road crossings, improved levels of policing	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Gary Smallbone		122	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance setting no limit to development. Respondent notes that the wording should be amended to approximately 200 or no more than 200 +/- 1% (to allow small but limited flexibility).	Change wording back to approximately 200 or no more than 200+/- 1 %, so that there is a limit in place.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr James Delo		123	141	Main Modification	Respondent disagrees with the addition of 200 homes noting that the community have been very negative towards the change. Respondent notes that the policy should contain 200 homes or less.	The proposal would have to be under 200 homes or the village would lose its sense of individuality and community.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Sara Ethell		124	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers unlimited development Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes that infrastructure will be affected as a result of development and will alter the character of the village.	The original wording is acceptable where the current planning proposals on Razors Farm and Minchens Lane more than meet the 200 new dwellings target.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Canham		125	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Considers Bramley is already overdeveloped as a result of the level of development over the past 10 years. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance to unlimited development. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	I consider that 200 additional homes should be a 'ceiling' and the original wording of 'approximately 200 homes' should be restored to maintain this ceiling. That would restore soundness to this aspect of the plan.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Professor Robert Cheke		126	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in Bramley. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and suggests no upper limit to development. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' and notes that sites already have planning permission granted in Bramley. Furthermore, infrastructure is weak in the village.	A restriction to no more than 200 houses to be built from now on, by reverting to the original wording of "approximately 200 houses" or better to write "approximately 100 houses".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Derek Mc Queen		127	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in regard to Bramley. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' as infrastructure such as the railway crossing, is unable to cope with surplus development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Barbara Wiltshire		128	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in particular relation to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and gives uncertainty to local residents as to development numbers. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Lisa Tarr		129	141	Main Modification	Respondent disagrees with the change from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent notes this provides an unlimited number of houses can be built in a village which is already overstretched.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Tamsin Gill		130	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in particular regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' as this protects infrastructure which is already at capacity with increased population negatively affecting this.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Serena Adele Blain		131	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with particular mention of Bramley. Respondent notes that 'at least' is not restrictive and implies no upper limit, with an increase in population adversely affecting the infrastructure and environment.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Stephen Lambe		132	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should say 'approximately' which would give a definitive figure which would place more certainty on residents.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Mac Andrade		133	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance with uncertainty given to residents. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Karen Rolfe		134	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'. Respondent notes that the infrastructure in Bramley is poor with schools at capacity and roads remaining congested.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Helen Zhu		135	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with particular regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance with a big change on the impact of Bramley particularly noting current poor infrastructure. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Jean Fuller		136	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with particular regard to Bramley. Respondent believes the character of the rural village would be altered with increased development with current infrastructure at capacity. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Bruce Wallace		137	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in regard to Bramley. Respondent notes that Bramley already has large sites with planning permission and believes that infrastructure should also be improved.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Chris Gent		138	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with particular regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' could provide a damaging change to Bramley and affect its current character as a small village. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Rose Waters		139	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in regard to Bramley. Respondent questions the change and believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Julian Pacey	T A Fisher & Son	140	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' gives no upper limit and is vague. Respondent believes wording should be amended accordingly.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Fiona Delo		141	141	Main Modification	Respondent objects to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent believes the change indicates significant change in Bramley and no limit or control is set. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Trevor Pym		145	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley which he believes would change the character of the village. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' noting that other developments in Bramley have gained planning permission already.	Bramley has already suffered major expansions over the past few years with the village population increasing at a massive rate. Given that each house now normally has 2 plus cars it means massive increase in traffic movements. This has major impacts to the village itself but also to surrounding village that people travel through to get to their places of employment. In addition given the number of affordable housing being developed which is way in excess of the requirements of the village population, and the minimal local employment opportunities within the village that do not need a car to travel to, means that people who are often on low income will have to travel to either Basingstoke or Reading for employment with all the costs and hassle of using public transport. I have lived in Bramley for nearly 20 years and have seen a continual degradation in the village due to the housing expansions and I am now almost at the point of where I no longer want to live in this village, the addition of "at least" 200 houses would be the last straw for me and would mean that Bramley is no longer that nice rural community with a great village atmosphere, but given the housing expansions that are planned between Chineham and Bramley along Cufaude Lane it would mean that for me that Bramley would become just an extension to the sprawl of Basingstoke. And not somewhere I would be proud to say is my home. The plan should be changed to say "No more than 200 homes" . Keep Bramley a Rural Village. Keep Bramley a place where people want to live and are proud to call home.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Simon Gill		151	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Respondent notes the current infrastructure problems occurring in the village with regards to the level crossing. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' noting large developments in Bramley already have planning permission.	To revert the wording back to approximately not at least 200 homes.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Jodie Saunders		152	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' with particular regard to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance, noting that 3 developments are also planned for Bramley. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' as infrastructure cannot sustain a higher population.	The wording should be left as it originally was i.e. Bramley - approximately 200 homes	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Brian Hayes Moody		153	141	Main Modification	Respondent objects to further development in Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Rebecca Blain		154	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Respondent believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows no upper limit on development. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately' to ensure infrastructure remains appropriate for the village.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Steve Delo		155	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows unlimited constraint to house building which he believes would damage the rural nature of Bramley. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Clause should remain "Bramley – approximately 200 homes" a definite range "X to Y" or "Up to 200 homes".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

J Edwards		156	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Richard Beale		157	141	Main Modification	Respondent strongly objects to policy wording in relation to Bramley. Respondent believes additional development would leave to increasing traffic levels, infrastructure issues associated with the level crossing and poor local amenities.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Ian Sims		158	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes that infrastructure in Bramley is poor and unable to cope with the current volume of traffic. Respondent also notes that there is no reference to human rights in the plan.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19). An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed and published at each stage of plan making.
Trevor Codlin	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	160	141	Main Modification	The inclusion of the wording 'at least' and justification for it, whilst ensuring that the figures are not considered ceilings for development levels, now gives the impression that there are no upper levels for development in each parish. If the character of each parish is to be maintained there will need to be a cap on development and this plan should reflect that, therefore an upper limit should be set.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Alan Johnson		163	141	Main Modification	Concerned that the policy is not clear enough to be applied when assessing a planning application. Further clarification should be provided on the location in which the 150 dwellings should be identified, and clarification should be provided on the phrasing of the proposed changes, i.e. should be changed to 'within or adjacent'.		It is acknowledged that the wording of the policy differs to the supporting text and therefore it would be suitable to ensure consistency by amending the policy as follows: '...at least 10 homes in and around within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries'. The council proposes to make this change as a minor modification.
MISS LISA LOBB		168	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the change in wording to 'at least'. Respondent notes that Bramley is already a large village and additional housing would strain this changing its character and appearance.	100 new homes in the area is more than enough, not in excess of 200. Bearing in mind the above and, should any building proposal go ahead, much thought will have to be given to providing more amenities for the villagers - currently, we only have one small pub, convenience store and bakery. Any new developments MUST also be in keeping with the feel and architecture of the buildings within the village. The most important thing is for Bramley to retain it's village charm and appeal and not be over-run with new development.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Robin Willoughby		169	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the change in wording from approximately to at least, particularly in relation to Bramley. Respondent believes that wording should be amended to a) Bramley approximately 200 homes with an upper limit of 250 homes".	Should revert to original wording. It may be necessary to supplement with a proposed upper limit as 'approximately 200 homes' could be interpreted as a little woolly. Something like "In the settlements listed below, it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to meet the following levels of development, generally in and around defined Settlement Policy Boundaries: a) Bramley approximately 200 homes with an upper limit of 250 homes"	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Clare Perkins		170	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the wording of approximately to at least in relation to Bramley. Respondent notes that traffic is already congested with local infrastructure unable to cope. Respondent is concerned that additional housing could close the gap between Bramley and Basingstoke.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Anita Gardner		171	141	Main Modification	The respondent opposes to the change of wording in relation to Bramley. Respondent notes that further development would affect the village as a whole and notes the railway station is at the heart of the village affecting the traffic at level crossings and believes the railway station should be reviewed before further development occurs.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Henrietta Pullan		172	141	Main Modification	The respondent refers to change in wording of policy SS5 in relation to Bramley. The respondent believes that no maximum is given allowing unlimited development and notes infrastructure changes are needed.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Sandra Joinson		173	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Andrew Shepherd		174	141	Main Modification	Respondent refers to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Believes 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance to unlimited numbers of development. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	The wording needs to change to reflect an upper ceiling, otherwise what is the point of having the wording at all. The new wording goes from being an indication of the amount to a floor. The wording needs to reflect the expected amount of housing so should contain a floor and a ceiling.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Geoff Myers		175	141	Main Modification	By making the change to use the words "at least" does not give any qualification to the actual number of allocated houses. For this document to have meaning then there must be more specific range of allocated houses specified. Simply stating at least 50, 150, 200 has no more meaning than stating more than one.	Be specific in the details of how many houses are allocated by area, this should be unambiguous and clear so that we can understand the change that this development plan will bring.	Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector. The use of 'at least' is common practice in Local Plans and does not equate to an unlimited ceiling on development levels.
Mr Tim Watkinson		177	141	Main Modification	The respondent notes the change from approximately to at least in relation to Bramley. The respondent suggests changing to "a) Bramley a maximum of 200 homes" (or lower number).	The line should be modified to read "a) Bramley a maximum of 200 homes" (or lower number)	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Homer		178	141	Main Modification	The respondent notes the change of wording of policy SS5 to Bramley. The respondent believes this opens Bramley up for unlimited development in which Bramley are unable to cope with.	It needs to say no more than 200 houses, with the developments in Minchens Lane and Razors Farm we are well over our quota already and for the reasons set out above there is no effective, justified or positively prepared reason that the proposed change should be made.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr C Denyer		179	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with additional housing in Bramley under policy SS5 with the wording change from approximately to at least.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Spring		180	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the alternation in Bramley from approximately to at least. Respondent notes that Bramley has already had large increases in development with more approved. Respondent also notes poor infrastructure in Bramley.	The legalities of the proposals are for legal expertise to consider after taking into account the objections raised by the local community who experience the existing problems on a daily basis.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Patricia Connolly		181	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned in relation to Bramley. Respondent wonders how the village would cope with increased development as it already suffers from infrastructure issues, particularly from the level crossing and flooding.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Mr Simon Steele		182	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with developments in Bramley. Respondent notes problems with infrastructure already in Bramley including the level crossing and issues in winter in terms of local flooding. Respondent believes that the character of the village would change with increased development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Venetia Rowland		183	141	Main Modification	Respondent objects to change reference PM141 on policy SS5 which refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent believes the change indicates significant change in Bramley and no limit or control is set. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Reinstating the requirement for approximately and the reinstatement of the phrase "through neighbourhood plans/neighbourhood development orders"	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Christel Dance		184	141	Main Modification	Respondent feels the amended wording on SS5 leaves Bramley open to development. Respondent believes that the village would be open to unlimited development and would lose its character and feel as a result.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Malcolm Dance		185	141	Main Modification	Respondent feels the amended wording on SS5 leaves Bramley open to development. Respondent believes that the village would be open to unlimited development which the village cannot take.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Frances Hartnett		186	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the change in wording of change PM141. In relation to Bramley, the respondent feels that the wording leaves the policy open to interpretation and could result in an unlimited number of dwellings. Respondent doesn't believe the infrastructure would cope with additional development.	It would be preferable if there were no further development outside of the Bramley Village Plan. However if development must go ahead then the following should happen: 1) New housing should be limited to a specific number and not be an unlimited number 2) A new primary school or an extension to the existing primary school should be built to accommodate the increased population. 3) A new road should be built to take 'through' traffic away from the village 4) Chemist and dentist facilities should be available in the village 5) An additional supermarket should be built on the outskirts of the village 6) An improved bus service should be provided between Bramley and Basingstoke 7) Footpaths should be built between Bramley and neighbouring villages	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Susan Whorton		187	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes current infrastructure is unable to cope with additional development.	Bramley has been allocated approximately 200 houses.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Wendy Craven		188	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in policy wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley noting this disregards local views that have been expressed throughout the neighbourhood planning process. Suggests that development in Bramley should be limited to the figure in the draft, or another limit should be applied.	The local view is that development in Bramley should be limited and if not to the figure listed in the original draft that some limit should be applied.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Karen F Bentall		189	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. New wording suggests unlimited development for Bramley. Re-instating of previous wording will make the policy sound.	The proposed modification needs to remove the words AT LEAST 200 houses from Page 50 a) and reinstate the previous wording, which is in keeping with development levels before 2009 and is to be upheld	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Jonathan White		190	141	Main Modification	Opposes the policy wording change from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Suggests the change states a lower minimum quantity of proposed housing and is not detailed enough. Suggests inclusion of maximum or guardrails.	maximum or guardrails - the statement is too vague.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr David Waine		191	141	Main Modification	Opposes change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Suggests change to "an upper limit of 200 houses".	The change should be rectified immediately to state "an upper limit of 200 houses". This action would, I'm sure, be acceptable to the residents of Bramley.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Ron Chambers		192	141	Main Modification	Concerned that an unlimited number of houses will be built in the village due to the proposed change in Policy SS5. There have already been a number of planning applications submitted in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Chris Wright		193	141	Main Modification	Concerned that the proposed changes to the wording in Policy SS5 could lead to an increase in homes in the Parish. A maximum threshold for the number of dwellings in the parish should be set in the plan, so it would not lead to unsustainable development.	If you are going to use the term 'at least' then specify boundaries/limits. That removes the possibility of ambiguity and possible legal challenges.	Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Ms Shona Tantam		194	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with additional development in Bramley, noting that substantial developments have already occurred in the village. Respondent believes that pressures should be eased rather than added to.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Denise Sharp		195	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with the wording of the policy in relation to Bramley. Respondent notes several developments already planned in Bramley and that the wording for Bramley should remain as 'approximately'.	We already have several developments approved here and I strongly object to any more. I also request that if we are forced against our will to accept more houses that the wording of Local Plan for Development is kept as Bramley has been allocated approximately 200 houses rather than at least. Please don't make a decision based on having to meet quotas, but look at the wider picture in terms of the wellbeing of the people who already live here.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Jacqueline Walker		196	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with additional development in relation to Bramley. The respondent notes the existing infrastructure is at capacity and new residents would impact on this negatively.	Therefore I would like to state my objections to the proposed building of "more than 200 " new houses being built in Bramley. I note that Manydown still remains as fields!	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Richard Herd		197	141	Main Modification	Respondent believes the change of wording of policy SS5 in relation to Bramley is open to unlimited housing development in the village. Respondent notes infrastructure is at capacity and increased development would add to these pressures.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Melanie Herd		198	141	Main Modification	Respondent believes the change of wording of policy SS5 in relation to Bramley is open to unlimited housing development in the village. Respondent notes infrastructure is at capacity and increased development would add to these pressures.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Melissa Dean		199	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with change of wording from "approximately" to "at least". The respondent believes that it could open Bramley up for unlimited development. Respondent believes this would not be suitable.	I respectfully request that you do not change the wording from that in the current draft - DELETE CHANGES UNDER CHANGE PROPOSAL PM141.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Sophie Lucas	Savills on Behalf of Gleesons	201	141	Main Modification	Gleeson strongly supports the councils proposed changes to Policy SS5. which seeks to include the words 'at least'. The introduction of a minimum housing requirements will provide the council with the flexibility required to respond to changing circumstances.		Noted
Jill Spring		202	141	Main Modification	Respondent objects to the proposed change in wording with reference to Bramley. Respondent notes the infrastructure which is already at capacity and would not be able to cope with additional development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Sophie Lucas	Savills on Behalf of Gleasons	203	141	Main Modification	There appears to be no mechanism for considering sites where a main settlement is not the subject of a submitted Neighbourhood Plan by April 2017. We recommend that further clarification is provided within SS5 to explain how the council will deal with sites which come forward in the main settlements which do not have a submitted neighbourhood plan by 2017.		Noted and no change proposed. The policy clearly sets out the council's support for neighbourhood plans which are considered to be the mechanism by which suitable sites should be allocated in the local areas. Every application will be considered on its merits in light of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, taking into account the position regarding neighbourhood plans, current land supply etc. This does not need to be set out specifically in relation to this policy.
RM Kerswill		204	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the change in wording for SS5, which they believe opens the plan to unlimited development in neighbourhood areas, such as Bramley. Respondent notes that infrastructure and facilities should be reviewed first.	I understand that 200 houses are proposed but a subtle change of wording to 'At least 200' is proposed, which in effect means no limit. I wish to object to the proposed change and request a sensible approach to future development in Bramley.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
John Walker		205	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with the proposed wording change, in relation to housing in Bramley. Respondent notes that infrastructure is at capacity, with the railway station having no parking. Respondent also notes that facilities in the village are currently stretched.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
David Cox		206	141	Main Modification	Objects to the proposed modification and any further homes being built in Bramley. Concerned that there is already too much pressure on the existing infrastructure.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Pauline Walker		207	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with the wording change which is seen to insinuate more housing in Bramley. Respondent notes that infrastructure is already at full capacity and would not be able to cope with increase numbers. Respondent believes housing should be available for local people.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Simon Watts		208	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change to 'at least' as they believe it will encourage unlimited expansion. Suggested policy wording to reinstate the word "approximately".	Revert to original wording, reinstate the word "approximately"	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr John Sinclair		209	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Believes Bramley has too much development. Suggestion to reinstate the original wording "approximately" or "no more than".	Reinstate the original wording "approximately" or even better "no more than". The government keeps talking about a Northern Powerhouse, well why don't they build all new houses in the North, this will force the creation of a Northern Powerhouse and will give the South a chance to keep some of our rural villages without the threat of more houses. we paid a premium to live in a village, we don't want our house devalued and our enjoyed damaged further by more houses being built in Bramley.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Gareth Jones		210	141	Main Modification	Oppose change to 'at least' 200 homes, with particular relation to Bramley which is too small to accommodate large scale development. Respondent notes associated service, transport and education issues and further concerns on drainage patterns. Believes wording should be 'not more than'.	Change to "not more than" 200 homes	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Helen Zhu		211	141	Main Modification	Opposes change of wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' particularly in relation to Bramley. Believes change in wording would impact the village and its rural environment in a negative manner.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Emma Tunnicliffe		212	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' noting pressure will be created on local infrastructure including school, amenities and roads. Wording should be reverted to 'approximately' with a limit set on numbers of houses that Bramley can take.	Their needs to be a limit set to the number of homes that Bramley can realistically take - with a careful feasibility study conducted to understand what our current limits would be.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Kevin Saunders		213	141	Main Modification	Opposes the modification which changes the wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes the volume of traffic would affect quality of life and safety of those living in Bramley. Suggests reverting the wording to 'approximately'.	I believe the wording for PM141 part (a) Bramley should be 'approximately 200 homes', and should not be changes to 'at least'.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Nicholas Hird		214	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes the change from 'approximately' to 'at least' gives a potentially infinite number, making planning increasing difficult. Respondent notes that the policy needs lower and upper housing numbers.	The plan needs hard lower and upper housing numbers.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	217	141	Main Modification	Dummer Parish Council oppose the need for identifying sites which can provide at least 10 houses in settlements with defined SPBs. Dummer PC note this is unreasonable as settlements vary in settlement size and employment opportunities. A Dummer should be excluded from this requirement.	The number of houses in settlements with SPBs should be a percentage of established housing numbers factored by local employment needs and distance to employment sites. Dummer should be excluded from this requirement.	Noted and no change proposed. The approach is considered suitable, directing development to settlements with an SPB which are, by definition, considered to be more sustainable. The approach complements Policy SS6: New Housing in the Countryside which provides a suitable policy framework for the delivery of suitable housing in the borough's rural areas. This is outlined in MF15 and is considered suitable particularly in light of the level of development proposed.
Mr Richard Milton		218	141	Main Modification	Respondent opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' for all villages named in Policy SS5. Respondent believes the change in wording encourages unchecked growth and a minimum baseline figure for rural communities. An amendment to the wording of the policy is suggested to provide protection to rural communities.	I believe that the substitution of the words "approximately" with "at least" is unjustified and should not be made. I would welcome the inclusion of some additional text in section PM141 to provide more protection to rural communities on the number of houses for development by requiring the support of the relevant Parish Council.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

						Compliance: Retain the original wording " Bramley approximately 200 homes " since this was agreed by all parties. The suggestion that the wording needed clarification since it might be taken that the "figures might be considered ceilings" is unfounded since from the dictionary definition of the word approximately it is quite clear that it means ' roughly' or ' not exact' and can therefore be higher or lower. To change the wording to "at least" means there is no upper limit, and therefore no guidance, leaving the door open to over development which is not sustainable for a village such as Bramley, as it is fundamentally a rural community. Soundness: Retain the original wording " Bramley" approximately 200 homes " as this amount of additional homes was considered not to be too detrimental to the current quality of life of the residents, with regard to the infrastructure of the village, and consistent with achieving sustainable development by Bramley Parish Council and the local residents. Retaining the original wording " Bramley" approximately 200 homes " and NOT modifying it to "at least" would therefore make the Local Plan sound since it would be in accordance with the previously agreed wording for the number of proposed homes in the village, between Bramley Parish Council, the Local Residents and the Borough Council.	
Mrs Janet Eastment		220	141	Main Modification	Respondent opposes the wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' 200 houses, particularly in relation to Bramley. Respondent notes that agreement was not reached between the parish council and Bramley residents and regards the current wording as not compliant. Respondent seeks policy wording to be changed to 'approximately'.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Ms Amanda Giles		230	141	Main Modification	Respondent opposes the change in wording of policy S55 from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Respondent believes that a clearer framework should be provided, as it stands the wording opens development to being limitless. Respondent believes wording should be reverted to 'approximately'.	I think for the plan to be sound it should set a limit on new development, and the original wording within the plan should be restored - that is that new sites should be found for approximately 200 homes.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Catrina Stockwell		231	141	Main Modification	Respondent notes that change in wording to 'at least' means that the borough council will have no control over development. Respondent believes that wording should remain as 'approximately' as villages are at risk of losing their rural status.	The previous wording "approximately" with the number of homes should be retained. It is necessary that the figure quoted should be considered a ceiling for development. BDBC have in the past stated their intention to protect the diversity of settlements in the borough, with both urban and rural areas. The proposed change of the wording to "at least" removes all protection for the named rural villages, as the borough council would have no effective control over development. Having regard to recent studies, the figures quoted for each of the five settlements is what is considered the maximum number of new houses that each could support with the existing (or proposed improvements in) amenities, and infrastructure. By changing the wording from "approximately" to "at least" the council would be opening the rural villages to levels of development that would be unsustainable. Without effective boundaries on numbers, the borough council is also risking expensive appeals by developers, if, in the future proposed developments are considered inappropriate. By leaving the wording to be "approximately", BDBC will retain control of development, which will preserve the diverse nature of the borough.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Ms Marie Roberts		234	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned that the wording of 'at least' leaves communities unable to plan effectively as they are unclear on total numbers for the designated areas. Respondent notes current infrastructure problems and traffic hold ups in relation to the level crossing in Bramley. Respondent believes that development could be opened up to unlimited numbers.	The words "at least" should be removed from the text. This would allow the community to prepare a sound NDP that plans for a known future.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Paul Stockwell		235	141	Main Modification	Respondent is concerned with the proposed change of policy S55 from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Respondent believes that this opens Bramley up to unlimited development in Bramley.	If the aim of the LDP is to maintain the rural nature of villages, the current wording of "approximately" is appropriate. It provides the correct guidance for future levels of development within the Bramley rural area.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Alan Stelling		236	141	Main Modification	Opposes further development in Bramley. Notes that the infrastructure is already stretched including the local surgery and high numbers of cars. Suggests policy wording remains as 'approximately' for Bramley.	We already have several developments approved here and I strongly object to any more. I also request that if we are forced against our will to accept more houses that the wording of Local Plan for Development is kept as Bramley has been allocated approximately 200 houses rather than at least. Please don't make a decision based on having to meet quotas, but look at the wider picture in terms of the wellbeing of the people who already live here.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Chris Flooks		237	141	Main Modification	Opposes the wording change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes that it is seen to undermine the Neighbourhood Plan process whereby residents have chosen allocation numbers. Furthermore, associated infrastructure is weak with more facilities necessary with current residents.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Peter Hayes		238	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes that character of village would change, as the changes suggests unlimited development. Respondent believes Bramley should remain rural.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Phyl Davies		239	141	Main Modification	Object to the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to an increased number of homes in the parish. There are already a number of planning applications that have been granted permission in the village.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Barbara Jacob		240	141	Main Modification	Opposes to the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes Bramley already has two large scale developments therefore it is already at capacity.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Karen F BENTALL		241	141	Main Modification	Opposes further development in Bramley under policy S55. Notes that infrastructure cannot support further development and questions where additional residents would go to school. Notes several other sites would be suitable for development across the borough.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Emma Dilnutt		242	141	Main Modification	Object to the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that there will be an increase in the level of housing proposed in the village which could lead to unsustainable development. There are already existing pressures on the infrastructure in the village. A limit should be set on the proposed housing requirements for Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Dr Edicula George		243	141	Main Modification	Opposes additional housing in Bramley, objecting to policy wording changes. Notes lack of infrastructure in the village, which cannot cope with further development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Ed Barton		244	141	Main Modification	Object to the change of wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that there will be a vast increase in the number of homes built in Bramley which lead to additional pressures on the existing infrastructure and facilities.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Patrick Murphy		245	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. There is no justification for the change in wording and the parishes involved were not consulted on this proposed modification.	Revert back to original text using word "approximately" Bramley has already committed its support to BDBC Local Plan by agreeing to development of 200 new homes at Minchens lane site, now BDBC are changing the goal posts	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Vicki Tilsed		246	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in Policy SS5. Concerned that there will be an impact on the existing infrastructure in Bramley, a reduction in green spaces and of the village character.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Green		247	141	Main Modification	Object to the potential increase in proposed housing developments in Bramley. Concerned about the impact of the existing traffic congestion levels and the potential strain on the existing infrastructure. This will reduce the quality of life for residents.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Graham Bridgwater		248	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change of wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that this will allow for unlimited development in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Frances and Leszek Stach		251	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. We are concerned that the proposed wording will lead to an increase in housing which will cause additional pressure on the existing infrastructure, and on the volume of traffic in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Lesley Rutland		253	141	Main Modification	Opposes change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes impacts that come with increased development, e.g. increased traffic, demand for school places and building works causing disruption.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Nicola Buchanan		254	141	Main Modification	Concerned that the wording for Policy SS5 will be changed from 'approximately' to 'at least'. There should be a ceiling on the number of proposed homes to be built in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Eur Ing Michael Rutland		255	141	Main Modification	Opposes change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Notes impacts that come with increased development, e.g. increased traffic, demand for school places and building works causing disruption.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Heather Pocock		256	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change to Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that this proposed modification could lead to an increase in proposed housing development in the village.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Eileen Green		257	141	Main Modification	Opposes the policy wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in regard to Bramley. Notes infrastructure problems associated with the village including traffic and only having one shop. Suggests the wording is reverted back to 'approximately'.	I would ask that the allocation of wording be reverted back to approx. 200 and not at least.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Carole Cairns		259	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that an increase in housing developments in the parish will put a strain on the existing infrastructure.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Nigel Blain		260	141	Main Modification	Object to the change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that there is already substantial development in Bramley and further development will lead to increased pressure on the existing infrastructure in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Anthony Durrant		261	141	Main Modification	Opposes policy wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley stating that it allows developers an open door for housing numbers in the parishes developing neighbourhood plans undermining their views. Notes the village already has issues with infrastructure which further development would not improve.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Joe Gregory		268	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change to increase numbers of housing without supporting additional facilities.		Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector. Infrastructure will be provided at a scale and pace to meet needs and requirements expected to arise from development, in line with Policy CN6.
James Forde		269	141	Main Modification	Opposes to the change from 'approximately' to 'at least' in the five neighbourhood planning areas. Notes that unlimited scope is given to developers making growth hard to monitor in parishes. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Do NOT change the wording from "approximately" to "at least".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Alan Stelling		271	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change to the wording of Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to an increase in housing developments and will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities in the village.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Alan Munday		272	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change from 'approximately' to 'at least' which they state leaves the door open for numbers to be far in excess of the total number required. Suggests that the wording should state a maximum number of houses, or similar. Proposal of introducing the word approximate but add a maximum number as well (say 10% extra).	The wording should state a maximum number of houses, or similar. I would propose re-introducing the word approximate but add a maximum number as well (say 10% extra), for example a) Bramley approximately 200 homes but no more than 220 b) Kingsclere approximately 50 homes but no more than 55 c) Oakley approximately 150 homes but no more than 165 d) Overton approximately 150 homes but no more than 165 e) Whitchurch approximately 200 homes but no more than 220	Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Mrs Sarah Adkins		274	141	Main Modification	Opposes change from 'approximately' to 'at least' with regard to Bramley. Notes that new developments have had an impact on the flood risk in the area. Believes Bramley does not have the capacity to cope with additional development. Believes that wording should be reverted to 'approximately' 200.	The modification should be removed and the original language 'approximately 200' reinstated.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Ian Blair		275	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to overdevelopment in the settlements listed.		Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.

Mr Ian Blair		276	141	Main Modification	Strongly object to the proposed changes in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern about the impact on the settlements listed in Policy SS5 and the potential strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities.		Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Mrs Eileen Durrant		279	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change to wording in policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will result in unsustainable development in the settlements listed.	The wording should read at most 200 homes, or 200 homes plus or minus 5% maximum. This puts a sensible and achievable target in place, allows for neighbourhood planning, and allows the planning process to progress in a balanced managed way instead of being entirely reactive to constant pressure from landowners and developers.	Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Mr Oliver Rea		282	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that it will impact upon the character of the village and will put a strain on local facilities and services.	Will destroy local characteristics and rural style. Will be too much strain on all local amenities.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Samantha Walton		283	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in the wording to Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that the proposed modification will lead to unsustainable development, in particular a strain on the existing infrastructure in Bramley, loss of countryside and wildlife, increased risk of flooding and increased traffic congestion.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Nalin and Indira Jayawardena		285	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change of wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that an increased in housing developments will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion and safety issues in the parish, put a strain on existing facilities such as the doctors surgery and the infrastructure.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Paul Lawrence		286	141	Main Modification	Object to the continued over development of Bramley. Concerned over the increase in traffic and the impact on the character of the village. Also concerned about the coalescence of Chineham and Bramley and the strain on the existing infrastructure in the parish.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Miss Antonia Dewhurst		287	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that increased housing development will put strain on existing traffic level, infrastructure and facilities in the parish.		Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
Barbara Carter		288	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned about the potential increase in housing developments which will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities in the parish. Also concerned about the impact on the current public transport facilities.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	290	141	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council accept the policy in principle however do recommend minor changes to improve clarity. Proposed changes include all references to development where a Settlement Policy Boundary exists, be changed to in or adjacent to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary and additional paragraph clarifying this.	Proposed changes: We propose all references to development where a Settlement Policy Boundary exists, be changed to in or adjacent to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary, We propose adding a new paragraph: This policy is only applicable to parishes/towns that contain a defined Settlement Policy Boundary. Development in settlements in the countryside located within the administrative/recognised boundary of a parish that does not have a designated Settlement Policy Boundary is covered in Policy SS6 and not subject to this policy. The policy will apply regardless of whether a parish/town council has commenced preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.	See response to Mr Johnson (Ref 163) and suggested minor modification. however, it is considered that the proposed additional wording is not required as the policy is sufficiently clear as currently worded. The policy supports Neighbourhood Plans across the borough although the requirements relate to settlements with SPBs.
Liz McCormack		298	141	Main Modification	Opposes additional development in the village of Bramley. Notes that Bramley will not retain its character and infrastructure is unable to cope with additional development.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Malcolm Bell	Bramley Parish Council	299	141	Main Modification	Opposes policy wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley stating that it allows developers an open door for housing numbers in the parishes developing neighbourhood plans undermining their views. Notes the village already has issues with infrastructure which further development would not improve.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Kirsten O'Malley		301	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley. Respondent notes insufficient infrastructure, i.e. level crossing, not enough parking at station, traffic which notes as an accident waiting to happen. Increased development affects flooding and an additional school would cause fragmentation problems.	Bramley is already expecting new housing developments at Minchens Lane and Strawberry Fields. We have been allocated a further "approximately" 200 houses - please do not push the village beyond breaking point by making it "at least 200".	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Shifra Langer		306	141	Main Modification	Opposes any additional housing taking place in Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Brian Pocock		307	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change to the wording of Policy SS5 from approximately to 'at least'. A ceiling should be set in the policy for the number of homes allocated to the settlement.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mrs Lucy Knowles		355	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that this proposed modification will lead to unsustainable development and will have an impact on the character of the village of Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Doris Grehan		356	141	Main Modification	Opposes the change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least' in relation to Bramley, states that the character of the village will change as a result.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Sue Poole		358	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned that this will lead to overdevelopment of the village of Bramley and will put a strain on the existing infrastructure.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Jon Adkins		360	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concerned about the strain on the existing infrastructure in Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Simon Lambden		361	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to overdevelopment of the village of Bramley and will also impact upon the existing traffic congestion and put further strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

Mr Philip Quinn		364	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to unsustainable development and will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities in Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Peter Dutton	Gladman Developments	366	141	Main Modification	Support PM141 but suggest the 150 homes to be provided outside the five main settlements should be a 'minimum'. Support intention to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to address shortfalls in the five main settlements. Suggest the provisions of this monitoring mechanism could be extended to the other smaller villages covered by the policy. Tadley should not be expressly identified as an exclusion to Policy SS5, as this would further limit the delivery of sustainable growth.	Revise policy SS5 to state: 'A minimum of 150 homes will need to be identified in areas outside those listed above, and it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes in and around each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries'. Suggest the provisions of this monitoring mechanism could be extended to the other smaller villages covered by the policy. Tadley should not be expressly identified as an exclusion to Policy SS5.	Noted and no change proposed. The 150 is considered a suitable level of development as discussed at the examination and a reference to minimum is not suitable. The council will annually monitor the delivery of units which contribute towards the 150 units, in line with the policy, as outlined in MF15. As already stated, where development is not forthcoming the council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through appropriate means. This would include the scheduled future review of SPBs. Tadley is excluded from the policy in light of constraints associated with the town, as reflected in Policy SS7.
Mr and Mrs Stoneham		367	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that this will lead to unsustainable development and will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities and exacerbate traffic congestion in the village of Bramley.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Peter Dutton	Gladman Developments	369	141	Main Modification	Support PM141 but suggest the 150 homes to be provided outside the five main settlements should be a 'minimum'. Support intention to prepare a Site Allocations DPD to address shortfalls in the five main settlements. Suggest the provisions of this monitoring mechanism could be extended to the other smaller villages covered by the policy. Tadley should not be expressly identified as an exclusion to Policy SS5, as this would further limit the delivery of sustainable growth.	Revise policy SS5 to state: 'A minimum of 150 homes will need to be identified in areas outside those listed above, and it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes in and around each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries'. Suggest the provisions of this monitoring mechanism could be extended to the other smaller villages covered by the policy. Tadley should not be expressly identified as an exclusion to Policy SS5.	See response to Gladman Developments (Ref 366)
Clr Ian Tilbury		379	141	Main Modification	I don't believe this is an appropriate way of allocating strategic housing and risks undermining the limited benefits of Neighbourhood Planning. The change from approximately to at least creates a situation where any number higher than the stated figure is acceptable. Approximately is admittedly vague and possibly plus or minus x% might be more appropriate. I also note there is a spelling mistake on P24 where it refers to meters rather than metres.		As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector and therefore no change is proposed in relation to this. However in order to pick up the typographical error, it is proposed that paragraph 4.73 will be amended as follows, as a minor modification: '...are limited up to 300 <del>meters</del> metres from the primary shopping area'.
Rebecca Davies	North Wessex Downs AONB Office	398	141	Main Modification	The replacement of the word approximately with at least is too a loose a term to use for development and would open the door to significant dwelling numbers. This could have a significant effect on the setting of the AONB in particular, Overton, Whitchurch and Kingsclere which are situated within the setting of the NWD AONB.	Approximately gives enough flexibility without raising concern, alternatively replace with up to and increase the dwelling numbers to provide an appropriate and balanced buffer. The use of in and around defined Settlement Policy Boundaries should be replaced with in and adjacent to defined Settlement Policy Boundaries. The use of the word around is again to lose a term and could result in housing being set out on a limb away from the defined settlement boundary in open countryside, which could raise landscape issues in terms of the character of the natural beauty and setting of the AONB.	Noted and no change proposed. As outlined in council document MF15, the change to 'at least' was made to promote flexibility and ensure that the neighbourhood planning figures are not considered as a ceiling for development levels by Neighbourhood Planning Groups. This change reflects discussions held during the examination and the views of the Inspector.
W MacLennan		433	141	Main Modification	Object to the proposed change in wording in Policy SS5 from 'approximately' to 'at least'. Concern that cumulative development in Bramley will put a strain on the existing infrastructure and facilities, and exacerbate traffic congestion.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Rebecca Davies	North Wessex Downs AONB Office	400	141	Main Modification	Greater clarification required on this policy as to whether dwellings already approved within the plan period count towards this or is it an additional 10. Concern that settlements without an SPB will also be considered that reflects local needs and ambitions.	Sites within the AONB should be excluded as their remote and tranquil character are special qualities of the AONB which could be significantly harmed by minor and major development (9+). Settlements without an SPB are those that are not in their own right considered sustainable therefore development in these settlements would not meet the three elements of sustainability and would not accord with para 14 of the NPPF.	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the plan is sufficiently clear that all sites meeting the relevant criteria within the plan period will be relevant to the policy. It is not therefore an additional 10 units. Policy SS6 provides a suitable framework to enable development outside of SPBs to meet local needs etc.
Mr Alan Johnson		164	143	Main Modification	Some of the text under PM143 required removal as it is a repetition of PM141 and adds nothing to the supporting text.		Noted and no change proposed. Some of the policy text is repeated in the supporting text but this goes on to add additional clarification to the policy and is therefore considered suitable. The wording '...in addition to other development outside of these areas' is considered suitable, reflecting the fact that development will also take place in the remaining rural parts of the borough to meet local needs.
Mr Geoff Myers		176	143	Main Modification	Respondent refers to changing 'approximately' to 'at least'. Respondent notes that 'at least' is not restrictive and allows developers more allowance on housing developments. Respondent believes wording should remain as 'approximately'.	Be specific in the details of how many houses are allocated by area, this should be unambiguous and clear so that we can understand the change that this development plan will bring.	See response to Mr Geoff Myers (Ref 175)
Mr Anthony Durrant		262	143	Main Modification	Opposes policy ref PM143 which supports policy PM141. Notes that the policy provides no support to Neighbourhood Planning.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Malcolm Bell	Bramley Parish Council	300	143	Main Modification	Opposes policy ref PM143 which supports policy PM141. Notes that the policy provides no support to Neighbourhood Planning.		See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	413	143	Main Modification	'Why exclude Tadley?'	None	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Councillor Roger Gardiner		6	144	Main Modification	Respondent doesn't agree with change in wording on policy SS5 and wishes for the original proposal of 150 homes spread through the villages over the plan period.	I supported the original wording in committee please can this be re-instated.	See response to Mr George Elkin (Ref 19)

E A Knight	Pamber Parish Council	34	144	Main Modification	The parish council is disappointed that the proposal to look for the required 150 homes in villages by way of small developments has been removed. Small amounts of growth are more acceptable than large developments.		Noted and no change proposed. The 150 homes remains in the plan but additional clarification has been added regarding location. Growth in rural areas is supported by Policy SS6: New Housing in the Countryside.
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	292	144	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council fully support the proposed modification.	We agree with the underlined change to this paragraph.	Noted
Mr Martin Small	Historic England	21	147	Main Modification	Supports PM147 for its requirement for development to be sympathetic to character and visual quality.		Noted
Cllr Horace Mitchell		35	147	Main Modification	Respondent objects to the removal of parish council support as a requirement for residential development at the edge of settlements and believes that this undermines national policy to empower local communities. Proposes wording is amended to include parish council support.	Reinstate "with parish council support".	Reference to support from parish and town council has been removed in light of soundness concerns. The policy continues to allow flexibility for settlements to grow in a sustainable manner, and would require input from Parish/Town Councils without developments being reliant upon their support. Neighbourhood planning also provides a powerful mechanism for local communities to shape housing provision in their areas, and the council is already providing considerable support for a large number of neighbourhood plans.
Mr Alan Johnson		165	147	Main Modification	Further clarification is required as to where the definition of small scale proposals apply and that this new criteria should only be permitted where it meets a locally agreed need, to ensure that housing development that is granted is consistent in scale.		The policy is not intended to be limited solely to settlements without a settlement policy boundary, and it is considered that any such approach would be inconsistent with the NPPF, as for example there is no such restriction implied by paragraph 55.
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	293	147	Main Modification	Opposes the change to policy as there is no clarity for settlements with no SPB. Note that the footnote 'Four dwellings or fewer (net) to a) of Policy SS6 should be added and a change in the second line to read locally agreed housing need (I.e. adding in the word housing).	Before "Small scale" add 'The policies in this sub section are applicable only to those parishes which do not have a Settlement Policy Boundary within their administrative/recognized boundary'. Add the footnote Four dwellings or fewer (net) to a) of Policy SS6. A change in the second line to read locally agreed housing need (I.e. adding in the word housing)	The approach in Policy SS6 (e) is applicable to all settlements, regardless of whether they have a SPB or not (no restriction is stated in the policy). It is not considered necessary to add the word 'housing' before 'need', as that is inherent from the policy and its title.
Mr Edward Dawson	Michael Frankham	353	147	Main Modification	Impact of change is limited. Policy SS6 is cumbersome, unwieldy and overly long, does not comply with NPPF para 54 as it would not 'enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities'. It should be further amended to encourage small scale schemes that contribute to sustainable development. In criterion (e), the definition of 'locally agreed need' is uncertain. Parish Councils may not speak with a unified voice. The term 'isolated form of development' is also open to interpretation.	Change 'locally agreed need' to 'meets local needs'. Delete requirement that development 'would not result in an isolated form of development'	Noted and no change proposed. The term 'locally agreed need' allows parish councils and other local bodies to influence small scale development in the areas that they know best. The requirement that development should not be 'isolated' is directly related to NPPF para 55.
Rebecca Davies	North Wessex Downs AONB Office	399	147	Main Modification	An improvement and greater clarification of what is small scale. Although mention of AONB would reinforce the importance of landscape and the sensitivity of developing within this designation.	Importance of special qualities of the AONB and link to management plan could be addressed in preamble to policy alternatively include another point: - Development which adversely affects the natural beauty and setting of the landscape of the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will not be permitted. Accords with the aims and objectives of para 115 of the NPPF	Noted and no change proposed. The importance of the AONB is reflected in Policy EM1 and does not required reiteration in relation to policy SS6.
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	414	147	Main Modification	'Why delete Environment?'	None	Noted and no change proposed. The new wording in criteria x and xi provides greater clarity in terms of how any impact on the environment should be considered.
Mr Alan Johnson		167	149	Main Modification	Proposed modification bears no relation to the policies governing applications for replacement dwellings. The proposed modification should have been included in the changes to Policy SS6 e) in change reference PM 147.		This paragraph in the supporting text follows those which refer to replacement dwellings so as to reflect the sequence of the different criteria within policy SS6.
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	225	149		The Parish Council supports this modification.	This modification should be retained.	Noted
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	270	149	Main Modification	Do not feel the additional text included as part of paragraph 4.60 relates to policies governing planning applications. Note the underlined section should be part of the footnote following on from Small scale at the beginning of SS6 e).	Make the underlined section part of the footnote following on from Small scale at the beginning of SS6 e).	Noted and no change proposed. The new text provides additional clarity to the policy and therefore is suitably placed in the supporting text.
Councillor Paul Harvey		340	161	Main Modification	Opposes the concept of offsite contributions for affordable housing.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	341	161	Main Modification	Opposes the concept of offsite contributions for affordable housing.		Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	328	164	Main Modification	Support. The use of S106 as the primary mechanism to secure funding for off site infrastructure is supported. This is considered to be the most suitable way to fund critical infrastructure necessary for this scale of development (Manydown) to ensure delivery.	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	396	164	Main Modification	Support. The use of S106 as the primary mechanism to secure funding for off site infrastructure is supported. This is considered to be the most suitable way to fund critical infrastructure necessary for this scale of development (Manydown) to ensure delivery.	None	Noted
Cllr Horace Mitchell		36	167	Main Modification	Respondent welcomes the increased focus on provision of improved cycling and walking provision. Respondent notes that the need for this is particularly acute in rural areas where public transport services have been sharply reduced over recent years and are expected to be further reduced.		Noted
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	150	167	Main Modification	Support the changes but there should be a requirement in Policy CN9 to accord with the cycle strategy.	b) Promote transport choice, through improvements to public transport services and supporting infrastructure, implementation of the Cycling Strategy, provision of coherent and direct cycling and walking networks to create a genuine alternative to the car and facilitate a modal shift;	Noted and no change proposed. The explanatory text to policy CN9 explains the links to the Cycling Strategy and the possible requirement for development proposals to assist in its delivery.
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	226	167	Main Modification	Provision for infrastructure secured via site specific mitigation measures or via CIL should be retained until the development is complete and occupied to ensure that land or funding required for that infrastructure is not released or reassigned prematurely as happened in the case of Beggarwood.	"Obligations secured for site specific mitigation measures or CIL must be enforced until a year after the housing development is complete and occupied to ensure that local consultation can take place before any changes."	Noted and no change proposed. Obligations secured to serve the site must be provided in accordance with the relevant legal agreement. Where this is not the case, the local authority has enforcement powers available, which it will be able to use, where appropriate.

Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	227	167	Main Modification	Respondent believes further clarification is required in the policy, as areas noted are major arteries that can become congested. Respondent suggests additional wording to "routes should be designed to avoid major arterial roads that are subject to congestion."	Add to do "routes should be designed to avoid major arterial roads that are subject to congestion."	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the proposed amendment is not appropriate, as alternative routes may not be available to provide for the bus route and /or suitable for buses, and these may not serve the needs of the operator. This level of detail should be considered through the Development Management process.
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	263	167	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council supports the proposed change reference and that it is sound.	We agree with the proposal to improve opportunities for cycling and walking provision.	Noted
Clr Horace Mitchell		37	168	Main Modification	Respondent welcomes the increased focus on provision of improved cycling and walking provision. Respondent also notes the need for this is particularly acute in rural areas where public transport services have been sharply reduced over recent years and are expected to be further reduced.		Noted
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	264	168	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council supports the proposed change reference and that it is sound.	We agree with the proposal to improve opportunities for cycling and walking provision.	Noted
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	359	168	Main Modification	Enterprise M3 welcomes the additional paragraph before 5.80, which specifically identifies and reinforces the role of the Borough in the Enterprise M3 area and of the economy generally. Enterprise M3 particularly welcomes the preparation of a Transport Strategy for the Borough. We are already working with the Borough Council regarding this and will actively engage in the preparation of this strategy. We would want to see all major stakeholders involved in the development of this strategy, including Hampshire County Council, National Rail and transport operators and would be pleased to be involved in bringing this grouping together. The Transport Strategy will need to take a longer view than the 2029 time horizon of the Borough Local Plan.		Noted. The council welcomes the support offered by Enterprise M3 regarding the development of a Transport Strategy for the borough and will actively engage with them throughout this process. The council acknowledges the likelihood that this study will need to go beyond 2029, and to consider the findings of the work currently underway with HCC and the LEP using CLG funding.
Mrs. Maria Miller MP		405	168	Main Modification	The proposed modifications in respect of cycling do not reflect the representations made at the examination hearings. There needs to be provision for developers to contribute to cycling facilities off-site, such as direct and useful cycle routes to the town centre and to local amenities. It is also important that cycling facilities are in accordance with the Cycle Strategy.	In order for the Local Plan to be sound, cycling provisions should form part of the broader Infrastructure Delivery Strategy for each allocated site, so that costs and funding for cycle provision are clearly identified, and the policy for each allocated site should include provision for direct cycle routes to the town.	Noted and no change proposed. As the individual requirements to access and serve sites by bike and on foot are not currently known, it is not possible to include specific details at this stage. The IDP includes a general requirement for sites to provide access on foot and by bicycle, in accordance with the policy requirements of the Local Plan.
Clr Horace Mitchell		38	169	Main Modification	Respondent welcomes the increased focus on provision of improved cycling and walking provision. Respondent notes the need for this is particularly acute in rural areas where public transport services have been sharply reduced over recent years and are expected to be further reduced.		Noted
Mrs Sadie Owen	East Woodhay Parish Council	265	169	Main Modification	East Woodhay Parish Council supports the proposed change reference and that it is sound.	We agree with the proposal to improve opportunities for cycling and walking provision.	Noted
Mrs Marion Wolstencroft	Natural Basingstoke	48	173	Main Modification	PM 173 is welcome but requires strengthening to ensure the intent of the modification is not compromised, suggest the following wording - Deletion of 'where possible' or addition of the wording 'Recovery of wildlife populations and habitats, where possible'.	Two potential alternatives for strengthening the supporting text includes: Deletion of 'where possible' or Addition of the wording 'Recovery of wildlife populations and habitats, where possible'.	Noted and no change proposed. Proposed modification PM173 reflects the exact wording in paragraph 66 of the council's Living Landscapes Strategy .
Trevor Codlin	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	161	173	Main Modification	We welcome the inclusion of this supporting text included in this modification.		Noted
Ms Joanne Russell	SEGRO (c/o Barton Willmore)	372	173	Main Modification	The new text recognises that modern storage and distribution facilities are generally likely to result in some adverse impacts on local character and visual amenity, which is a welcomed addition to Policy EP1, given the inherent scale and massing of storage and distribution development. We consider that the inclusion of the modifications will provide a more flexible application of Policies EP1 and EM1. The additional focus on the increased recognition of green infrastructure is commendable practice and a welcomed inclusion within the Local Plan.		Noted
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	415	173	Main Modification	'Good'	None	Noted
Trevor Codlin	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	162	181	Main Modification	We welcome the inclusion of these revised monitoring requirements.		Noted
Mr Alan Read (Countrywatch)	Countrywatch	416	181	Main Modification	Why delete NE, HWLT and HBIC from monitoring? Has HWLT changed its name?	None	Noted and no change proposed. The text has been moved rather than deleted.
Mr Martin Small	Historic England	22	194	Main Modification	Supports PM194 but would welcome the following additional criterion - "capable of avoiding any harm to heritage or biodiversity assets".		Noted and no change proposed. The criteria are designed to address specific issues likely to be of significance to new storage and distribution sites in all cases. However, where relevant the avoidance of harm to heritage or biodiversity assets is already addressed through Policy EM4 and EM11.
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	363	194	Main Modification	Enterprise M3 supports the new text proposed for the end of this policy, but is of the view that it does not go far enough. It meets the LEP's requirements in respect of Storage and Distribution but it does not address our specific and consistent request for additional employment land. Enterprise M3 requests that the development of additional sites for industrial and campus style office uses are also facilitated by this policy.	Enterprise M3 requests the following amendment to the wording to include reference to both Industrial and Prime B1 campus office space as follows (additional wording in upper case):Development proposals for storage and distribution, INDUSTRIAL, AND CAMPUS STYLE B1 OFFICES, outside of the existing Strategic Employment Areas, which come forward in advance of a subsequent DPD, will be permitted, which area it is critical, in our view, that there is joined up thinking and on-going dialogue in respect of linkages between employment, housing and infrastructure. The Council can be assured that Enterprise M3 will work closely with it to facilitate a Development Plan Document which can address the requirements for both of these uses at the earliest possible date, to secure the future of Basingstoke's important employment role into the future.	There is already a considerable amount of vacant office space in the borough, the highest amount in the EM3 area. In addition, rental values would not support speculative office development. The NPPF also steers offices to the town centre, and then edge of centre locations, where there is considerable capacity (in Basing View for example). The need for additional industrial land is not conclusive, whilst occupancy rates are healthy, the rental values are low, and the economic projections for this sector suggest a contraction, not an expansion. Therefore, it is considered that the approach requested would be unjustified.

Ms Joanne Russell	SEGRO (c/o Barton Willmore)	375	194	Main Modification	Segro Properties Ltd welcome the Proposed Modification to Policy EP1. The proposed text to be inserted at the end of the Policy facilitates the growth of the storage and distribution sector where proposals may come forward on land that is outside of an existing Strategic Employment Area, in advance of a Site Allocations DPD. The introduction of broad criteria against which proposals will be assessed is also welcomed as an approach. This provides clarity for developers with proposals. The criteria are generally supported. However, greater clarification is recommended in relation to the requirement for high quality floorspace. In addition, Segro state that the criterion regarding the need for the floorspace to be proven should not be used to frustrate development that may be proposed on a speculative basis.		Support noted. The criterion regarding the quality of the space required is derived from the council's ELR, which refers to the need for grade A space. Segro's own evidence also makes reference to this same requirement. The supporting text also specifies that the goal is to meet the requirement for grade A space (PM195). The criterion regarding need is considered reasonable so that the decision making process can respond to changing market conditions and so that the need for the development can be weighed against any detrimental impacts.
Mr Martin Small	Historic England	23	195	Main Modification	Supports PM195 but would welcome the following additional wording "facilities should avoid harm to heritage or biodiversity assets, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy EM4 and EM11".		Noted and no change proposed. The criteria are designed to address specific issues likely to be of significance to new storage and distribution sites in all cases. However, where relevant the avoidance of harm to heritage or biodiversity assets is already addressed through Policy EM4 and EM11.
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	368	195	Main Modification	Enterprise M3 supports the new text proposed for the end of policy EP1, but is of the view that it does not go far enough. It meets the LEP's requirements in respect of Storage and Distribution but it does not address our specific and consistent request for additional employment land. Enterprise M3 requests that the development of additional sites for industrial and campus style office uses are also facilitated by this policy.	Enterprise M3 requests the following amendment to the wording to include reference to both Industrial and Prime B1 campus office space as follows (additional wording in upper case):Development proposals for storage and distribution, INDUSTRIAL, AND CAMPUS STYLE BI OFFICES, outside of the existing Strategic Employment Areas, which come forward in advance of a subsequent DPD, will be permitted, which are It is critical, in our view, that there is joined up thinking and on-going dialogue in respect of linkages between employment, housing and infrastructure. The Council can be assured that Enterprise M3 will work closely with it to facilitate a Development Plan Document which can address the requirements for both of these uses at the earliest possible date, to secure the future of Basingstoke's important employment role into the future.	See response to Ms Barker (Ref 363)
Mrs Marion Wolstencroft	Natural Basingstoke	50	201	Main Modification	The addition of definitions concerning biodiversity and actions are welcome. However, there are no definition for green spaces, there are a number of references for different green spaces throughout the Local Plan which do not appear in the glossary, including multifunctional green space.	A number of green space terms should be defined within the glossary and incorporate biodiversity where possible.	Noted and no changes proposed. Definitions of some of the terms requested to be added to the Local Plan glossary are already within the glossary of the council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and it is not considered necessary for the others to be added to the Plan, particularly at this late stage. This issue was not raised through the S of CG when the council worked with Natural Basingstoke and some balanced changes were made to achieve consensus between the parties.
Heather Rainbow	CTC Right to Ride Co-ordinator for Basingstoke	148	214	Main Modification	Additional text is required to the proposed modifications for the Local Plan to be sound. This includes references to information in the cycle strategy.	Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes, including direct, convenient cycle access to the town centre and local facilities, improved access towards Dummer and the provision of internal walking and cycling routes linked to existing and potential external routes and the Public Rights of Way network in accordance with the Borough Cycle Strategy, improving the links to the existing Winchester road bus stops and providing safe and convenient crossing points for the A30	Noted and no change proposed. It is considered that the wording of the policy, together with policy CN9 and its supporting text meets this requirement.
Mr Julian Jones	DUMMER PARISH COUNCIL	223	214	Main Modification	Respondent notes that a map of existing bus stops should be added. Respondent suggests amendments to remove reference to "improving links to the existing Winchester Road bus stops." and add "create safe crossings and clear waymarking of cycle and pedestrian crossings of the A30 and connections to the local footpath network south of the A30, especially for the Wayfarers Walk National Long-Distance footpath."	Remove reference to "improving links to the existing Winchester Road bus stops." Add "create safe crossings and clear waymarking of cycle and pedestrian crossings of the A30 and connections to the local footpath network south of the A30, especially for the Wayfarers Walk National Long-Distance footpath."	Noted and no change proposed. The changes would be unduly detailed.
Mrs Gillian Lincoln		232	214	Main Modification	There has been no consideration for car use in the proposed modifications. Concerned that the A30 is already at full capacity and developing the site along this stretch of road, will exacerbate the current traffic problems.	If Hounsome Fields, along with Basingstoke Golf Course, are developed then provision must be made for access to any future development of South Manydown as well as a link to any future western bypass, otherwise all future routes will be blocked. This will also ensure that the conservation area of Old Down Woodland Park and its many wildlife species can be preserved for future generations to enjoy.	Noted and no change proposed. The council's position on this issue was discussed at the examination.
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		98	215	Main Modification	Respondent doesn't believe the change is reflective of NPPF and respondent notes that PM215 is in conflict and inconsistent with principles of the NPPF. Believes wording should be amended to ensure the NPPF is fully reflected.	PM215 needs to reflect the NPPF seeks "sustainable development" and not development "wherever possible"	Policy SD1 replicates the PINS model Local Plan policy. It does not seek to deliver sustainable development, 'wherever possible', but to find solutions to enable proposals to be approved 'wherever possible'.
Mr Geoffrey Hunt		99	215	Main Modification	Respondent believes wording should be altered in the interests of members of the public. Respondent believes that the council should not "work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible" as he believes this may conflict with the councils role.	When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work with applicants to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.	Policy SD1 replicates the PINS model Local Plan policy.
Mr James Wells	Basingstoke Golf Club	107	215	Main Modification	We support the additional of the new Policy SD1.		Noted
Sophie Lucas	Savills on Behalf of Gleesons	200	215	Main Modification	Gleeson welcomes the inclusion of the new policy which sets out the positive approach the Council will take in applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.		Noted
Councillor Paul Harvey		308	215	Main Modification	Respondent adds suggested wording to the policy, which include 'will be approved without [unnecessary] delay' for clarity.	Suggested wording: Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without [unnecessary] delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will [be minded to] grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.	Noted and no change proposed. Policy SD1 replicates the PINS model Local Plan policy as is considered suitable.

BDBC Labour Group	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	313	215	Main Modification	Respondent adds suggested wording to the policy, which include 'will be approved without [unnecessary] delay' for clarity.	Suggested wording: Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without [unnecessary] delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will [be minded to] grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.	Noted and no change proposed. Policy SD1 replicates the PINS model Local Plan policy as is considered suitable.
Ms Rachel Barker	Enterprise M3	333	215	Main Modification	New policy SD1 has been added at the request of the Inspector in order to comply with the NPPF and the need for planning policy to adopt a positive approach. This resonates with the aims and objectives of Enterprise M3 as the body charged with promoting business and enterprise across this important high-tech corridor, of which Basingstoke is such an important part. The inclusion of this policy is supported by Enterprise M3.		Noted
Mr Peter Dutton	Gladman Developments	365	215	Main Modification	Support Policy SD1	None	Noted
Rebecca Davies	North Wessex Downs AONB Office	401	215	Main Modification	Focused on presumption in favour of development but no attention to designation of AONB (character and setting) whereby there is no presumption in favour of development. Policy should include footnote 9 of para 14 of the NPPF.	Include reference to AONB via use of footnote 9 of NPPF that, within the AONB designation there is no presumption in favour of development and major applications would need to meet the tests of para 116 of the NPPF.	Noted and no change proposed. Policy SD1 replicates the PINS model Local Plan policy and cross refers to other policies in the Plan . The AONB is considered under policy EM1 and this does not require reiteration .
Mr David Flint		1	225	Main Modification	Respondent doesn't believe that BDBC has consulted with HSE in regards to the location of the proposed school and centre at Manydown as it is located on an oil pipeline on the inset map. Respondent doesn't believe PM225 is sound or in accordance with National Policy.	Policy SS3.10: Include a new sub-paragraph: 'Pre-application advice shall be sought from the Health and Safety Executive on the proposed development within the Consultation Zones of the oil pipelines and the development shall comply with that advice'.	The inset map provides an illustrative layout rather than a detailed land use map, and the form of the final development will be informed by a range of detailed considerations including the alignment of the oil pipeline. The council does not consider it to be necessary to include the suggested paragraph as other legislation will require the landowner to consult with the HSE.
Paul Bayliss		42	225	Main Modification	Respondent notes that Portway Place (RG23 8DT) is not shown on the inset map and notes that this should be updated.	Up-to-date detailed map	Noted and no change proposed. The inset map only provides an illustrative layout rather than a detailed land use map and therefore no update is considered necessary.
Miss Lucie Stone		278	225	Main Modification	Proposed Amendment PM225 refers to the Inset Map and specifically states that the precise location of a railway crossing will be determined through future planning applications. The reference to a crossing between two points (e.g.. A and B) the exact point to be determined at planning permission level should be sufficient and would not prejudice the delivery of housing numbers during the current plan process.	Amend the hatched land proposed to be safeguarded along the length of the railway with two co-ordinates within which an appropriate location for the crossing will be identified,	Noted and no change proposed. The inset map provides an illustrative layout rather than a detailed land use map. As safeguarding land for a railway crossing is a key element of the policy, it is appropriate that an indicative area should be shown on the inset map. The precise location of the railway crossing will be informed by detailed technical work undertaken by the landowner to inform their outline planning application.
Mr Richard Bayley	B&DBC Landowner Director	311	225	Main Modification	Supports wider area safeguarded for potential future crossing of the railway line.	None	Noted
Mr Matthew James	Hampshire County Council	383	225	Main Modification	Supports wider area safeguarded for potential future crossing of the railway line.	None	Noted