



**Statement of Common Ground  
between Hart District Council  
and Basingstoke and Deane  
Borough Council**

**Ref: SOCG 7**

**4th June 2013**

## Background

1. Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council (BDBC) (Representor 0176) has made a number of representations on the Hart Local Plan: Core Strategy (Pre-Submission Draft).
2. This Statement of Common Ground summarises Basingstoke and Deane's representations, and clarifies whether or not the issues raised have subsequently been addressed in light of the published submission documents, including **Minor Changes** made to the plan at the submission stage, and **Main Changes** that the Council has proposed for the Inspector to consider. The schedules of changes are available at: [http://www.hart.gov.uk/index/top-planning/planning-policy/local\\_plan\\_core\\_strategy.htm](http://www.hart.gov.uk/index/top-planning/planning-policy/local_plan_core_strategy.htm) BDBC has agreed to this statement.

## Policy CS3: Housing Provision

3. BDBC submitted a holding objection to Policy CS3 (Housing Provision) on the grounds that the zero net migration derived housing target would not meet the full objectively assessed need for housing in Hart. BDBC is concerned with the approach taken and that in particular if housing needs in the west of Hart (around Hook) are not met in full that this may result in additional housing pressure on Basingstoke and Deane.
4. BDBC state that this objection could be withdrawn subject to additional evidence being provided that demonstrates that the housing provision under Policy CS3 and the housing allocation under Policy CS23 are sufficient to meet the objectively assessed needs to the west of the district and thus not putting further pressure for additional housing in Basingstoke and Deane.

### ***Hart DC Response:***

5. There is no ready-made figure for objectively assessed need in the west of Hart. However the Council has sought to satisfy BDBC that objectively assessed needs for housing in the west of Hart will be met.
6. Hart DC commissioned Demographic experts at BDBC to establish what Hart's objectively assessed housing need would be using the methodology that BDBC were using at that time (no longer used). This gave a figure of 4,572 dwellings needed in Hart between 2011 and 2029 (254 per annum).
7. Hook's population is 8.65% of Hart's total population. It is considered reasonable that 8.65% of the figure for overall need in Hart could be considered to represent the objectively assessed need for housing in that part of the district. 8.65% of 4,572 dwellings equals 396 dwellings.
8. 600 dwellings are proposed at Hook through the Core Strategy, including 500 dwellings at the North East Hook site allocation. Including completions since

2011 (3) and outstanding planning permission (77) this gives a total of 680 homes planned at Hook. This comfortably exceeds the 396 figure.

9. BDBC have recently updated its housing evidence with demographic research and a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment. However, for the purposes of providing a benchmark, a similar exercise can be carried out using the latest available CLG household projections. To meet CLG household projections, Hart would need 6,404 dwellings between 2011 and 2029 (356 per annum). 8.65% of 6,408 dwellings equals 554 dwellings, again somewhat fewer than the 680 to be provided at Hook.

### ***BDBC's position***

10. BDBC generally agree that in light of the work outlined above the Hart Core Strategy could be considered to meet needs for housing in the west of the district, where if not met, pressure on additional housing in Basingstoke and Deane may arise. However Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council are still of the view that a Zero Net Migration approach to determine the housing needs of Hart District does not meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and BDBC's objection on this point still remains.

## **Policy CS23: North East Hook**

11. BDBC submitted a holding objection to Policy CS23 on the grounds that it is potentially unsound as it has not been justified that the necessary infrastructure improvements to ensure the proposed development is sustainable, can be provided in a timely and appropriate manner, particularly in the context of the existing constraints on the capacity of infrastructure that serves Hook.

12. Following further discussions between the two Councils, this objection could be withdrawn subject to further evidence on the nature, extent and provision of the necessary infrastructure to serve this development.

### ***Hart DC Response:***

13. It is understood that BDBC's main infrastructure concerns are with regards to transport impacts and sewage treatment capacity as issues that could potentially have a cross boundary impact.

14. With regards transport, the Transport Assessment Corridor Mitigation Study (WSP 2013) does not identify any need for mitigation on routes between Hart and Basingstoke and Deane as a result of the development proposed in Hook.

15. Hampshire County Council (HCC) are the relevant highway authority and have been involved with the TA work throughout the Core Strategy preparation. HCC considers that for the purposes of a Core Strategy that sets out a broad housing distribution (rather than a full set of site allocations) the Transport Assessment work carried out by Hart DC is sufficient. However HCC consider that the supporting text to Policy CS13 Transport should be amended to clarify that Hart DC will undertake additional work to refine the transport assessment findings when

the site allocations are determined through a subsequent DPD, and through the more detailed work associated with specific transport assessments.

I.Changes to paragraph 148 beneath Policy CS13 (Transport) to be included in Local Plan

Para. 148

All significant development proposals will be required to demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the local and strategic road networks or that they can mitigate any adverse impacts. Where a Transport Assessment for a significant development proposal illustrates that there will be an impact on the capacity of local or strategic routes, the developer will need to undertake detailed traffic modelling in accordance with national guidance and to provide effective mitigating measures.

Additional text to be included in Para 148:

Assessment to date has been at the strategic level through transport assessment work undertaken by consultants, which has included review of possible junction improvement measures to mitigate the impact of forecast overall growth in transport demand. It is recognised that this will need to be refined as more detailed plans on the location and distribution of development comes forward. In particular, more detailed work will need to be undertaken at the subsequent Sites and Allocations stage of the Local Plan. This will draw on the work undertaken in the strategic level Transport Assessment, but more specifically will identify priorities for transport mitigation measures linked to particular proposed development sites. Each planning application will also need to be supported by a Transport Assessment which will also be expected to undertake detailed assessments on affected junctions. As this information comes forward it will influence the final package of junctions requiring mitigation measures. As such the current mitigation measures and proposals outlined in support of local plan growth is subject to review following further more detailed work.

16. With regards sewage, Thames Water has agreed in principle to a drainage strategy for the residential development whereby foul flow will be pumped through the Crooked Billet WPS. This is set out in the North East Hook Development Principles Masterplan, May 2013. The email attached at Appendix I confirms that the Crooked Billet WPS connects to the Hartley Wintney STW. The planning application for a supermarket submitted by Sainsbury's (Ref: 13/01145) confirms that this will also be the case for the supermarket (should it be permitted) on the remaining part of the site. There will therefore be no impact on foul waste infrastructure in Basingstoke and Deane.

17. It is also relevant to highlight a proposed a 'Main Change' to Policy CS11 (Infrastructure) which clarifies that cross-boundary impacts will be addressed.

**Main Change No. 10:**

Amend second para. of Policy CS11 as follows:

**The scale and pace of development will depend on sufficient capacity being available in existing infrastructure to meet the needs of new development. Where this cannot be demonstrated the scale and pace of development will be dependent on additional capacity being released through reasonable demand management measures or better management of existing infrastructure, or through the provision of new infrastructure.**

**Development proposals will be required to provide on and/or off-site infrastructure, facilities and/or mitigation necessary to address needs arising from the proposal, including cross boundary impacts, and appropriate measures towards the mitigation of cumulative developments impacts. Provision may also be required for subsequent maintenance where contributions are secured for facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of users of the development concerned.**

**Where new development creates a need for additional infrastructure a programme of phasing and delivery must be agreed with the Council, in partnership with relevant partners, before development begins. The Council may require that development does not proceed in advance of appropriate and necessary infrastructure improvements.**

**Proposals for new and improved infrastructure will generally be supported subject to an assessment of their environmental impacts.**

### ***BDBC's position***

18. BDBC agree that subject to the changes to paragraph 148 proposed by HCC, and the proposed Main Change to Policy CS11 being included in the Core Strategy, its concerns regarding Policy CS23: North East Hook have been adequately addressed.

## **Mitigation for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area**

19. Although not raised through its representations on the Core Strategy, BDBC is asking whether SANGs in Hart could be used to mitigate any small scale development in Basingstoke and Deane that may take place within the 5km zone of influence.

### **Harts DC position**

20. Hart DC agrees to this request in principle provided it will not prejudice the ability of Hart DC to deliver its own plan.

# APPENDIX I



Daniel Hawes <daniel.hawes@hart.gov.uk>

---

## Fwd: FW: Crooked Billet SPS Hook C10187

2 messages

---

Robert Thain <robert.thain@hart.gov.uk> Tue, May 28, 2013 at 12:23 PM  
To: Daniel Hawes <daniel.hawes@hart.gov.uk>  
Cc: Robert Jackson <robert.jackson@hart.gov.uk>, Daryl Phillips <daryl.phillips@hart.gov.uk>

Confirmation of network destinations from the Crooked Billet SPS

Robert Thain MATCP MAUD  
Principal Planning Officer  
Hart District Council  
Email: [robert.thain@hart.gov.uk](mailto:robert.thain@hart.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01252) 774459

---

**From:** Timothy Dale [mailto:[timothy.dale@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:timothy.dale@thameswater.co.uk)]  
**Sent:** 28 May 2013 11:27  
**To:** Mike Smith  
**Subject:** Crooked Billet SPS Hook

Morning Mike

I refer to a telephone conversation today concerning the above station.

I can confirm that the Crooked Billet pumping station discharges to the gravity network in Phoenix Green Hartley Wintney. This network then gravitates to the Hartley Wintney STW in Hares Lane.

[Kind regards](#)

**Tim Dale**  
[Adoptions Engineer](#)  
[Developer Services](#)

\* Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Clearwater Court, Vauxhall Road, Reading, RG1 9DB

( Direct: 0203 577 9223 Helpdesk: 0845 850 2777

<https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?ui=2&ik=83f7beec1a&view=pt&search=inbox&th=13eeae13da0...>

1/2