



**Basingstoke
and Deane**

Draft Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024-2042

Summary of Representations made on Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation, January 2024: Spatial Strategy Policies

November 2025



Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	4
2.	Background	5
	Table 1: Plan Production Timeline	5
3.	Summary of representations and proposed changes	7
	Policy SPS1: Scale and Distribution of Development (462 Respondents).....	7
	Policy SPS2: Neighbourhood Renewal (28 Respondents)	10
	Policy SPS2a: Buckskin and South Ham Neighbourhoods.....	11
	Policy SPS3: Delivering the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan (15 Respondents).....	11
	Policy SPS4: Basingstoke Town Centre – Areas of Change (14 Respondents) ...	12
	Policy SPS5: Sites Allocated for Housing Led Development (49 Respondents)...	13
	Policy SPS5.1: Northern Manydown (28 Respondents).....	14
	Policy SPS5.2: Land North of Pack Lane.....	15
	Policy SPS5.3: Southern Manydown (252 Respondents).....	15
	Policy SPS5.4: Land at Whitmarsh Lane (46 Respondents to Land East of Basingstoke)	17
	Policy SPS5.5: Redlands	18
	Policy SPS5.6: Redlands Lodge (Seven Respondents).....	18
	Policy SPS5.7: Sherfield Hill Farm (19 Respondents)	19
	Policy SPS5.8: Popham Garden Village (982 Respondents).....	20
	Policy SPS5.9: Upper Swallick Garden Village	21
	Policy SPS5.10: Land West of Marnel Park (13 Respondents).....	21
	Policy SPS5.11: Weybrook Park Golf Course (10 Respondents) Combined with Land adjacent to Weybrook Park Golf Course (Five Respondents).....	22
	Policy SPS5.12: Land west of Upper Cufaude Farm	23
	Policy SPS5.13: 65 New Road (Five Respondents)	23
	Policy SPS5.14: Oakley Farm, Wash Water	24
	Policy SPS5.15: Land at West End Farm, Mortimer	24
	Policy SPS5.16: Skates Lane, Tadley.....	24
	Policy SPS6: Neighbourhood Planning (199 Respondents)	24
	Policy SPS7: Ensuring a Supply of Deliverable Sites (60 Respondents).....	25
	Policy SPS8: Nuclear Installations – Aldermaston and Burghfield (11 Respondents).....	25
	Policy SPS9: Basing View (13 Respondents).....	26
	Policy ENV2: Strategic Gaps (52 Respondents).....	26

Glossary (Four Respondents).....	27
Policy map (Six Respondents).....	27
Appendix 1: Representations on Allocations now Proposed for removal from the Local Plan	29
Former Policy SPS5.2: Basingstoke Golf Course (Nine Respondents)	29
Former Policy SPS5.3: Hounsome Fields (Eight Respondents)	29
Former Policy SPS5.10: Overton Mill (67 Respondents)	29
Former Policy SPS5.13: 16 Southern Road (Five Respondents).....	30
Former Policy SPS5.15: Land off Ashwood Way (Four Respondents)	30

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement of consultation has been prepared to accompany the publication of the Draft Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024-2042: Updated Spatial Strategy for consultation (2025). It has been published to provide interested parties with a high-level summary of comments made during the previous consultation on the evolving Local Plan which was held in 2024 (the first Regulation 18 consultation). The 2025 consultation focuses on the proposed new spatial strategy and therefore, whilst the 2024 consultation was on a whole draft plan, only comments made on the spatial strategy have been included. A full consultation statement prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Regulation 22(c) will be published alongside the submission Local Plan, which will include all representations made at every stage of the plan-making process.
- 1.2 In addition to a summary of representations, this statement also summarises how relevant policies have been updated since the 2024 consultation. Updates have been made as a direct result of the new National Planning Policy Framework (published in December 2024), comments made during the 2024 consultation and also the updated technical evidence which underpins the plan.
- 1.3 It should be noted that, due to the summary nature of this statement, not all duly made comments from the 2024 Regulation 18 consultation are included. However, all comments made during the consultation remain valid and they will continue to be considered by the Local Planning Authority through the plan making process, albeit in the context of the updated national planning policy position.

2. Background

- 2.1 In 2019, the council decided to launch the preparation of an updated Local Plan. National guidance promotes the concept of an on-going cycle of plan making and review, which is reinforced by the statutory requirement to review Local Plans every five years. An Issues and Options consultation was held in 2020, followed by consultation on a Draft Local Plan in 2024 (Regulation 18 Consultation). This consultation ran for six weeks from Monday 22 January 2024 to Monday 4 March 2024. Over 1,600 representations were made in response to this consultation.
- 2.2 In December 2024, the government published a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024). This had important implications for the plan-making process, including a significant increase in the housing need requirement for the borough. As such, the council needed to revisit the draft plan’s spatial strategy to develop a strategy which would meet the increased housing needs, alongside additional employment floorspace and infrastructure needs. This has led to the identification of additional site allocations.
- 2.3 A second formal Regulation 18 consultation is being held to enable stakeholders to comment on the proposed revised spatial strategy. This is prior to a final consultation on the whole Plan which is timetabled for summer 2026.
- 2.4 The Plan production process is set out in table 1 below.

Table 1: Plan Production Timeline

Milestone	Explanation of Milestone	Date/Expected Date
Issues and Options consultation	The Issues and Options consultation represented the first public consultation stage in the update process. The non-statutory consultation focused on relevant issues facing the borough and set out options for addressing them over the plan period.	Completed in Autumn 2020
Consultation on Draft Plan (2024 Regulation 18)	This statutory stage was a six week consultation on the Draft Plan, which set out the council’s preferred strategy for accommodating future growth and included a full suite of draft development management policies. Comments made have helped shape the next stage of the Plan.	Completed in Spring 2024

Milestone	Explanation of Milestone	Date/Expected Date
Additional Consultation on Draft Plan (2025 Regulation 18) This is the current stage.	This eight week consultation focuses on the council's new preferred spatial strategy for accommodating future growth, taking account of the changes made to the NPPF in December 2024.	Autumn/Winter 2025
Publication of Submission Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) and period of consultation (Regulation 20)	This involves the publication of the Plan in a form which the council believes to be sound and which it intends to submit for examination. This stage includes a further six week consultation period. Comments must specifically relate to the legal compliance and soundness of the plan.	Summer 2026
Submission of Plan to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)	This is when the plan is submitted by the council to the Secretary of State. The evidence base and the representations made during the Submission Plan consultation are also provided to the Secretary of State. The Examination of the Local Plan starts at this point.	Winter 2026
Examination (Regulation 24)	The examination involves an independent Planning Inspector testing the plan for legal compliance and soundness. This process includes an examination in public when public hearings are held.	Spring 2027
Publication of the recommendations of the appointed Independent Inspector (Regulation 25)	This stage involves the independent Planning Inspector providing their recommendations to the council for implementation prior to adoption.	Autumn 2027
Adoption (Regulation 26)	The final stage in the process is the formal adoption of the Plan by the council. Once adopted it forms part of the development plan for the area and will guide future development.	Winter 2027

3. Summary of representations and proposed changes

- 3.1 The following section sets out a summary of the representations made in response to the Regulation 18 consultation held in Spring 2024. It focuses on the policies that relate to the draft Plan's spatial strategy and which are the subject of the 2025 Regulation 18 consultation.
- 3.2 All representations made during the 2024 consultation have been considered by the Local Planning Authority, and, where relevant, have informed proposed updates made to policies. The following section includes a high-level summary of the comments made on relevant policies and site allocations. The section also summarises the main changes that have been made to draft policies since the 2024 consultation as set out in paragraph 1.2. These changes are shown within a text box following the representation summaries. The titles refer to the headings contained in the consultation version of the [Regulation 18 Plan \(2024\)](#). Appendix 1 outlines comments made on policies which are now proposed for removal from the evolving Plan, but they are included for completeness.

Policy SPS1: Scale and Distribution of Development (462 Respondents)

Duty to Cooperate:

- Support from neighbouring authorities for the Plan's approach of meeting the borough's housing needs in full.
- Some respondents considered there to be a lack of commentary in the Plan on the Duty to Cooperate and unmet housing needs.
- Concern was expressed that there were no accompanying Statements of Common Ground to support the Plan.

Standard Method:

- Some support for using the standard method, primarily from the development industry
- 192 representations objected to the use of the standard method as the basis for Plan making in the borough.
- Respondents considered that the standard method is flawed because it is based on past delivery. Alternative methods were suggested.
- Some respondents felt that exceptional circumstances exist in the borough, restricting the ability to meet housing needs in full.
- Concern that councillors acted against their motion to reject Basingstoke and Deane's housing number and the Council should continue to campaign for revisions to the Government's standard method.
- Some support for the housing requirement to be above the Local Housing Need (LHN), to boost the delivery of affordable housing.

- Some concern that the Plan has failed to consider a higher housing figure than the standard method.
- Some support for the housing figure as a minimum level of growth to be planned for.

Plan period:

- Concern that the plan period is shorter than the required minimum of 15 years.
- The plan should look forward at least 30 years, as it relies on large scale developments.
- Queries around the appropriate base date for the Plan.

Stepped Trajectory:

- 30 supportive comments relating to the stepped trajectory and the infrastructure first approach.
- 85 representations objected to the stepped trajectory.
- Concerns included a lack of evidence to demonstrate the approach was realistic, feasible or viable; whether the government would accept this approach; how infrastructure delivery justified a stepped trajectory; questions over whether it is achievable as it relies on the delivery of large sites, and a concern that failing to meet housing need early in the Plan could jeopardise delivery of affordable homes.
- It was suggested that the council should use a ten-year rolling average across the available data.
- Some representations highlighted that no detailed housing trajectory was provided.

Components of supply:

- Concern expressed that the housing buffer is unclear and insufficient. and that there was a lack of flexibility in the supply of housing.
- Some concerns that the Plan's reliance on windfall sites is not in accordance with the NPPF.
- Strategic development sites have not been deliverable in the past so deliverability of the strategy was questioned.
- Suggested that housing delivery could be aided by additional allocations.
- Highlighted that the NPPF's housing requirement on small sites is not being met.

Distribution of development:

- 125 responses supported the spatial strategy. 30 responses supported the omission of a housing allocation at Upper Swallick.
- Supportive comments were received from developers where the spatial strategy allocates their site.

- Concern expressed over the allocation of greenfield sites - development should be focused within Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs).

Neighbourhood Renewal:

- Support expressed for the brownfield first approach.
- 142 respondents felt the spatial strategy should do more to prioritise brownfield land - opportunities within SPBs and the potential for high-density development should be fully investigated first.
- Suggested that Festival Place should be protected and enhanced as a shopping and leisure centre asset.

Allocations:

- Objections to cumulative development to the west of Basingstoke.
- Some concern that councillors had not been fully involved in drafting the Local Plan.
- Concerns expressed over the impact of the Local Plan on villages, alongside concern over impacts on the environment, the local road network and local services and facilities.
- Concerns about the impact of the Plan on designated strategic gaps..
- Concern that development at Overton is accommodating Whitchurch's need.

Neighbourhood Planning:

- Support was given in terms of ensuring fairness by recognising past delivery when setting housing targets for settlements.
- Concern expressed that building on greenfield was going against the Climate Change Strategy.
- Considered that homes should be delivered in sustainable locations well served by transport and infrastructure.
- The Plan should reflect how sites will sustain bus routes to prevent car dependency and potential rail improvements should be considered to help accommodate future growth.
- Concern that development would add further pressure to existing facilities and services particularly healthcare and education services.
- Concern that the Plan failed to have an adequate heritage evidence base.
- Increases in traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) or its junctions need to be carefully planned and mitigated.

Land supply/phasing:

- Concern that there is an over reliance on the delivery of homes on large strategic sites, particularly to the west of Basingstoke, and there is no contingency if large sites do not deliver.
- Development within settlements outside Basingstoke could deliver homes earlier in the Plan period.

Employment:

- Support expressed for floorspace being a minimum but there was encouragement for cross-boundary work to quantify the strategic need for storage and distribution uses.
- Suggested that the Plan should reflect an updated Economic Needs Assessment which should underpin the Plan

Omission Sites:

- A number of new sites were promoted for housing development and employment floorspace.
- Support expressed for the removal of the former allocation at Whitchurch Railway Car Park (Policy SS11) although the site promoter objected to its deletion.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The housing numbers have been updated to reflect the new standard method housing requirement and draft updated spatial strategy, including a stepped trajectory.
- Clarification on the inclusion of a windfall allowance has been added.
- An updated employment section has been included within the policy, to explain the strategy in more detail.
- References to the leisure park and also new retail provision within larger housing allocations has been included.

Policy SPS2: Neighbourhood Renewal (28 Respondents)

- Support expressed for the policy from Hampshire County Council (HCC), neighbouring authorities, some organisations, developers and a number of councillors and individuals.
- Sovereign Hill Partnership (SHP) suggested a new policy for the Buckskin and South Ham area, designating it for neighbourhood renewal.
- Concern that the policy is limited by only referring to neighbourhood renewal within certain residential locations.
- Suggested that references to the minimum number of additional homes to be delivered should be removed.
- Some respondents felt that a minimum of 200 homes was too conservative whilst others felt it was undeliverable.
- Additional wording was suggested to ensure opportunities to enhance the historic environment are taken.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been strengthened to outline more fully what relevant proposals will need to deliver, including a demonstrable benefit to the local community.
- The number of new homes to be delivered has been increased from 200 to 1,000 over the plan period.
- A number of specific issues such as heritage impact and green and blue infrastructure have been added to the supporting text.
- The policy has been expanded through the addition of Policy SPS2a, which identifies the priority areas for Neighbourhood Renewal.

Policy SPS2a: Buckskin and South Ham Neighbourhoods

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS3: Delivering the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan (15 Respondents)

- Some respondents raised the importance of retaining parking in the town centre that is easily accessible, such as for those in rural areas who may not have access to a good bus service.
- Suggested that more needed to be done to support the improvement of the Top of Town area.
- Concern that the practicality of delivering the Basingstoke Town Centre had not been tested.
- Clarification was sought on the approach of the Local Plan to the potential for shop units in Festival Place to be converted into new homes.
- Concern that the policy requirement for the delivery of 400 homes in the town centre was not aspirational enough.
- Recommended that the policy should set a minimum provision of green spaces, based on the Urban Greening Factor approach.
- Support expressed for the policy references to a well-connected town centre – with active and public transport being the predominant modes of travel.
- Considered that a new train station forecourt should be a key aspiration of SPS3 and that land should be safeguarded for a railway freight loop to the north of the station.
- Suggested that the redevelopment of the eastern end of the town centre should include the creation of a high-quality public space, incorporating the former canal.
- Clarity sought on whether the requirement for proposals to positively contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre applies to development only in the town centre or throughout the borough.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- Wording has been amended to highlight the suitability of the town centre for education and medical uses, and to reinforce that the primary function of the Primary Shopping Area is to accommodate retail uses.
- The first paragraph of the policy has been amended to clarify that it applies to development proposals within, or closely related to, the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan area, as designated on the Policies Map.
- The contribution made by the town centre to the supply of housing within the plan period has been increased from 400 to 500 homes.
- The boundary of the Town Centre Masterplan area has been amended to accord with that of the Town Centre Masterplan adopted by the Council in 2022 (other than Eastrop Park and War Memorial Park which are not included in the area covered by Policies SPS3 and SPS4 as the focus of these policies is on areas with opportunities for redevelopment).

Policy SPS4: Basingstoke Town Centre – Areas of Change (14 Respondents)

- Suggested that new development should respond positively to the character and setting of nearby heritage assets.
- Considered that more needed to be done to improve the Top of Town area.
- Considered that public transport to the railway station could be improved, whilst the rail station and the Top of Town need to be better connected through development. Additional references to active and sustainable travel could be made.
- Clarification sought on the option to sever Churchill Way and remove the parking which is currently above it.
- Church Street Area of Change should include more of the older part of Festival Place.
- Suggested that Basingstoke Canal should be included in any heritage assessment for any allocation site policies that lie over the historic route of the Canal, or in proximity to it.
- The Eastrop Area of Change should be extended to include the Waitrose/John Lewis site in Basing View. This site should be identified as suitable for a tall building.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- Additional references made to the need for development to have due regard to the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and to the setting of listed buildings.
- The Policies Map/Illustrative Plan (Figure 4.1) has been amended to include an extension eastward of the eastern boundary of the Church Street Area of Change. This will facilitate a more comprehensive improvement of part of Festival Place to better meet the needs of retail and other uses.
- Wording has been added on the opportunity for the River Loddon to become a feature as part of a wider network of public spaces.
- Wording has been amended on the allowed storey heights of buildings.

Policy SPS5: Sites Allocated for Housing Led Development (49 Respondents)

- Objections made from omission site promoters regarding a number of potential site allocations.
- Support expressed by several organisations and site promoters of allocated sites.
- Suggested that allocations with outline permission should be referred to as commitments in the Plan.
- Sites within Ministry of Defence (MOD) safeguarding zones should include wording that development should be designed to ensure no impact on the operation or capability of defence sites or assets.
- The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be updated to use the latest 3.3% annual exceedance probability (AEP) for functional floodplain.
- Suggested that sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3 with large areas at high-risk surface water flooding and at risk of groundwater flooding might require a level 2 SFRA. The risk of groundwater flooding needs to be considered and high-risk locations within sites should be avoided in site layouts.
- Considered that there was a lack of ambition to enhance and support nature recovery in proposed developments.
- Concern that there is no heritage evidence to support the site allocations and Historic England stated that Heritage Impact Assessments were needed for certain sites.
- Suggested that Design Codes could be approved as non-statutory guidance rather than a Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
- Considered that updated high-level Concept Plans would be more appropriate than masterplans.
- Masterplans should set out school locations and associated pedestrian/cycle routes.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been updated to reflect the new proposed site allocations.
- The changes clarify when masterplans and strategic design codes will be produced and required.

Policy SPS5.1: Northern Manydown (28 Respondents)

- Support from the landowner for the continuation of the allocation within the Local Plan.
- Concern expressed regarding housebuilder engagement and the phasing and delivery of the first homes.
- Requested that the area safeguarded for a crossing be removed. Others sought clarity over the use of the railway crossing.
- There was some concern around the development of parcel 6A, with some suggesting it should be retained as open space and others noting the impact on the five ways junction.
- Concern regarding uncertainty around the road network and the possible impacts.
- Highlighted that the policy does not include suitable buffers and a requirement to protect irreplaceable habitats and ancient woodlands or provide Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
- Concern that the scale of development would be likely to require upgrades to the wastewater treatment works (WWTW).
- There was a request for land to be safeguarded for a GP surgery.
- Stated that a detailed hydrogeological risk assessment was essential in respect of contaminated land and groundwater quality.
- Concern that development would add to existing infrastructure pressures, and therefore mitigation would be necessary.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- An overall vision has been added for Western Basingstoke. This is relevant to Policies SPS5.1, SPS5.2 and SPS5.3.
- The land south of the railway has been removed and separated into its own policy (Policy SPS5.2, Land North of Pack Lane). This reflects the fact that the majority of Northern Manydown already has planning permission, whereas the land south of the railway does not, and there is an opportunity for it to be comprehensively planned with Southern Manydown (Policy SPS5.3).
- The land at Becketts Rise in Worting has also been removed from the site allocation boundary as the development on this land is already completed.
- Wording has been added on protecting and enhancing the ecological network including rare arable flora, Ancient Woodlands, and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, linking to opportunities identified in the Hampshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).
- Wording has also been added to the policy on securing 10% BNG and ensuring the protection of groundwater.

Policy SPS5.2: Land North of Pack Lane

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation. This land was included in the North Manydown site allocation in the adopted Local Plan (Policy SS3.10) and the 2024 draft Regulation 18 Plan (Policy SPS5.1). However, this site has now been separated out into a new site allocation with a new policy in recognition of the fact that it does not have planning permission and to allow for it to be planned comprehensively with Southern Manydown.

Policy SPS5.3: Southern Manydown (252 Respondents)

- Concerns expressed around the scale and location of development; including the impact on countryside and agricultural land, character and appearance of the area and its historic landscape, the reduction in Strategic Gaps, biodiversity, nature conservation, air and light pollution, issues around the water environment and wastewater, traffic impact, the site being unsustainable and carbon intensive and whether more storage and distribution jobs are needed.
- Concerns expressed regarding the risk that the site could be unsustainable as two unconnected phases.
- Stated that a Heritage Impact Assessment and a Hydrological Risk Assessment were needed.

- Clarity sought on how the habitats within the site would be protected or enhanced.
- Stated that a new medical facility was required to mitigate impact on primary care and also that sites should be safeguarded for 2 x 12 form entry (FE) secondary schools.
- Stated that archaeology and ancient woodland are likely to constrain delivery.
- Site promoter generally supported the policy but suggested that it should include all of the promoted land, a narrower Strategic Gap with Oakley, an additional 1,000 homes and specified amount of industrial and logistics floorspace.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- Further masterplanning work has been undertaken to refine the site's boundary and its capacity. This has resulted in the overall capacity of the site being reduced to 6,000 dwellings, subject to further refinement including understanding the density of development linked to Garden City principles and the overall vision.
- The proposed settlement policy boundary has been reviewed and this has resulted in a small increase in the developable area north of Jeffery's Copse (on the western boundary, adjacent to Oakley) that responds to the site's topography. At the southern end of the site the development has been pulled away from North Waltham so that it would be screened behind the Beech Break to the north of the village.
- The concept plan includes a planting buffer along the site's western boundary to screen the development from the wider landscape and provide improved ecological connectivity between the ancient woodlands. Further green connections are shown within the site to ensure that impacts upon the ancient woodlands are avoided.
- The specific site for the new hospital and employment uses has been identified, and wording has been added to clarify that employment uses includes logistics and industrial floorspace.
- The policy maintains its focus on prioritising active travel and public transport, and highlights some of the key areas where off-site highways mitigation would be required. Wording has been added to ensure the developments at SPS5.1, SPS5.2 and SPS5.3 have public and active travel corridors throughout, including a new active modes crossing over the railway line.
- Wording has been added to ensure the protection of groundwater, enhance and protect the ecological network, and ensure lighting impacts are minimised.
- Wording has been added on retaining the Scheduled Monument as an area of multifunctional green space, forming a heritage park.

Policy SPS5.4: Land at Whitmarsh Lane (46 Respondents to Land East of Basingstoke)

- Suggested that the line of the canal could provide a viable walking/cycling route from the development and that there should be a requirement to include the Basingstoke Canal in a Heritage Impact Assessment.
- Considered that ancient woodland should not be incorporated within the development and a 50m buffer should be maintained.
- Concern that bedrock may not be suitable for infiltration features, that a detailed hydrogeological risk assessment based on baseline monitoring was needed, buffers for watercourses should be 10m or wider, and a minimum of 10% BNG should be secured.
- Concern expressed about flooding - the layout should avoid areas of flooding from all sources, and watercourses should be retained as close to their current alignment as possible.
- Development should include an assessment of impacts from all potential sources of pollution including surface water run-off, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) measures, be supported by a Construction Environmental Management Plan and should clearly set out the habitats within the site to be protected or enhanced, opportunities for new habitat creation or improvements in connectivity and whether any off-site provision is likely to be necessary, linking to the emerging LNRS.
- Suggested that paths linking into urban area should be preserved, extended and improved where appropriate, and incorporated into green corridors.
- Support for references to improved active travel links with Basingstoke rail station.
- Some support for proposal for a bus gate but concerns raised around the bus lane exit onto Pyotts Hill.
- Concerns expressed about odour impacts due to the site's proximity to Basingstoke Sewage Treatment Works. The site falls within the buffer zone of two safeguarded waste infrastructure sites: Chineham Energy Recovery Facility and Basingstoke WWTW.
- Concerns expressed around the impact on health and wellbeing of residents.
- Concerns around the size of the development on a constrained greenfield site.
- The deliverability of the site was questioned.
- Site promoters raised comments on the contributions required towards community infrastructure.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- An overall vision for Eastern Basingstoke has been added. This is relevant to Policies SPS5.4, SPS5.5, SPS5.6 and SPS5.7.
- The allocation has been extended to include Lodge Farm and the site name changed from Eastern Basingstoke to Land at Whitmarsh Lane to reflect the new site and the need for a wider Eastern Basingstoke Vision.
- Updates have been made to refer to the River Loddon Valued Landscape (L1).
- Updates have been made to criteria relating to the ecological network and BNG, with reference to the LNRS and offsite habitat restoration/creation.
- Updates have been made to the SuDS criteria as the geology of the site may not be suitable for infiltration features.
- Clarification that supporting infrastructure is brought forward in a co-ordinated manner in line with a Phasing Strategy, to be agreed by the council.
- Updates have been made to the infrastructure criteria to refer to early years provision and to clarify the position with regards to the existing access at Whitmarsh Lane.
- Wording has been added to explain the requirement for and purpose of a Land at Whitmarsh Lane masterplan and strategic design code.

Policy SPS5.5: Redlands

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS5.6: Redlands Lodge (Seven Respondents)

- Concerns expressed about traffic impact, pressure on local facilities, resulting pollution and environmental impact.
- Considered that there could be archaeological interest in the site.
- Suggested that the site needs to be able to demonstrate options for the drainage of surface water.
- The preservation of permissive and public footpaths was encouraged.
- Stated that mitigation via section 106 (S106) would be needed at Chineham medical centre.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The housing capacity has been reduced from 16 to 15 dwellings.
- Two potential principal access options are now shown. A new access is shown from the Redlands allocation to the east instead of via the site to the north (which was also formally known as Redlands). This limits disruption to the footpath running along the northern boundary and reduces reliance on the delivery of the Land at Whitmarsh Lane allocation to the west, should this be slower to come forward.
- Updates made to SuDS criteria to refer to consideration of individual site geology/constraints.
- Updates made to criteria on the ecological network and BNG with reference to the LNRS.
- New criteria added relating to archaeology.
- Wording has been added on the requirement to work with all site promoters for Eastern Basingstoke to create an overall masterplan to be adopted as an SPD.

Policy SPS5.7: Sherfield Hill Farm (19 Respondents)

- Stated that the policy needs to take account of all potential heritage impacts.
- Stated that the scale of development is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network.
- Concerns raised around the impact of development in terms of traffic, wildlife, loss of greenspace, flooding, infrastructure pressures, narrowing of the strategic gap, landscape impacts and the need for safe cycle and footpaths.
- Requested that public paths be preserved and extended where appropriate.
- Concern expressed that the development will increase car dependency.
- Suggested that a Level 2 SFRA would be required and that watercourses should be retained as close to their current alignment as possible.
- Suggested by the promoter that the site could deliver more than 300 homes.
- Suggested that the boundary should be amended to exclude Bellway land in the south-west corner.
- Site promoters stated that land directly adjoining the Sherfield Hill Farm site to the north should be included as an extension to the proposed site.
- Concern that the London Clay bedrock may not be suitable for infiltration features.
- Parish councils objected to the site, highlighting concerns about landscape, traffic, inadequate infrastructure, and Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision
- Stated that mitigation via section 106 (S106) would be needed at Chineham medical centre.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The majority of the site benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission for 350 homes.
- The yield has been increased to 385 homes to reflect the permission and also the development likely to come forward on the remaining land adjacent to the A33.
- Update to criteria on the ecological network and BNG with reference to the LNRS.
- New criteria included for archaeology.
- Update to SuDS criteria to refer to consideration of individual site geology/constraints.
- Wording has been added to ensure an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy is provided.
- Wording has been added to protect and enhance the ecological network, require a minimum of 10% BNG, and ensure protection of groundwater.
- Wording has been amended to ensure the site responds sensitively to the significance of heritage assets.
- Wording has been added on the requirement to work with all site promoters for Eastern Basingstoke to create an overall masterplan to be adopted as an SPD.

Policy SPS5.8: Popham Garden Village (982 Respondents)

- Concern expressed that the allocation would be unsustainable and that it would be poorly served by public transport and active travel and would generate a large amount of traffic.
- Stated that the site should remain in its existing use as an airfield given its contribution to the General Aviation (GA) network of airfields in the south east of England.
- The site is considered to be a valuable resource for holding both aviation and non-aviation community and sporting events.
- It was queried whether the site could deliver 1,400 homes within the plan period.
- Concern expressed about the loss of countryside, biodiversity habitats and green infrastructure.
- It was suggested that the policy should refer to protecting the setting of the nearby Scheduled Monument.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The overall capacity of the site has been increased from 3,000 to 4,250 homes. This has enabled the development to accommodate a secondary school which will allow it to become significantly more sustainable in transport terms.
- The site boundary has been extended northwards and westwards to accommodate the increased level of development. New woodlands are proposed along the northern boundary of the site to improve the screening of the development in views from the north. Extensive green connections are provided across the site to provide biodiversity corridors and to enhance the landscape setting of the housing.
- A larger Solar Farm has been introduced into the scheme split between two locations in the west and south-east of the site.
- Further to advice from the statutory providers, the policy refers to the on-site provision of an early-years childcare facility and health care facilities.
- Supporting text has been introduced to recognise the loss of the Airfield in the southern part of the site. The contributions made by the Airfield to the national network of general aviation airfields, to aviation-related employment and to community and leisure events are being considered further. These contributions will be considered in the context of a need for sustainable housing growth.

Policy SPS5.9: Upper Swallick Garden Village

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no detailed comments from the last consultation, although it is noted that a number of supportive representations were received regarding the non-allocation of this site at the time.

Policy SPS5.10: Land West of Marnel Park (13 Respondents)

- Concern expressed that the allocation would fail to preserve the significance of the farmstead.
- Considered that more details were required to assess the impact on wastewater infrastructure.
- Objections to the loss of greenfields, which would change the quiet nature of the area. The strategic gap should be maintained, not built on.
- Suggested that paths should be preserved, and opportunities taken to extend the path network.
- Stated that a detailed hydrogeological risk assessment would be needed.
- A 50m buffer should be maintained between development and ancient woodland. Also links to the emerging LNRS should be made where possible.
- Stated that mitigation for healthcare provision should be provided via a S106.

- Concerned expressed regarding the requirement for self-build homes, and provisions for Gypsies and Travellers.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The site boundary has been extended southwards with a new access from Chineham Lane. This will allow a higher housing capacity (changed from 200 to 250 dwellings). The visual separation of Basingstoke with Sherborne St John will be maintained whilst this alteration will enable a lower housing density more in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
- The new access from Chineham Lane will enable less reliance on vehicular travel through the existing neighbourhood to the east and will allow improved retention of the green infrastructure corridor to the north.
- Wording added to ensure access will be provided from Gibbons Place and secondary access from Chineham Lane if appropriate, subject to a detailed Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plan.
- Wording updated on the ecological network and BNG with reference to the LNRS, and wording added on protecting and enhancing green and blue infrastructure.
- Additional criteria added relating to scheme design and noise mitigation.
- Requirement included for hydrogeological risk assessment.

Policy SPS5.11: Weybrook Park Golf Course (10 Respondents) Combined with Land adjacent to Weybrook Park Golf Course (Five Respondents)

- Objections made relating to the loss of the current golf course.
- Concern that development would require upgrades to the WWTW. Concern also raised about the impact of the development on a principal aquifer. Options for the drainage of surface water should be demonstrated and the area to the southeast should be assessed for potential off-site risks.
- Stated that improvements to active travel access would be needed. Paths should be retained and incorporated into the green infrastructure (GI) network.
- Considered that access arrangements should consider Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) ensuring that the flow of traffic isn't affected.
- The requirement for Gypsy and Traveller pitches was queried, as was the allotment requirement.
- Recommended that green infrastructure and links to the emerging LNRS were more fully considered. The need to protect and enhance habitats and the opportunities for new habitat creation should be made clearer.
- A greater understanding of the roman road running through the western boundary of the site is required.
- Stated that mitigation via S106 would be needed at the Bramblys Grange Medical Practice and Crown Heights Medical Centre.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The main Weybrook Park Golf Course site (originally for 220 homes) and the Land adjacent to the Weybrook Park Golf Course (for 30 homes) have been combined to form one allocation.
- In order to retain the trees in the centre and north of the main Weybrook Park Golf Course site, the housing yield has been reduced by 40 homes.
- Additional text has been added to protect the right of way footpath along the western site boundary and to ensure that any noise arising from golf related activities to the west is suitably mitigated.
- The Environment Agency (EA) provided comments during the previous Regulation 18 consultation that the smaller site (for 30 homes) has potential off-site contamination risks and potential contaminants from previous uses. Relevant wording has been added to the policy to address these concerns.
- Building heights have been limited on the south-western part of the site.
- Additional text has been added to ensure archaeological constraints are respected. The actual location of the banjo enclosure (archaeological site) has been included on the concept plan.
- The concept plan has been updated to show the two sites combined as one, in addition to the retention of the aforementioned trees.
- An 'all modes access point' has been shown connecting the main allocation to the smaller site to the south-west, and the entire site would be accessed from the A340.
- Wording amended on protecting and enhancing ecological networks, requiring a green and blue infrastructure plan, and securing minimum 10% BNG.

Policy SPS5.12: Land west of Upper Cufaude Farm

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS5.13: 65 New Road (Five Respondents)

- Concern expressed that the site is not deliverable as the current use is still operational.
- Stated that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required for the site.
- Potential for contamination and ground water flooding was raised.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- Wording amended for the protection and enhancement of ecological networks.
- Wording added to require investigation into any potential sources of on-site contamination.
- Wording added to require the provision of SuDS.
- Wording added regarding the provision of suitable water and utilities infrastructure.

Policy SPS5.14: Oakley Farm, Wash Water

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS5.15: Land at West End Farm, Mortimer

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS5.16: Skates Lane, Tadley

- This is a new policy and there are therefore no comments from the last consultation.

Policy SPS6: Neighbourhood Planning (199 Respondents)

- Objections made to the housing requirements set for some villages from parish councils.
- Parish councils supported the recognition of past delivery and the role of neighbourhood planning
- Promoters of land sought further or higher housing allocations in some settlements.
- In relation to the Settlement Study, concerns were raised regarding the data being out dated, some felt that higher housing figures should be included to boost supply early in the plan, and concerns expressed that more sustainable settlements have not been allocated for additional development.
- Concerns expressed around neighbourhood plans contributing to the delivery of homes and that it was being used as a tool to resist development. The approach would result in tighter timescales for delivery being needed.
- A number of SPB boundary changes/new SPBs were proposed.

- Considered that the policy should recognise smaller parishes/settlements without a housing allocation that may wish to engage with neighbourhood planning.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been updated to reflect the housing requirements identified for the rural settlements in the updated Settlement Study (2025).

Policy SPS7: Ensuring a Supply of Deliverable Sites (60 Respondents)

- Concern raised about relying on large sites, which take longer to deliver.
- Considered that the policy should make it clear that in the first five years post adoption, the assessment of housing supply would relate to the LP requirement.
- Suggested that the LP should consider the need to allocate additional sites as a safety net.
- The policy is too vague around the trigger for review, brownfield sites, future supply and timeframes.
- Considered that, as a principal, there should be no deterioration in water quality, development should provide an improvement. Also, housing shouldn't be built until water companies demonstrate wastewater abilities.
- It was questioned whether the Environment Agency (EA) has adequate resources to undertake monitoring.
- Suggested that permit limits will likely need to be tightened at Basingstoke WWTW.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- No updates have been made.

Policy SPS8: Nuclear Installations – Aldermaston and Burghfield (11 Respondents)

- Concern that the 12km consultation zone in Figure 6.18 is not referred to within the policy or supporting text.
- Wording changes were suggested to more closely align the policy with the approach set out in the West Berkshire Local Plan.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been amended so that it more closely aligns with the policy in the West Berkshire Local Plan.
- Wording amended to provide a more accurate description of the situation and reflect the presumption against development in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ).

Policy SPS9: Basing View (13 Respondents)

- Suggested that the delivery of a university at Basing View could be strengthened.
- Highlighted that Grade II Mountbatten House and Registered Park & Garden could be used in place making.
- Suggested that opportunities should be taken to create better pedestrian and active travel routes through the site and to the station. There should also be a reference to reducing car dependency.
- Ahead of any development applications it was stated there will need to be an assessment of the potential risks of contamination and flooding.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been amended to reflect the conclusions of the work the council has undertaken on the suitability of Tall Buildings in Basing View and the opportunities for Intensification of Basing View, particularly the introduction of a mix of uses, including residential uses.
- Wording has been added to require a green and blue infrastructure network, minimum 10% BNG, investigations into any potential sources of on-site contamination, and ensure the protection of groundwater.
- Wording has been added to avoid development and points of access within flood zones 2 and 3 and require appropriate flood risk management strategies.
- Wording has been amended to refer to listed buildings and ensure the historic asset is better used in placemaking.

Policy ENV2: Strategic Gaps (52 Respondents)

- Support expressed for the policy from individuals, site promoters, parish councils and the countryside charity CPRE.
- Concern that there has been an erosion of existing gaps.
- Concern that the approach restricts the growth of existing settlements too greatly.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been amended so that it more closely aligns with the policy in the West Berkshire Local Plan.
- Wording amended to provide a more accurate description of the situation and reflect the presumption against development in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ).

Policy SPS9: Basing View (13 Respondents)

- Suggested that the delivery of a university at Basing View could be strengthened.
- Highlighted that Grade II Mountbatten House and Registered Park & Garden could be used in place making.
- Suggested that opportunities should be taken to create better pedestrian and active travel routes through the site and to the station. There should also be a reference to reducing car dependency.
- Ahead of any development applications it was stated there will need to be an assessment of the potential risks of contamination and flooding.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policy has been amended to reflect the conclusions of the work the council has undertaken on the suitability of Tall Buildings in Basing View and the opportunities for Intensification of Basing View, particularly the introduction of a mix of uses, including residential uses.
- Wording has been added to require a green and blue infrastructure network, minimum 10% BNG, investigations into any potential sources of on-site contamination, and ensure the protection of groundwater.
- Wording has been added to avoid development and points of access within flood zones 2 and 3 and require appropriate flood risk management strategies.
- Wording has been amended to refer to listed buildings and ensure the historic asset is better used in placemaking.

Policy ENV2: Strategic Gaps (52 Respondents)

- Support expressed for the policy from individuals, site promoters, parish councils and the countryside charity CPRE.
- Concern that there has been an erosion of existing gaps.
- Concern that the approach restricts the growth of existing settlements too greatly.

- Suggested that further explanation of what constitutes ‘small scale development’ was needed and clarity was sought in relation to farm diversification in areas designated as strategic gaps.
- Reference should be made to the visual identity of settlements and the openness of the gap.
- Suggested that opportunities to maximise biodiversity in strategic gaps should be explored.
- A number of suggestions were made to amend existing gaps and delineate new gaps.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- A new strategic gap between Cliddesden and the proposed Upper Swallick new settlement has been included.

Glossary (Four Respondents)

- Updated definitions were suggested for the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE), DEPZ, and Off-Site Emergency Plan.
- Updated references to the Hampshire County Council Plan was suggested, to instead refer to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- Requests were made for the inclusion of additional terms within the glossary including blue infrastructure, outdoor streets, mobility hub and mitigation zone/mitigation approach.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The glossary has been updated to amend the wording for the AWE and the DEPZ.
- New relevant terms have been added and defined.

Policy map (Six Respondents)

- Suggested that a number of changes were made, including: villages should be shown at a smaller scale so the impact of development and context is clearer; scale bars and north arrows should be added; inset maps should be used; page numbers and contents page should be added to the inset maps.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- The policies map has been updated with all new and amended site allocations.
- Policies not being consulted on in the 2025 Regulation 18 are still on the map but changed to grey.

Appendix 1: Representations on Allocations now Proposed for removal from the Local Plan

Former Policy SPS5.2: Basingstoke Golf Course (Nine Respondents)

- Stated that the scale of development may require upgrades to the WWTW.
- Suggested that a reference to ancient woodlands was needed.
- Stated that a detailed hydrogeological risk assessment was essential in respect of contaminated land and groundwater quality.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- This policy has been removed as it has planning consent and is being built out.

Former Policy SPS5.3: Hounsome Fields (Eight Respondents)

- Suggested that the 2FE primary school could be expanded to a 3FE primary school.
- Stated that the scale of development may require upgrades to the WWTW.
- Stated that a detailed hydrogeological risk assessment was essential in respect of contaminated land and groundwater quality.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- This policy has been removed as it has planning consent and is being built out.

Former Policy SPS5.10: Overton Mill (67 Respondents)

- Stated that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was necessary and that the mill merits further investigation.
- The site promoters suggested there could be more flexibility to allow more than 340 dwellings if viable and deliverable, requested flexibility around the 40% affordable housing requirement on-site, specified building heights and stated that parking for the railway station should be proportionate to the scale of development.
- The site promoters also commented that deliverability and achievability was unevidenced and highlight that remediation costs could impact on viability.
- Suggested that the requirement for custom and self-build homes should be omitted due to significant abnormal costs.

- Concerns expressed about pressure on local services, over development, traffic, insufficient parking for the railway station, access, visual impact on the National Landscape, lighting, biodiversity, flooding, heritage concerns, loss of greenfields, water quality and pollution.
- Both the site promoter and residents objected to the Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- This policy has been removed as it is being taken forward as a proposed allocation in the Overton Neighbourhood Plan.

Former Policy SPS5.13: 16 Southern Road (Five Respondents)

- Concern expressed that the site was not deliverable as current use still operational. There was also concern about the proposed quantum of development.
- Stated that a HIA was necessary.
- Concern was raised over the potential for contamination and ground water flooding.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- This policy has been removed as it is no longer available for development within the plan period.

Former Policy SPS5.15: Land off Ashwood Way (Four Respondents)

- The absence of a reference to surface water flooding was noted.
- Clarification was sought on the replacement of native trees.

Summary of changes made since the Regulation 18 2024 Consultation:

- This policy has been removed as further work has shown the delivery of the proposed allocation is not viable.