

## Consultation Statement (October 2019)

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Background

1.1.1 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in relation to the development of the allocated site at the Basingstoke Golf Course. The SPD provides more detailed advice and guidance concerning the relevant policies within the adopted Local Plan (2011 – 2029), and once adopted it will be used as a material consideration for planning applications on that site.

#### 1.2 Purpose of the Consultation Statement

1.2.1 Part 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 requires that, when adopting a Supplementary Planning Document, Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should prepare a Consultation Statement. This should include the following information:

- (i) The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
- (ii) A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- (iii) How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

#### 1.3 How much consultation do the Regulations require? What is good practice?

1.3.1 The Local Plan Regulations set out that LPAs should make the document 'available' for a minimum of four weeks. During such time, the document should be made available for inspection at the council offices and other appropriate locations, and should be published on the local planning authority website.

1.3.2 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in March 2018, which sets a commitment to go over and above the legal minimum. This states that the council will undertake the following:

<b>Table 2: Supplementary Planning Documents</b>	
<b>Key stages</b>	<b>Opportunities for engagement</b>
<p><b>Evidence gathering/preparation of draft document</b>            Baseline information and evidence gathering.            Undertake further technical work; identify reasonable options.</p>	<p>At the evidence gathering stage, statutory bodies are consulted about the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening and Habitat Regulations Assessment (if required).            Consultation with councillors on the scope and content of the SPD will be undertaken. Targeted informal consultation will also be undertaken, with relevant agencies, stakeholders, service providers, parish/town councils, local groups and residents where relevant.</p>
<p><b>Consultation on draft SPD</b>            Formal publication for public consultation of the draft SPD along with associated evidence base documents and SEA report (minimum statutory period of 4 weeks).</p>	<p>The council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write to specific, general and all other consultees who the council consider may have an interest including those on the planning policy consultation database who wish to be informed of planning policy documents.</li> <li>• Make consultation documents available on the council's website, at the civic offices and other locations as considered appropriate such as libraries.</li> <li>• Discuss the document with stakeholders that are relevant to the topic involved, including statutory consultees, specialist bodies, planning agents and existing groups/forums as appropriate.</li> <li>• Use social media and local media to raise awareness</li> <li>• Depending on the content, consultation may also be supported by workshops/meetings.</li> <li>• If the matter is specific to a location, the council will aim to engage with local residents and groups through meetings/workshops or via community magazines and publications</li> </ul>
<p><b>Finalise SPD</b>            Review representations received and make any changes to SPD where justified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments received will be made available on the council's website along with a summary of their content.</li> <li>• The council will publish a schedule of its response to each of the points made.</li> <li>• Further consultation may be undertaken if responses lead to a significant change of direction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Adoption of the SPD</b>            SPD is adopted by the Council. It will include a statement explaining what consultation has been undertaken and how the council has dealt with representations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the Supplementary Planning Document, consultation statement and adoption statement available on the council's website at the civic offices and other locations as considered appropriate such as libraries or parish offices.</li> <li>• Send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption.</li> <li>• Where appropriate, use social media and local media/press to publicise adoption.</li> </ul>

1.3.3 The purpose of this statement is to demonstrate that LPA has met the regulatory requirements for a Supplementary Planning Document and complied with the best practice set out within the adopted SCI. It also provides the necessary information required under Part 12 of the Regulations (as set out above).

## **2. Evidence gathering and early engagement**

- 2.1 Early work on the draft SPD was informed by extensive consultation with members and other council departments, which took place in parallel with pre-application discussions. As part of this early work, the LPA and the developer jointly held two workshops in January/February 2019 to scope out the key issues for the development brief and inform the planning application. The first workshop was attended by key internal and external technical stakeholders including a cross-section of council officers and a number of external consultees including the Local Highway Authority (LHA). A second workshop was held with the local ward members, including neighbouring ward councillors, and the county councillor. These initial discussions highlighted areas of particular interest to those stakeholders and helped to inform the priorities of the development brief.
- 2.2 Based upon this engagement together with initial technical work undertaken by the developer, an early draft of the development brief was produced. This was shared with the local councillors and representatives of Dummer Parish Council (the site is located in the Parish of Dummer) and the adjacent parish councils of Oakley and Deane and North Waltham. A meeting to discuss their views on the draft SPD took place in April 2019 and various further amendments were made. The development brief was discussed at Economic, Planning and Housing Committee in June 2019 and further changes were made in response to the views expressed.
- 2.3 Prior to consulting on the SPD, the LPA carried out a screening exercise in order to establish whether there was a need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or a full Habitats Regulations Assessment to be produced. Following consultation with the three statutory consultees (the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England), it was concluded that an SEA was not required and the SPD would not need to be subject to a full Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations.

## **3. Formal consultation on the draft SPD: Who was consulted and how?**

- 3.0.1 The LPA consulted on the draft SPD between 20<sup>th</sup> June and 5<sup>th</sup> August 2019. In accordance with the adopted SCI, the council consulted a wide range of stakeholders. The engagement was tailored to ensure the consultees were engaged in the most effective and appropriate manner.

Where letters/emails were sent out they contained the following information (in accordance with the SCI):

- what was being consulted on;
- where the documents could be viewed;
- how and when comments could be made; and
- the next steps in the process.

### 3.1 Statutory consultees and general consultation bodies

- 3.1.1 Emails and letters were sent to the relevant statutory consultees and general consultation bodies. These are listed in **Appendix A**, and an example email/letter is contained in **Appendix B**.

### 3.2 Members of the public and other interested parties

- 3.2.1 The LPA also consulted with other people registered on the council's planning policy database (including members of the public) who had expressed an interest in being notified about new planning guidance. Members of the public were also engaged through a statutory notice which was placed in the Basingstoke Gazette (as shown in **Appendix C**). Paper copies of the consultation version of the SPD were also available to view at the borough council's offices and in the libraries in Basingstoke.
- 3.2.2 The consultation was also publicised through the council's social media platforms and a press release.

### 3.3 Where was the information available to view?

- 3.3.1 Information about the consultation was available to view on the council's planning policy consultations web page (<http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations>) where consultees could find out more about the consultation and view the document (**Appendix D**).
- 3.3.2 The council's consultation web page included a PDF copy of the document, the SEA and HRA screening opinions, along with a copy of the representation form, which could be filled in electronically and emailed to the LPA or printed and returned to the LPA. The web page included an option to respond directly through the council's consultation software if the consultee wished (**Appendix E**).
- 3.3.3 The web page explained where hard copies of the document could be viewed, explained how to make comments and set out the deadline for making representations.

## 4. What issues were raised and how were they taken into account in the final document?

### 4.1 What responses were received?

4.1.1 The LPA received responses from 21 individuals, groups or organisations. This included representations from:

- Statutory consultees including Natural England, Historic England and Highways England;
- Other local groups including the South West Action Group (SWAG), Hatch Warren Nature Group, and Cycle Basingstoke;
- A local councillor and the county councillor;
- The site's developer (Bloor Homes represented by Boyer Planning); and
- Local residents.

4.1.2 A table showing what issues were raised in written responses and how the LPA responded to those issues is set out in **Appendix G**. The full comments can be viewed on the consultation portal at: [https://basingstoke-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/fpt/spd/bqcspd\\_1?tab=list](https://basingstoke-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/fpt/spd/bqcspd_1?tab=list)

4.1.3 There have also been a number of other minor changes, typos, presentational amendments and factual amendments/ updates, however these minor changes are not detailed in the appendix.

4.1.5 An acknowledgement email/ letter was sent to all the respondents when their comments were processed by the LPA.

### 4.2 Issues raised

4.2.1 The following key issues were raised through written responses:

#### Chapter 5: Housing

- Developer sought recognition that market housing mix requirements could change over the course of the development.
- Concern about whether the site was suitable for 1 bed units or older people.
- Requirement for self-build plots should be made more flexible.
- Principle about gypsies and travellers should principle be strengthened to be explicit that the pitch should not be located adjacent to existing homes.

#### Chapter 6: Community Facilities

- Conflicting views about whether the references to the school being located on the Basingstoke Golf Course site should be deleted or strengthened.
- Further information should be provided about what should be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.

- Document should provide clarification that the health facility should only be sought where required by the Clinical Commissioning Group.

#### Chapter 7: Transport

- The developer suggested that the requirements of the TA should be less specific.
- The development should have a secondary access, but a second roundabout on the A30 would be unacceptable.
- Developer challenged the justification for the contribution towards the Mass Rapid Transport Network.
- Various suggestions about how walking/cycling connectivity should be improved, with further connections points from the site identified and off-site improvements suggested.

#### Chapter 8: Environment

- The developer questioned whether the terminology about the site being on 'rural edge' and providing a 'transition between town and countryside' was appropriate.
- Developer suggested changes to scope of protection to trees and ecology, and the LPA's position in relation to noise mitigation.
- Natural England suggested that the SPD should require a 50m buffer to the ancient woodland SINC.
- Additional wording sought by Thames Water in relation to foul and surface water drainage.
- Developer suggested that the site should not be referred to as a non-designated heritage asset due to its recent use as a golf course. Approach to heritage generally supported by Historic England.

#### Chapters 9-10: Design and Delivery

- Developer suggested that the scale of development should allow 2-3 storeys (as opposed to being generally limited to 2 storeys).
- Design guidance should refer to specific features that are beneficial for wildlife (native planting etc).
- SPD should allow for the Design Code to be submitted with the first reserved matters application.

### 4.3 How was the document changed?

4.3.1 A number of changes have been made to the draft document. The changes were generally minor in nature and strengthen the document rather than changing the overall meaning. The following key changes were made:

- The housing section has been amended to recognise that the size mix of market housing needed in the borough may change over the course of the development.
- Additional information has been included to explain how the self-build plots should be marketed.
- The Gypsy and Traveller guidance has been strengthened by incorporating the requirement for the pitch to be well related to and integrated with the new development into the development principle.
- Further information provided about the requirements of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.
- Requirement for the retail facilities to be suitable in size and scale to the development and not prejudice other local facilities.
- Deletion of guidance about the design and location of the school on this site.
- Requirement that the design and location of any secondary access should minimise the disruption to the flow of traffic along the A30 corridor, and take into account any other impacts such as those upon trees and biodiversity.
- SPD amended to provide greater recognition of importance of walking/cycling connectivity, including an additional connection in/out of the site (to the east) and identifying the need for connections to the wider countryside.
- Requirement for green corridors within the site to connect to the green infrastructure in the wider area.
- Additional requirements in relation to surface and foul water.
- Requirement that development should incorporate specific features beneficial to wildlife.
- Recognition that the design code could be submitted as part of the first reserved matters application.

## Appendices

- A** List of statutory consultees (specific and general bodies) consulted
- B** Text of emails/letters sent to statutory consultees and those on the Local Plan database
- C** Public Notice in the Basingstoke Gazette
- D** Text from BDBC website (planning policy consultations page)
- E** Objective web text
- F** Press notice
- G** Full schedule of comments and proposed changes

## **Appendix A: List of statutory consultees (specific and general consultees) consulted**

### **Specific consultees**

Organisations who have been identified under the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 that may have an interest in the proposals within a Development Plan Document are set out below:

#### **Local Planning Authorities, Unitary Authorities and Town and Parish Councils**

- All parish councils within and adjoining the borough
- Hampshire County Council
- Hart District Council
- East Hampshire District Council
- Test Valley Borough Council
- West Berkshire Council
- Winchester City Council
- Wokingham Borough Council

#### **Other organisations and bodies**

- Civil Aviation Authority
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Homes England
- Marine Management Agency
- Mono consultants (represents mobile operators)
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
- NHS Trust and Clinical Commissioning Groups
- Office of Rail Regulation
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- Scottish and Southern Energy
- South East Water
- Southern Gas Network
- Southern Water
- Thames Water
- The Coal Authority
- The Environment Agency
- Transport for London

## **General consultation bodies**

In addition to the specific consultation bodies listed above, the council will involve as many people and groups as possible in preparing supplementary planning documents. A number of whom are listed below:

- Access Basingstoke
- Association of Parish Councils
- Basingstoke and District Disability Forum
- Basingstoke Voluntary Action
- CPRE Hampshire
- Cycle Basingstoke
- Enterprise M3
- Forestry Commission
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
- Hampshire Fire Service
- Health and Safety Executive
- Maria Miller MP
- Ministry of Defence
- National Trust
- Natural Basingstoke
- Office for Nuclear Regulation
- Sport England
- Theatres Trust
- Various land agents and planning consultants

## Appendix B: Text of email sent to statutory consultees and consultees on the Local Plan Database

Dear Sir / Madam,

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is consulting on a draft new Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) relating to the Basingstoke Golf Course site allocation in the council's adopted Local Plan.

### ***What does the document cover?***

The draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief SPD has been prepared by the Local Planning Authority to add detail to the policies in the Local Plan by providing guidance building on existing planning policy, in particular Policy SS3.11 (Basingstoke Golf Course) of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029.

The consultation runs for six weeks from **Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> June to Monday 5<sup>th</sup> August 2019.**

### ***Viewing the documents***

The draft SPD and supporting documents can be viewed on the council's website at [www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations) or directly on our consultation software [here](#).

Paper copies of all the documents are available for public viewing at the Borough Council's offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH between the hours of 8.30 – 17.00 Mon to Thurs and 8.30 to 16.30 on Fridays. The documents are also available to view in the Basingstoke Discovery Centre and South Ham libraries in the borough during their normal opening times.

### ***How to comment***

If you would like to comment on any of the draft documents, please complete a representation form and return it to the council **by 4pm on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> August 2019**. The easiest way to respond to one of the consultations is through the Consultation Portal, available [here](#).

Representation forms can be completed online or can be downloaded from our website ([www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations) ).

Paper copies of the form are also available on request. Comments can be submitted in the following ways:

- By completing the online form at: <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>
- By email to [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk)
- By post to Planning Policy, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH

### ***Next steps***

Following this consultation, all comments for the SPD will be taken into consideration in compiling a final version of the document.

***Consultation database***

The council is contacting you because you have asked to receive updates on planning policy related issues or are a statutory consultee.

If you would like to be removed from the planning policy consultation database or would like your details amended, please email [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk) or contact the Planning Policy team on 01256 844844.

***Further information***

If you require further information about the draft SPD, please email [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk) or contact 01256 844844.

There are a number of other consultations which are also running in the borough, to review these consultations please visit: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations>.

Yours sincerely

**Planning Policy Team**

## Appendix C: Statutory Notices

### Basingstoke Gazette:



**Basingstoke  
and Deane**

**Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004  
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING)  
(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012**

**Notice of Public Consultation on draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)  
Statement of the Representations Procedure**

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given that the council is inviting representations on the draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief SPD between **Thursday 20 June to 4pm on Monday 5 August 2019**.

The document has been prepared by the Local Planning Authority to add detail to the policies in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 by providing guidance on how the Basingstoke Golf Course housing allocation site (Policy SS3.11) should be developed in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies. In accordance with the regulations, the council has made a copy of the SPD and this statement available:

- on the council's website at [www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations); and
- at the Civic Offices on London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4AH, Monday to Thursday 8.30am-5.00pm and Friday 8.30am-4.30pm; and
- in Basingstoke Discovery Centre, and South Ham library during their normal opening hours.

**Consultation Responses**

Representations can be made during the period to be made no later than **4pm on 5 August 2019** using the council's online consultation portal, by email or by post.

Online at: <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

Or by e-mail to: [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk)

Or by post to: **Planning Policy Team  
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 4AH**

Representations made will be considered for incorporation into the final version of the document. Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the SPD. All comments received will be publicly available and included on the council's website. Any person who has made representations about the above SPD may withdraw those representations at any time by giving notice in writing to the council either by e-mail or by post at the addresses given above.

**Appendix D: Text from BDBC Website**  
**(<https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations>)**

**Draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The council is currently undertaking consultation on the draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document.

This draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in its role as Local Planning Authority to support the delivery of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029. The SPD addresses how the Basingstoke Golf Course housing allocation site should be developed in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies. Once adopted by the council, the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of relevant planning applications.

The consultation is now open and responses must be received by **4pm on 5 August 2019**.

Please click [here](#) to view the Basingstoke Golf Course SPD and make representations on the document.

## Appendix E: Text from Objective (Consultation Portal)

### **Draft Basingstoke Golf Course Supplementary Planning Document**

This draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in its role as Local Planning Authority to support the delivery of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029. The SPD addresses how the Basingstoke Golf Course housing allocation site should be developed in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies. Once adopted by the council, the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of relevant planning applications.

### **How do you have your say?**

The consultation is now open and responses must be received by **4pm on 5 August 2019**.

The draft Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief SPD can be downloaded by clicking the 'View and Comment' button. The Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening and Habitats Regulations Assessment for the SPD is also available to download from 'Supporting Documents' below.

In order to comment, we would encourage you to register (using the tab at the top of the page) and complete an online form. Alternatively you can download a representation form (below) and submit this by email to: [local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk) or via post to Planning Policy, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke RG21 4AH.

Please note the comments received during this consultation cannot be treated as confidential. Responses will be published on the council's website and this will include the name and/or organisation of the respondent.

### **Next Steps**

When the consultation has ended, the council will prepare a statement setting out who was consulted, a summary of the main issues raised and how the council has addressed those issues.

Should you have any questions, contact the Planning Policy Team on 01256 844844.

## Appendix F: Press notice

# Give your views on redevelopment at Basingstoke golf course

News release 8499, published on 12 Jul 2019

Local residents are being asked to help shape the redevelopment of the Basingstoke golf course site where approximately 1,000 new homes will be built.

A consultation on the Basingstoke Golf Course Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is now open until Monday 5 August. It gives local people the chance to put forward their views on what is needed, including the type and size of homes, community facilities, transport, access, environmental quality, design and layout, before a decision is taken on the final document, due to be adopted in October 2019.

The site was allocated for development in the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan in 2016, and the SPD has been prepared by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in its role as the Local Planning Authority.

It will be used to help determine planning applications on the site, including the current proposal by Bloor Homes and Basingstoke Golf Club to develop the Winchester Road site with up to 1,100 homes and community amenities.

Cabinet Member for Planning, Infrastructure and Natural Environment Cllr Mark Ruffell said: "The council is keen to get people's views on what they want to see on the proposed redevelopment and I encourage everyone to respond to this consultation, which will run until Monday 5 August 2019.

"It is important to gather local opinions in order to get the best possible outcome for this development."

The Basingstoke Golf Course Development Brief SPD can be viewed online at: [www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/planning-policy-consultations).

It is also available for public inspection at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Civic Offices and at all public libraries in the borough during normal opening hours.

## Appendix G: Full schedule of comments and proposed changes

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
<b>Sections 1,2, 3 and 4: Purpose, Background, Planning Policy Framework and Vision</b>				
Section 1: Purpose of the Development Brief	Simon Preedy	Suggest that the council should be reviewing its policies (including the Local Plan) rather than writing SPDs, which are frequently ignored. Will the SPD for this site be a material planning consideration?		As set out in paras 1.3 and 1.4, this SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of the (current) outline planning application and any subsequent planning applications.  S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase requires applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
1.3	Bloor Homes	To clarify status of document	Following consultation, this document will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It does not include new policies, <u>or amend adopted Local Plan policies</u> , but identifies more detailed development principles that build upon existing planning policy	Agree. Provides additional clarification.
2.1	Cllr Terri Reid	Support reiteration of capacity of 'approximately 1,000 homes' as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3.11		Noted
2.1	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Capacity is 'approximately 1,000 homes' as set out in Local Plan Policy SS3.11. The council should object to proposals for over-development.		Noted.
2.4	Bloor Homes	To provide clarification that the site does not currently provide any public access.	is currently in use as a <u>private members</u> golf course	Agree. Provides additional clarification.
2.4	Bloor Homes	Not all trees are established.	and contains <del>many established</del> <u>trees of varying quality</u>	No change required. There are many established trees on the site. The value of specific trees will be determined through the tree survey that would be provided as part of any planning application.
4.1	Historic England	Add reference to 'historic' in vision.	'... The sites will respect, respond to and enhance their landscape, <u>historic</u> and biodiversity context...'	The vision is a direct quote from the adopted Local Plan, so it is not appropriate to change it in this instance.
4.2 (Objective 4)	Bloor Homes	The focus should be on protecting ecologically important habitats and species rather than "sensitive" habitats and species.	Development should protect and enhance <del>sensitive</del> <u>ecologically important</u> habitats and species	No change.  Ecologically important habitats and species could be construed as specific to key/protected habitat species types.
<b>Section 5: A mix of homes</b>				
Chapter 5 (Housing)	Hampshire County Council (Public Health)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support specific requirements for accommodation for older people and people with support needs.</li> <li>ii. Support recommendation to apply Nationally Described Space Standard as linked to quality of life.</li> <li>iii. Support requirement for 40% affordable housing and detailed requirements.</li> <li>iv. Support requirement for G&amp;T accommodation, but query what 'within reasonable distance of local facilities' means.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Noted</li> <li>ii. The council is not able to require development to meet the Nationally Described Space Standard through an SPD.</li> <li>iii. Noted</li> <li>iv. The requirement for the G&amp;T pitch to be located within 'a reasonable distance of local services' is drawn directly from Local Plan Policy CN5. There is no specific definition of what constitutes a 'reasonable distance' and each proposal would need to be judged on its merits. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) requires LPAs to ensure sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, and in particular promotes access to appropriate health facilities and schools.</li> </ul>
<b>Market mix</b>				
5.3	Bloor Homes	Given the scale of the development and its phased delivery over an extended period of time, flexibility should be provided to ensure that the mix of homes (in particular in later phases), respond to housing market need.	<del>Consequently,</del> The current requirement is for development should principally focus on a mix of 2 and 3 bedroom market dwellings (particularly houses), with only a limited requirement for homes with 4 bedrooms or more, which should normally comprise no more than 30% of the market dwellings. <u>However, it is recognised that needs may change over time.</u>	Agree. Given the timescales for delivery, it is recognised that some flexibility may be required to address changing needs.  <u>'... However, it is recognised that needs may change over time and any updated information should be considered through the planning application process'</u> .

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
5.5	Bloor Homes	This is not a policy requirement and should not be referenced in the document.	<del>The council therefore strongly encourages all new dwellings to meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS).</del>	No change. This is expressed as an aspiration.
Development Principle 1a	Bloor Homes	Given the scale of the development and its phased delivery over an extended period of time, flexibility should be provided to ensure that the mix of homes (in particular in later phases), respond to housing market need.	<del>2) As set out in the council's Housing SPD, the development should principally focus on a mix of The requirements at April 2019 are for predominantly 2 and 3 bedroom market dwellings, particularly houses, with only limited provision of 4 (or more) bedroom units. Requirements may change as a result of local need and market conditions.</del>	Agree. Given the timescales for delivery, it is recognised that some flexibility may be required to address changing needs.  <u>'... However, it is recognised that needs may change over time and any updated information should be considered through the planning application process'.</u>
Development Principle 1a	County Cllr Stephen Reid	This should be strengthened to place an upper limit on the number of 1 bedroom properties that will be allowed on the site.		No change.  It will be necessary for the developer to justify the housing mix, based upon the requirements of LP Policy CN3 (in the case of market housing), and local affordable needs. The SPD already provides a strong steer that 2/3 bedroom homes are most appropriate.  The precise mix of affordable dwellings will be determined in discussion with the council's housing team based upon needs.
Development Principle 1a	South West Action Group (SWAG)	Question whether the site is appropriate for the older population. There will be a number of smaller centres in the local area, none of which would have the critical mass to be a social hub where the elderly can meet. Suggest centres at Hounsome Fields and Basingstoke Golf Course are consolidated.		The Local Plan already establishes the principle of centres on both the Hounsome Fields and Basingstoke Golf Course sites, and Policy SS3.11(c) and SS3.12(c) require these should be comprehensively planned (for example, taking into account issues like size to ensure that they do not compete). Local Plan Policy CN4 requires sites of this size to consider the need for older persons' accommodation.
Development Principle 1a	Julian Jones	Site is remote from town centre or employment areas or leisure facilities. Consider suitability for older residents, teenage children and occupants of affordable housing.		No change. The site will include a range of facilities and services to support a mixed and sustainable community.
<b>Affordable housing</b>				
5.6	Bloor Homes	Flexibility required to ensure a balance with regards to the LPA's infrastructure requirements and the scheme's viability.	The development must accord with Policy CN1 in the ALP, and make provision for 40% affordable housing (of which at least 70% should be rented accommodation), <u>having regard to the current viability of developments including land values and other development costs.</u>	No change. The SPD reflects adopted Local Plan policy, and this was taken into account in setting the Community Infrastructure Levy for the site.  In accordance with Local Plan Policy CN1 and the NPPF, there may be scope to flex requirements if a viability case can be clearly and robustly demonstrated, however it is not necessary for this to be set out in this document.
5.9	Bloor Homes	Site constraints may impact upon the ability to cluster units.	<del>with units dispersed across the site in clusters</del>	No change. This is a key requirement of the Housing SPD (as set out in para 5.9). The distribution of affordable units would in any case be considered on its merits taking into account site constraints.
Development Principle 1b	Bloor Homes	To provide flexibility to allow the tenure split to consider local requirements, viability etc.	<del>The tenure split will include 70% rented homes as a minimum</del>	No change. The SPD reflects adopted Local Plan policy, which itself is informed by local requirements. In accordance with Local Plan Policy CN1 and the NPPF, there may be scope to flex requirements if a viability case can be demonstrated.
Development Principle 1b	Bloor Homes	Flexibility required to ensure a balance with regards to the LPA's infrastructure requirements and the scheme's viability.	1) The proposal will need to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy CN1 and make provision for 40% affordable housing, <u>having regard to the current viability of developments including land values and other development costs.</u>	No change. The SPD reflects adopted Local Plan policy, and the site's infrastructure requirements were taken into account when setting the Community Infrastructure Levy. In accordance with Local Plan Policy CN1 and the NPPF, there may be scope to flex requirements if a viability case can be demonstrated, however it is not necessary for this to be set out in this document.
<b>Older people</b>				

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
5.14	Bloor Homes	There is insufficient land to provide bungalows and they are difficult to build into slopes.	Removal of para 5.14	No change. This is expressed as something that the council would encourage and support rather than as a requirement.
Development Principle 1c	Bloor Homes	Support flexibility in principle	None	Noted.
<b>Self-build</b>				
5.19	Bloor Homes	Self-build register does not provide a realistic indication of local demand.	<del>5%</del> An element of custom or self-build, if justified of 1,000 dwellings would equate to 50 plots and would make a significant contribution towards meeting this need.	<p>The council considers that 5% SB is justified. This reflects the approach in the adopted Housing SPD and is appropriate for inclusion in this document.</p> <p>The Housing SPD para 5.32 is clear that if there is no demand for the plots at the time that they are marketed, they can revert back to conventional market housing. Further information will be added to paragraph 5.20 accordingly.</p> <p><u>'... As set out in Principle 5.4 of the Housing SPD, the plots will be marketed for a minimum period of 12 months in a manner that brings them to the attention of the maximum number of potential purchasers at a fair open market value. Should the plots not have been sold within this time period, they may be built out as conventional market housing by the developer.'</u></p>
5.20	Bloor Homes	It must be recognised that self-build creates design and deliverability issues as well as health and safety considerations, and therefore there must be flexibility in the requirements.	There is therefore an unmet local requirement (within the borough), that would justify securing <del>5% an element of</del> custom or self-build plots on this site, <u>if justified. This is subject to viability and demand.</u>	<p>Partial change.</p> <p>It is recognised that it would be appropriate to expand upon the circumstances in which the plots would no longer be required (as set out in response to 5.19, above).</p>
Development Principle 1d	Bloor Homes	The 5% requirement has not been sought in full on other sites and such a requirement must be justified by robust evidence, as part of the planning balance.	In order to deliver a mixed and sustainable community, a <u>proportion at least 5%</u> of the units should be made available as self-build and custom-build plots.	<p>No change.</p> <p>At the time that the outline planning application at Hounsome Fields was determined, the council had little evidence of demand for self-build plots. The planning application was submitted prior to the establishment of the self-build register, and had relatively few people on it at the time that the application was determined. The determination of the application also pre-dated the Housing SPD, which established the 5% target. The circumstances relating to this application are therefore materially different.</p>
Development Principle 1d	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Principle should be strengthened to define in greater detail what is meant by 'custom-build' – or to just require self-build.		<p>Partial change.</p> <p>The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act does not distinguish between self-build and custom build units, and so it is not possible for local planning policies to differentiate between them in setting policy requirements. However, para 5.21 (bullet point 4) requires development to provide a mix of sizes and types to meet demand, and this could be expanded to be clear that this should also include units to meet the demand for different build routes.</p> <p>Para 5.21 bullet point 4:</p> <p><u>'Providing a mix of sizes and types, to meet the type of demand shown by the council's self-build register, including a mix of self-build and custom-build properties (Principle 5.7)'</u></p>
<b>Gypsy and traveller accommodation</b>				
5.22	John Mathew	Gypsy pitch needs to be incorporated into a more central area of the development so the occupants can better integrate with the new community.		Noted. The specific location of the pitch will be determined through the planning application process.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
5.23	Bloor Homes	It is important that any triggers for provision do not restrict the wider delivery of development and that they are negotiated as part of the planning application process, and not set within the SPD.	<del>This should be capable of being delivered early in the development to meet projected need.</del>	No change. It is considered appropriate for the SPD to set out the LPA's requirements at the outset. Early delivery of the pitch is very important to help to meet need and assist the council with demonstrating a deliverable supply of sites. It is recognised, however, that the overall package of requirements will be negotiated as part of the planning application and that this would, amongst other matters, take into account delivery considerations.
5.24	Bloor Homes	Such detailed matters will be dealt with through the planning process. There is no justification for the need for a 'day room' for a single pitch.	The size and shape of the pitch should be adequate to meet the needs of the future occupants <del>(for example, to allow the parking of a caravan and the provision of a day room)</del> , and allow space for a vehicle with a caravan to manoeuvre and safely join the highway. <del>Unless demonstrated to the contrary, the council does not consider that a location in the northwest corner of the site (as shown in the material submitted in April 2019 with the outline application) would satisfy these requirements.</del>	No change. It is good practice and common practice for a day room to be provided with gypsy pitches. A day room has been provided with other pitches across the borough, including through the legal agreement for the pitches at Hounsome Fields.  The second part of the text provides a steer about the acceptability of the particular site proposed.
Development Principle 1e	Cllr Terri Reid	The development principle should be strengthened to make clear that the gypsy and traveller accommodation should be integrated into the development and not positioned to be adjacent to existing homes.		It is considered that the SPD goes as far as it can go in this regard. Requirement for development to be 'well related to and integrated with the new development' has been strengthened by being added to Development Principle 1e (2).
Development Principle 1e	Bloor Homes	This should be addressed through the planning application process instead.	<del>2) The design and location of the pitch should meet the detailed requirements set out in Local Plan Policy CN5 (Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople).</del>	No change. This criterion helpfully signposts the relevant Local Plan policy, which sets criteria that would be considered through the planning application process.
Development Principle 1e	Simon Preedy	Does not agree that traveller pitches should be further integrated into these new housing estates. They are better placed on the periphery. Consider that the site shown in the material submitted in April 2019 with the outline planning application is within a 'reasonable distance of local services' (also noting the new healthcare facilities proposed in Beggarwood).		Noted.
Development Principle 1e	John Mathew	Should not reopen Peak Copse traveller site. In particular, it would have a harmful impact upon biodiversity and ancient woodland.		Noted.
<b>Section 6: Community Infrastructure</b>				
Section 6	Sport England	Sports provision sought should be supported by the council's own assessment of playing pitch needs. However, BDBC's Playing Pitch Strategy is now out of date. Suggest that further discussion needs to take place with Sport England and other sports bodies to determine the most appropriate provision taking account of the community needs and priorities for the area.		The council's Playing Pitch Strategy covers the period 2015-2025 so is still in date. The council is in regular communication with the Hampshire Football Association about the needs of football within the borough, and through these and other discussions, the council is seeking to comprehensively plan for sport across south-west Basingstoke including Manydown.
Chapter 6 (Community Infrastructure)	Hampshire County Council (Public Health)	Support proposed community infrastructure and suggest that their specific locations should take account of potential sources of air and noise pollution to protect the health and wellbeing of those using the facilities. Retail facilities should be 'health enhancing' – for example selling locally produced food and limiting the number of takeaways.		Noted. Planning applications would need to be supported by assessments of air quality and noise, as required by Local Plan Policy EM12 (Pollution).  It would not be appropriate for the SPD to seek to influence the precise types of goods being sold in the centre.
<b>Delivery and timing of infrastructure</b>				
6.1	Bloor Homes	SPD must clarify that the school will be on Hounsome Fields	As an example of this, the Local Plan requires that Basingstoke Golf Course will provide outdoor sports pitches in a single location to meet the need arising from	No change. Changes are proposed elsewhere in the SPD to clarify the location of the school.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
			all the sites. <u>The Local Plan confirms that the school will be provided on Hounsome Fields.</u>	
6.2	Bloor Homes	Early provision of infrastructure is subject to viability, cash flow and delivery considerations requiring collaborative discussion with the developer.	Suitable mechanisms for ensuring the early provision of infrastructure <del>must be incorporated into planning consents, with appropriate triggers within the Section 106 agreement.</del> <u>should be discussed with the developer.</u>	No change. It is inherent that the S106 would need to be discussed with the developer given that they would need to sign/agree it.
6.2	Stephen Harris	Section about the timing of delivery of infrastructure should be strengthened with specific targets. If facilities are not delivered early, residents will find alternatives and this could reduce the viability of local facilities when they are eventually built.		It is recognised that the early delivery of infrastructure is of key importance, and this is reflected by Principle 2a. It is considered that specific delivery triggers can best be agreed through the planning application process taking into account specific issues such as phasing and viability considerations. A minor change is proposed to para 6.6 (see below) in relation to the provision of a temporary community facility to address the potential displacement issue suggested by the respondent.
Development Principle 2a	Julian Jones	Comprehensive planning should include the Fairways and Kempshott Park. Measures should be taken to ensure potential users of the sports fields will not park in nearby residential areas.		No change. It is only necessary for new development to address its own needs (the tests for planning obligations are set out in NPPF para 56). However, it is recognised that such needs must be understood in the context of existing local provision.  It will be necessary for the specific design and layout of the sports fields to ensure that anti-social parking does not occur. In particular, impacts would be assessed against Local Plan Policy EM10 (Delivering High Quality Development).
Development Principle 2a (1)	Bloor Homes	The SPD should provide further information about the expectations for the IDP.	Planning applications should be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy to demonstrate that the infrastructure has been comprehensively planned with Kennel Farm (SS3.2) and Hounsome Fields (SS3.12) and other existing facilities in the local area. <u>The Strategy should include...</u>	Change.  Further information has been about the types of infrastructure to be included in the IDS in para 6.1:  '... This should include details of the off-site mitigation (including highway improvements, pedestrian and cycling connections and public transport arrangements), and on-site facilities such as those for sport, community, education and green infrastructure'.
Development Principle 2a	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Principle should be strengthened to allow for the school previously identified for the Hounsome Fields site to be relocated to the Golf Course.		No change.  The LPA is not proactively looking to alter the location of the new school. Should it be moved, the council would expect this to be reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, and any such application would be considered on its own merits.
Development Principle 2a (2)	Bloor Homes		Infrastructure should be delivered <del>as soon as is practicable to meet the needs of the new community, in accordance with S106 triggers, as discussed with the developer.</del>	No change. It is inherent that the S106 would need to be discussed with the developer given that they would need to sign up to it.
<b>Community infrastructure</b>				
6.3	Stephen Harris	What provision will be made for a church?		The community centre would include flexible spaces that would allow it to be used for worship, should that be demanded.
6.4	Cllr Terri Reid	Requirement for a health care facility should be identified by the local Clinical Commissioning Group, which would also have to confirm its ability to establish and staff it.		Agreed.  6.4 <u>It is recognised that the site is located close to Beggarwood surgery. However, should a need for a health care facility be identified on this site by the Clinical Commissioning Group, this would be supported by the council would also support the delivery of a suitable health care facility on this site, should it be required.</u>

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
6.4	Bloor Homes	In light of the Beggarwood Surgery position, it is important that any new facilities do not compromise the viability / vitality of existing facilities. The development of 1000 homes represents an opportunity for additional residents to support existing facilities not undermine them.		Noted. This section has been amended to ensure that the provision of any such facilities reflect need (see above).
6.4	Simon Preedy	Note that new provider is set to take over Beggarwood surgery, with questions about how this will operate.		Noted. The specifics about how the surgery will operate is not a planning matter.
6.4	John Mathew	A suitable healthcare facility should be provided on site to provide choice for new and existing residents.		The requirement for a healthcare facility will be informed by the CCG (see changes proposed to para 6.4, above).
6.5	Bloor Homes	Support requirement that all the community facilities 'should' rather than 'must' be co-located, as this provides scope for the layout to take account of constraints (for example, the location of the sports pitches).		Noted. The proposed wording sets out the council's preference, but with scope for flexibility should it be necessary and justified.
6.6	BDBC Community	Suggest a temporary community facility early on in the development.		Agree.  If required, a community centre will need to be provided early in the development to create a focal point for the new community ( <u>this could take the form of a temporary facility in the first instance</u> ).
6.6	Bloor Homes	Early delivery is subject to viability and cash flow considerations. This needs to be more flexible and for negotiation as part of the S106	If such a facility is required, the timing for the delivery of a community centre will need to be discussed with the developer and <del>provided early in the development</del> <u>agreed through the S106</u> . This facility would create a focal point for the new community.	No change. The wording sets out the council's aspirations for the community facility to be delivered early in the development, as this can help to establish a sense of community. However, it is recognised that this and other triggers would need to be considered holistically as part of the S106 negotiations.
6.7	Bloor Homes	This should be a council led engagement process to ensure the community feels that this is impartial.	The precise design and uses in the centre should be determined through engagement with local residents and stakeholders once the site has begun to be occupied. <u>This engagement will be led by the Local Authority.</u>	No change. This would depend upon the agreed method of delivery of the community facility.
6.9	Bloor Homes	This paragraph is too prescriptive. The building may need to be two storey to allow flexibility of use, natural surveillance to the urban park and to give the local centre presence.	The building will need to be <del>single storey and be</del> designed to accommodate the varied and flexible needs of the facility <del>and with potential for future expansion.</del>	Changed to reflect the fact that the community facility itself would need to be on a single storey. The specific design of the building can be informed by the proposed future uses within it, its surroundings, management issues etc.  The building will need to <del>be single storey and</del> be designed to accommodate the varied and flexible needs of the facility <u>on a single level</u> and <del>with</del> <u>have</u> potential for future expansion.
6.9	Mr Julian Jones	The hub building should have sufficient internal height to accommodate all purposes.		The design of the building will be informed by best practice and consultation with local residents and stakeholders, which will identify the proposed uses, and the necessary design response.
6.9	BDBC Community	Revision to paragraph suggested to improve clarity.	For example, adequate storage space, <u>a centre</u> office space and suitable mechanisms need to be available in order to ensure that the building can be used effectively for a wide range of community activities (e.g. <u>soundproofing/sprung floor</u> etc).	Agree. Improved clarity of requirements.
6.10	BDBC Community	Mention sustainability of community building (in particular context of BDBC Climate Emergency)		Agree.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
				'The design of the building will need to minimise its <u>environmental impact and minimise</u> ongoing running and maintenance costs...'
6.11	Bloor Homes	Para should recognise the importance of the retail facilities being of an appropriate scale.	The <u>scale</u> , location and design of the retail facilities should give consideration to their viability, to ensure they can continue to be occupied for the benefit of the local community <u>and will not prejudice other local facilities.</u>	Agree. Local Plan Policy EP3 (Town, District and Local Centres) states that, 'New local and district centres may also come forward as part of larger developments set out in Policy SS3, where they are suitable in scale to the level of growth proposed'.  'The <u>scale</u> , location and design of the retail facilities should give consideration to their viability, to ensure they can continue to be occupied for the benefit of the local community. <u>They will need to be suitable in scale to the size of the development, and not prejudice other local facilities.</u> '
6.12	Bloor Homes	Para should be amended to reflect the developer's aspiration to locate the sports pitches in the south east corner of the site (away from the other community facilities).	<del>In order to assist management, the council's preference is for the facilities to be co-located with the proposed community centre. Should this not be practical or feasible,</del> a separate pavilion building should be provided adjacent to the pitches <u>if justified</u> . In such a case, in order to allow the facility to be self-sustaining, it would be necessary to provide sufficient car parking and for the pavilion to provide a kitchenette.	No change.  The paragraph sets out the council's preference. It is for the developer to justify as part of their planning application why any deviation from this would be acceptable.  The council considers that if the sports pitches are remote from the community centre (where shared facilities could be provided), a separate pavilion building would be justified.
Development Principle 2b	Julian Jones	Retail units and community facilities (including sports pitches) should have adequate parking and, where necessary, space for HGVs to manoeuvre.		Principle 5b requires parking spaces to be provided in accordance with the Parking SPD, which includes a quantity standard for retail and community facilities. The SPD also sets out requirements in relation to providing space for delivery vans to manoeuvre.
Development Principle 2b	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Given that the CCG is saying that the future of the Beggarwood surgery has been secured, the reference to a healthcare facility at the Golf Club site might now be considered superfluous		No change. The reference can be retained to cater for any potential uncertainty.
Development Principle 2b	Cllr Terri Reid	Should be strengthened to define how need for a health facility might be identified, by whom and when.		No change  This is addressed through the change to the supporting text in para 6.4.
6.13	Bloor Homes		A new primary school is required in south-west Basingstoke to meet the needs of the new residents. The Local Plan identifies that this should be located on the Hounsome Fields housing allocation (Policy SS3.12), and outline planning permission has been secured for a three form entry school on this site. <del>However, concerns have been raised about the consented site due to its proximity to busy roads and concerns about air quality. The Local Education Authority is therefore investigating whether the school could be relocated onto the Golf Course site.</del>	Change. Delete second part of para 6.13 (as shown) and para 6.14.  This reflects the adopted Local Plan policy; the extant consent for a primary school on Hounsome Fields; the lack of interest in relocating the school expressed by the developer; and consequently the fact that the LPA is no longer pursuing this option.
6.13	John Mathew	The school should be located on the golf course site to make it easily accessible to residents of the wider Beggarwood area.		No change. The provision of the school on Hounsome Fields is in line with the Local Plan and the extant consent (as above).
6.14	Bloor Homes	The LEA is no longer proposing to relocate the school. This matter should not be revisited in the SPD.	Paragraph deleted	Change. Delete paras 6.13 and 6.14 (as above).
6.15	Bloor Homes	Clarification required.	In addition to providing on-site infrastructure, the developer will also be required to pay the council's	No change. This is a procedural matter. Approach to CIL set out in other council documents.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
			Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). <u>CIL payments can and are likely to be phased in line with the Council's instalment policy.</u>	
<b>Section 7: Transport and Access</b>				
Section 7 (general)	Hampshire County Council (Public Health)	Support proposed transport requirements. Emphasise importance that pavements are not obstructed by cabinets or other infrastructure to support new technologies.		Noted. The issue about pavements being obstructed is already addressed by para 7.19.
Section 7 (general)	David Watton	Development does not take account of access to Basingstoke town centre, and will exacerbate existing problems along the A30 and particularly at Brighton Hill Roundabout. Traffic flow around Basingstoke has not been looked at comprehensively. It is likely that a link road between the M3 at Dummer and the A339 Newbury road would help.		Any planning application would be supported by a Transport Assessment that would assess the impact of the cumulative impact of this development and others planned in the locality, and identify necessary mitigation measures (for example, upon Brighton Hill Roundabout). Appropriate guidance is provided in the section entitled 'Mitigating the impact on the highway network'.  The SPD also strongly supports non-car modes of transport.
<b>Mitigating the impact upon the highway impact</b>				
7.1	John Mathew	A30 is very busy. Concerned about proposed roundabout – may require more lanes or a flyover.		As set out in para 7.7, the design of the principal roundabout was agreed as part of the outline consent for Hounsme Fields. This is now subject to a S278 application (to finalise the detailed design).
7.1	Highways England	Welcome recognition that TA should be developed in conjunction with Highways England, consider cumulative impact, and assess the operation of M3 J7 and J8.		Noted.
7.2	County Cllr Stephen Reid	The golf course should be included in a transport assessment that takes into account the cumulative impact of all other planned development.		No change.  The scope of the Transport Assessment will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority. Para 7.2 already states that 'the mitigation measures should take into account the cumulative impact of other planned development in the borough, in particular the other consented schemes in south-west Basingstoke, and the allocated site at Manydown'.
7.3	Bloor Homes	The traffic impact analysis will determine the extent of the highway network that will be required to be examined; however, it will be necessary to at least examine the impact of the development upon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A30 corridor between the M3 Junction 7 and Brighton Hill Roundabout; and</li> <li>The M3 Junctions 7 and 8</li> </ul>	<del>In particular, it will be necessary to examine the impact of development upon:</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>The A30 corridor between the site and Basingstoke town centre;</del></li> <li><del>Tronchard Lane;</del></li> <li><del>The Kempshott Lane corridor, including Fiveways crossroads; and</del></li> <li><del>The operation of M3 junctions 7 and 8.</del></li> </ul>	Minor change to reflect that these are the LPA's aspirations and that the precise scope of the TA will be based upon a technical assessment.  <del>It will be necessary to should</del> examine the impact of development upon:...
7.4	Highways England	Support requirement to implement a Travel Plan.		Noted.
Development Principle 3a	County Cllr Stephen Reid	It is meaningless to state that 'development must not have a severe impact on the highway network'. 'Severe' is not defined and no cumulative transport assessment has been completed. The highway impacts must be better measured.		No change. The requirement for the residual cumulative impact on the highway network to be less than 'severe' is set out in the NPPF para 109.  Criterion 1) should be changed to better reflect this wording:  '1) Development must not have a severe <u>residual cumulative impacts</u> on the highway network'.
<b>Access</b>				
7.9 (and suggested consequential change to Objective 3)	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Should be strengthened to state that a secondary access 'must' be provided.		No change. The SPD provides strong support for the provision of a secondary access.
7.10	County Cllr Stephen Reid	The SPD should make it clear that another access onto the A30 would not be an acceptable solution.		Agree.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
		If that were to be allowed, the A30 corridor would feature the Kempshott roundabout, the Hatch Warren roundabout, the Beggarwood Lane junction, the Longacre junction, the Golf Course secondary junction, the Golf Course/ Hounsome Fields roundabout, the A30/A33 junction and the M3 Junction 7 roundabout, which is a recipe for delay.		Add to the end of Para 7.10:  <u>'The design and location of any secondary access should minimise the disruption to the flow of traffic along the A30 corridor, and take into account any other impacts such as those upon trees and biodiversity'</u> .
7.10	Bloor Homes	Para should be updated to reflect the fact that the applicant cannot deliver a vehicular access from Beggarwood Lane.	Information provided by the developer has indicated that it <del>is</del> <del>may not be</del> possible to form a vehicular access in this location due to land ownership constraints. <del>Should this be the case,</del> the developer should provide detailed evidence to demonstrate why this could not be overcome, and show that all options have been explored with the Local Highway Authority. <del>Should it not be possible to form a secondary vehicular access from Beggarwood Lane,</del> the developer will <del>should</del> still investigate the provision of an access <del>seek to make provision</del> for pedestrians and cyclists in this location in order to provide direct connectivity to local facilities avoiding circuitous alternative routes. <del>In this case,</del> the developer will <u>also need to</u> consider the feasibility and desirability of other locations for a secondary access, in order to allow vehicles (including public transport) to circulate through the site.	No change. The purpose of the SPD is to set out the council's preferred approach. It would be necessary for the applicant to provide information to demonstrate why the access from Beggarwood could not be provided as part of a planning application to the satisfaction of the LHA and the LPA.
Development Principle 3b	Mr Julian Jones	The design of the access roundabout should include sufficient space for the MRT lanes and cycle routes. Future proofing from the Manydown spine road should include a flyover or an underpass for the A30, which would help to reduce congestion and air pollution.		As set out in para 7.7, the design of the principal roundabout was agreed as part of the outline consent for Hounsome Fields. This is now subject to a S278 application (to finalise the detailed design).
Development Principle 3b	Julian Jones	Any secondary access onto the A30 should be restricted to inbound access for public transport vehicles.		Noted. This would be considered in detail through the planning application process.
Development Principle 3b	Natural England	Construction of the main access roundabout on the A30 will involve the loss of potential priority habitat (lowland mixed deciduous woodland). The secondary access at Beggarwood Lane may have detrimental impacts upon the Coachroad Belt SINC's.	'Principle 3b: Vehicular access requirements' of the SPD is broadened to include a requirement for the development to accord with National Planning Policy Framework on ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees and Natural England standing advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees. Development should follow the mitigation hierarchy set out within paragraph 175a of the NPPF and that any unavoidable loss of priority habitat should be compensated. Ecological connectivity around and within the site should be enhanced.	The design and location of the principal access has already been established through the approved application for Hounsome Fields.  These detailed matters about biodiversity and trees are already addressed in detail through Principles 4a and 4b. It is nonetheless considered appropriate to signpost that the design and location of the access should consider any consequential impacts upon trees and biodiversity.  Para 7.10  <u>...and take into account any other impacts such as those upon trees and biodiversity.</u>
Development Principle 3b (2)	Bloor Homes	Para should be updated to reflect the fact that the applicant cannot deliver a vehicular access from Beggarwood Lane.	2) A secondary vehicular access should be provided from Beggarwood Lane, <u>or an alternative location if this is not possible</u> . The design of the junction and internal layout of the site should be designed to prevent rat-running. Should a vehicular access not be achievable in this location, the developer <u>should investigate</u> the make provision for a walking and cycling <del>connection</del> in this location, and a secondary vehicular access should be provided elsewhere.	Change is not necessary. The wording already covers the eventuality that an access could not be formed from Beggarwood Lane, as envisaged by the Local Plan policy.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
<b>Public transport</b>				
7.12	Bloor Homes	There is no justification for this request.	<del>Proposals should also give consideration to the indicative proposals for a Mass Rapid Transit Network, as set out in the councils' draft Transport Strategy (2018), which would provide frequent quick connections between the communities in south-west Basingstoke and the town centre.</del>	Change to provide further information about the MRT.  7.12 Proposals should also give consideration to the indicative proposals for a Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Network, as set out in the councils' draft Transport Strategy (2018) <sup>1</sup> , which would provide frequent quick connections between the communities in south-west Basingstoke and the town centre. <u>The Local Highway Authority has indicated that it will use the indicative MRT routes as a material consideration in planning application response to ensure the deliverability of the MRT network.</u>
Development Principle 3c	County Cllr Stephen Reid	There is a risk that securing public transport through the planning process will lead to the operator claiming the S106 moneys (and leaving less for other infrastructure).		No change.  It is normal practice to secure public transport improvements through the planning process.
Development Principle 3c	Highways England	Public transport and suitable supporting infrastructure needs to be secured through the planning application process, and integrated with the service to Hounsome Fields and Kennel Farm.		Noted.
<b>Walking and cycling connectivity</b>				
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	The location of the site will make it car dependent. The off-site cycling infrastructure (particularly along the A30 corridor) has had little investment, has not been given sufficient consideration in the roundabout redesigns, and will not encourage walking or cycling.		The council will seek a financial contribution from the development towards improving the off-site pedestrian and cycling facilities connecting to the town centre. A similar contribution was sought from Hounsome Fields (pedestrian/cycle contribution).
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	Walking and cycling should be given greater prominence given the council's decision to declare a climate emergency.		Noted.
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	Cycle routes should be segregated from walking routes.		Additional text added to para 3.16:  <u>It will be necessary to ensure that development responds to the different needs of walkers and cyclists, and where possible cycle routes should be segregated from walking routes.</u>
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	Walking routes within the site should have a high degree of permeability. This needs to be defined or given better guidance.		Amendment to Development Principle 3d (1):  <del>4) Development will provide</del> High quality, safe <u>and permeable</u> , pedestrian and cycle routes <u>will be provided</u> within the development. Where possible these should be set within green space.
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	The SPD should show further pedestrian and cycling connectivity to neighbouring areas – with more crossing points on the A30, connections to the south (into Peak Copse), connections to the north, and more links to the east into Beggarwood (diagram provided).		The precise location of crossing points should be informed by the layout of any scheme. Where new vehicular accesses are formed, it is expected that there should be adequate and suitable provision for walkers and cyclists.  The Indicative Development Framework Plan has been amended to show an additional connection on the eastern side of the site into Beggarwood. There would potentially be ecological concerns about disturbance from visitors if routes were formed through the SINCS/ancient woodland to the north and south.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.hants.gov.uk/basingstoketransportstrategy>

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
				Further connections to the A30 would need to be assessed on their merits taking into account the highways layout of the site and the location of footways outside the site, with consideration to pedestrian safety.
7.15- (Walking and cycling connectivity)	Stephen Harris	The A30 crossing at the main entrance should be a bridge or an underpass. At the start and end of school times, the traffic lights will experience continuous pedestrian demand and slow traffic flows.		The SPD sets out the requirement for connections between the sites. A roundabout with signalised crossing points was approved as part of the Hounsome Fields planning application. The detailed design of the crossing is being worked up with the LHA through the Section 278 agreement.
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	There need to be multiple access points for cycling (not just the two primary vehicular access points).		The Indicative Development Framework Plan shows a number of other pedestrian/cycling connections, including one at the north of the site (on the desire line to the town centre), and one to the centre at Beggarwood. As suggested, a further connection has been added on the eastern boundary providing direct connectivity to Beggarwood.
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	Cycle routes within and outside the site should not be on shared use footways but have allocated protected space on the carriageway. On main corridors there should be routes on both sides of the carriageway.		Agree. New text added to para 7.16  It should be demonstrated that non-motorised user needs are integrated into all highway and traffic management schemes. <u>It will be necessary to ensure that development responds to the different needs of walkers and cyclists, and where possible cycle routes should be segregated from walking routes.</u>
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	Footpaths 7 and 8 need to be made restricted byways to enable cycling.		Changing a public right of way is a legal process. This cannot be a requirement of this SPD.
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	Long distance routes (such as route 5) should have protected space segregated from the carriageway.		Noted. This is a wider strategic issue. The route should be delivered in accordance with the council's adopted Cycle Strategy.
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	Development should upgrade footpath along Squirrel Drive and the connection to Down Street in Dummer.		Minor amendment:  Beyond the immediate surrounds of the site, comprehensive, safe and direct cycling and walking routes should connect the site to the town centre (and the rail station) and other key destinations (including secondary schools) <u>and provide access to the countryside.</u>
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Stephen Harris and Cycle Basingstoke	Connections to North Waltham should be improved.		Minor amendment:  Beyond the immediate surrounds of the site, comprehensive, safe and direct cycling and walking routes should connect the site to the town centre (and the rail station) and other key destinations (including secondary schools) <u>and provide access to the countryside.</u>
7.15- Walking and Cycling Connectivity	Cycle Basingstoke	Should upgrade the footpath to Farleigh Lane. This would allow people living in the new development to travel to leisure destinations outside Basingstoke and allow people living in the villages access to the employment opportunities in the new development.		Minor amendment:  Beyond the immediate surrounds of the site, comprehensive, safe and direct cycling and walking routes should connect the site to the town centre (and the rail station) and other key destinations (including secondary schools) <u>and provide access to the countryside.</u>
7.17 (bullet point 5)	Cycle Basingstoke and South West Action Group (SWAG)	An additional crossing is required between the site and Southwood Farm.		No change. A safe crossing point is being created at the principal entrance into the site.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
7.18	Bloor Homes	Additional text required, as it may be more suitable for HCC to implement this with developer funding.	Improvements should be secured in line with the borough council's Cycling Strategy (2016), and in particular deliver <u>or provide a suitable contribution to the delivery of</u> Route 5 along the A30 corridor to the town centre.	Agree. Provides greater flexibility.
Development Principle 3d	Hampshire County Council (LEA)	It is important that a crossing is provided between the site and Hounsme Fields across the A30.		Agree. This is supported by Principle 3d.
Development Principle 3d	Julian Jones	Pavements for pedestrians should be clear of hazards.		Agree. Addressed by change to Principle 3e  Care should be taken to ensure that pavements are safe for all users, and are not obstructed by cabinets and/or other infrastructure required to support new technologies (such as 5G or electric vehicle charging), <u>and that measures are employed to prevent pavement parking.</u>
Development Principle 3d	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Should remove reference to the primary school being on Hounsme Fields, to allow for flexibility if an agreement can be reached to move it.		No change  The SPD should reflect the position set out in the Local Plan.
Development Principle 3d (2)	Bloor Homes	Additional text required, as it may be more suitable for HCC to implement this with developer funding.	2) Routes will integrate the development site with Hounsme Fields, Beggarwood and the wider countryside, and deliver <u>or provide a suitable contribution to the delivery of</u> wider cycling connections in line with the Cycle Strategy (2016), including Route 5.	Agree. Provides greater flexibility.
<b>Design of highways within the site</b>				
7.19	Simon Preedy	Para should address the issue of inappropriate pavement parking which obstructs users.		Agree. Highway design can be used to discourage pavement parking.  Care should be taken to ensure that pavements are safe for all users, and are not obstructed by cabinets and/or other infrastructure required to support new technologies (such as 5G or electric vehicle charging), <u>and that measures are employed to prevent pavement parking.</u>
Development Principle 3e	County Cllr Stephen Reid	Concern that the principle requires highways to be built and maintained to adoptable standards a suitable equivalent. Council policy should be that the roads on the estate will be built to an adoptable standard with the expectation (not preference) that they will be adopted.  There should also be explicit reference to the main feeder roads in the estate being sufficient to accommodate public transport.		No change  The Local Planning Authority cannot require the roads to be adopted by the LHA, only that they must be built and maintained to an adequate standard.  The second point about the primary roads being able to accommodate public transport is already addressed by para 7.14.
<b>Section 8: Environmental quality</b>				
<b>Green Infrastructure, landscape and trees</b>				
8.2	Julian Jones	The need to preserve mature trees should be emphasised.		No change. This is a clear priority for the council and is adequately addressed in para 8.4 and through Development Principle 4a: Landscape and Trees. This is also emphasised through the heritage and design sections.
8.3	Bloor Homes	The site is not in a countryside location and is an enclosed site for 1,000 homes with very limited views in/out. It is inappropriate to consider this a 'transition' location.	<del>The design and layout of the site will need to reflect its location at the transition between the edge of Basingstoke and the wider countryside...</del> Important landscape features such as <del>significant</del> important trees within and on the perimeter of the site will need to be	No change. SPD sets out the LPA's starting point. The trees would be considered on their merits.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
			retained and integrated where possible, other than where they must be removed for access/infrastructure.	
8.4	Bloor Homes	There must be a balance struck between delivering homes and community facilities and the loss of lesser quality trees. It is not going to be possible to retain Category B trees.	Whilst it is accepted that some trees will need to be lost to facilitate the development, <del>as many trees should be retained as possible, including those trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), and in particular veteran trees, other veteran, Category A and trees of ecological significance, and B with the exception of those needing to be removed for access/ infrastructure should be retained.</del>	No change. It may be appropriate to retain some Category B/C trees, particularly where they are located close to Category A trees.  The SPD already recognises that some trees will need to be lost and that this should be considered as part of the planning balance.
8.4	Cllr Terri Reid	Where the paragraph quotes from the NPPF, it should also include the detail about what might be a wholly exceptional reason in the footnote.		Agree  'The NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons circumstances and a suitable compensation strategy exists. <u>A footnote to the NPPF sets out that a nationally significant infrastructure project, where public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of the habitat, would be an example of a 'wholly exceptional reason'.</u>
8.5	Bloor Homes	Should reference Veteran and Category A trees.	It will be important to provide green corridors and open spaces to break up the urban form, which should be aligned to incorporate <del>significant trees</del> <u>those trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), and in particular veteran trees, other Category A specimens, and trees of ecological significance where possible,</u> and to maximise the benefits for biodiversity, townscape, amenity, and movement (as set out elsewhere within this SPD).	No change. Proposed wording lessens the importance of protecting Category B trees and trees of ecological significance.
Development Principle 4a: Landscape and trees	Bloor Homes	This site is not rural given the fact that it is visually enclosed.	The design of the proposed development will need to be informed by and respond positively to its location <del>on the rural edge.</del>	No change. The site sits as the south-western edge of the built-up settlement of Basingstoke where it meets the open countryside.  By definition it is at the rural edge, at the transition between the edge of Basingstoke and the countryside. This is in contrast to, for example, a site closer to the town centre which would be set within a completely urban context. The A30 at this location also creates a clear gateway into the settlement from which the transition into the settlement from open countryside is experienced.  This is not just about the visibility of the site but also how the character of any new development relates to the surrounding context, which includes open countryside.
Development Principle 4a	Cllr Terri Reid	This principle should be strengthened to state that nothing will be done to compromise the status of the Peak Copse site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). This would then complement Principle 4b.		In order to keep the guidance about biodiversity in one place, it is instead proposed to strengthen Principle 4b to state:  as per the guidance set out in the council's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD <u>to ensure development does not compromise the integrity of those habitats and designated sites.</u>
Development Principle 4a	Historic England	Brief should make more of the heritage interest associated with the high quality landscape surrounding the site. It may be helpful to reference the role that green infrastructure can have in		Agree.  The brief already references the need for the application to address the principles contained in the Heritage SPD, including Principle GIH01 (Appreciating significance through green infrastructure).

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
		conserving and enhancing the historic environment.		However, it is considered that Principle 4f could be strengthened by expanding part (3) to refer to '...the character of the historic parkland <u>and the wider landscape...</u> '
Development Principle 4a	Hatch Warren Nature Group	The development brief should do more to value and retain trees. Near veteran and mature trees deserve the same protection as veteran trees, particularly for their biodiversity value.		No change. Development Principles 4a and 4b (and other principles) clearly state the importance of retaining trees on the site. As set out in para 8.4, this is not just limited to veteran trees. This para states that 'as many trees should be retained as possible, including those trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), and in particular veteran trees, other Category A and B specimens, and trees of ecological significance'.
Development Principle 4a	Hatch Warren Nature Group	Tree Impact Assessment should take account of a wide range of issues such as biodiversity, age importance, human wellbeing, landscape setting etc. For example, low Category C trees such as hawthorn support a wide range of flora and fauna.		No change.  Information on trees is provided by a number of targeted reports including the arboricultural report, ecological reports etc which give the decision-maker the full picture on the trees health, placement, support for biodiversity etc. For example, the importance of Hawthorn is recognised through the Ecological Impact Appraisal, so this would be considered as part of a planning application.
Development Principle 4a	Hatch Warren Nature Group	Policy SS3.11 (d) requires that development must 'respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape and respect its location'. The development brief does not support this.		No change. This is adequately addressed in the section on Landscape and Trees.
Development Principle 4a	Natural England	Welcomes retention of veteran trees in line with national policy.	It is recommended the SPD outlines a requirement to also accord with Natural England standing advice on ancient and veteran trees.	Agree. Add to para 8.4: 'Development must also accord with <u>Natural England's standing advice on ancient and veteran trees</u> '.
Development Principle 4a (2)	Natural England	Welcomes that Development Principle 4a outlines the requirement to minimise light pollution. This should apply in particular to wildlife corridors across the site.		Noted. No change required.
Development Principle 4a (3)	Natural England	Requirement to create green corridors within the site should be broadened to require them to link to the wider environment (for example, to facilitate the movement of fauna).		Agree. Change to para 8.5:  It will be important to provide green corridors and open spaces to break up the urban form, which should be aligned to incorporate significant trees and to maximise the benefits for biodiversity, townscape, amenity, and movement (as set out elsewhere within this SPD). <u>Corridors should also maximise opportunities to connect to the wider environment including linking to green infrastructure in nearby developments to facilitate the movement of fauna across the wider area.</u>
<b>Biodiversity</b>				
8.10	Bloor Homes	This is not for the SPD to require.	This tree belt and the SINC woodlands require ecological buffers of <del>at least</del> 20 metres in order to provide a naturally graded edge to the woodland and to allow for maintenance. <del>Given the ecological significance of the SINC, deeper buffers would be expected,</del>	This reflects the guidance in the adopted Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD (2018). It has an influence on development proposals and is considered to be appropriate for inclusion in this document.
8.10	Natural England	Section 8.10 outlines a requirement for a minimum 20m buffer against the SINC and woodland belt along the A30 at the western edge of the site. It is considered that a 20m buffer alongside the SINC, particularly those supporting elements of ancient		No change. The approach in the SPD is consistent with the adopted Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD (2018).  The SPD requires buffers of 'at least 20 metres' (in line with the Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD), and that 'applications will

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
		woodland, will not be sufficient to mitigate against recreation and other impacts associated with a large residential development (including trampling, eutrophication, loss of dead wood habitat, pet predation of native fauna etc.). It is recommended a more robust buffer of 50m is required by the SPD to provide greater confidence the development will minimise damage to existing habitats, where the first 15m is allowed to scrub up naturally and the remaining buffer can be used for informal recreation (such as mown paths).		need to... show how the features to be protected can be adequately managed'. It is not considered appropriate for the SPD to identify specific buffer depths in the absence of detailed evidence, but this approach will enable applications to be determined in accordance with the specific characteristics of the habitat.
8.10	Julian Jones	Tree protection should be measured from the edge of the canopy not the trunk.		Agreed. Details supporting this approach are set out in the Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD (Figure B5).
8.12 – 8.13	Bloor Homes	Concern that the retention in situ of the calcareous grassland would impact upon the site's ability to accommodate 1,000 homes. It is not appropriate for such matters to be considered in the SPD.	As such expansion and connection of these areas and management to enhance them will be <u>encouraged where possible and justifiable</u> <del>sought by the council</del> in order to retain any relic grassland communities whilst increasing species diversity to achieve net gains for biodiversity.	No change. It is considered appropriate for the SPD to set out the LPA's position on this matter as this has a significant influence on the site's masterplan.
8.13	Bloor Homes	In-situ retention is not going to be possible. Flexibility must be retained.	As such expansion and connection of these areas and management to enhance them will be sought by the council in order to retain, <u>insofar as is possible (given their small size and isolated nature)</u> , any relic grassland communities whilst increasing species diversity to achieve net gains for biodiversity.	No change. Proposed wording undermines LPA's approach.
8.14	Natural England	Section 8.14 of the SPD outlines the requirement for future planning applications to be supported by detailed assessments of the impact on protected species. Natural England has produced Standing Advice to help local planning authorities assess the impact of particular developments on protected or priority species.		Noted.
8.14	Bloor Homes	Clearer wording required.	Future planning applications will need to be supported by detailed assessments of the <u>potential for</u> impact on these species, <u>where ecological studies have confirmed their presence</u> , along with proposed mitigation and enhancement measures as required.	Agree. Provides clarity.
8.15	Bloor Homes	Reference to Dormouse Bridges has been removed. This should not be required by the SPD.	Consideration should therefore be given to mitigation in this location (for example, lighting reduction and arboreal continuity for dormice <del>dormouse bridges by, for example, minimising road width, including structural planting around the break and enhancing boundary planting to provide alternative routes in the short term</del> ), and the enhancement of wildlife corridors elsewhere within the site.	No change. The key requirement is to provide mitigation. The wording suggests ways in which this can be done, but does not require a particular approach. The LPA has not determined whether dormouse bridges will be required or not, but they are one possible outcome.
Development Principle 4b	Bloor Homes	Only necessary to buffer retained features	Appropriate buffers to these <u>retained</u> features will need to be provided, as per the guidance set out in the council's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD.	Agree. Provides clarification.
Development Principle 4b	Natural England	The SPD's requirement for development to expand, connect and enhance areas of remnant chalk grassland are welcomed, as is the requirement for ecological mitigation and management plans set out within Development Principle 4b.		Noted.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
Development Principle 4b	Hatch Warren Nature Group	The developer should commit to provide an activity programme of community engagement on biodiversity of the site. This should include the provision of funded work for activities associated with the site's long term biodiversity management.		Agree, however this may be difficult to secure. Add to end of para 8.16:  <u>'... The council will support proposals that enable the local community to become engaged in the future management and maintenance of the retained habitats'.</u>
Development Principle 4b	Julian Jones	Should include other Cat A and B trees		No change. The document should be read as a whole and this is adequately covered in Principle 4a and its supporting text.
Development Principle 4b (2)	Natural England	Natural England welcomes the requirement for development to ensure measureable biodiversity net gain is achieved.		Noted.
<b>Green space</b>				
8.17	Bloor Homes	There must be flexibility here to ensure that the open space strategy for the site is not unduly restrictive and allows for consideration of other material factors	15.6 hectares total required for 1,000 dwellings, <u>unless other material considerations support a lesser provision.</u>	No change. SPD sets out LPA's policy starting point. This is helpful as it indicates the scale of the MFGS required in accordance with the adopted standards.
8.17	Hampshire County Council (Public Health)	Support requirement for development to meet the council's green space standards.		Noted.
8.20	Bloor Homes	Veteran and Cat A trees should be specifically referenced.  The site is not designated as a heritage asset and therefore its former use is not relevant for the future proposals.  There is no justification for a water feature which is a detailed matters that will be considered as part of reserved matters applications.	<del>The location and design of the open spaces should give consideration to how they might accommodate significant trees those trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), and in particular veteran trees, other Category A specimens where possible and reflect the site's former use as parkland or as a golf course. It should consider the inclusion of a water feature, with design and ongoing maintenance costs and responsibilities addressed at an early stage.</del>	No change. The proposed wording would lessen the importance of Category B trees and other trees of ecological significance.  The LPA considers that the site is a non-designated heritage asset (see response to comments in heritage section).  The SPD states that a water feature should be considered. It provides helpful guidance about local aspirations.
8.23	Bloor Homes	This can be provided in the DAS and does not have to be on a Parameter Plan.	The outline planning application should be accompanied by <u>information on the proposed a green spaces parameter plan</u> that clearly identifies the areas of strategic multi-functional greenspace to demonstrate how the standards would be met.	Agree. It does not matter in what form the information is presented, provided it is clear.
<b>Flood risk, drainage and sewerage</b>				
8.25	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	Clarification required	'shows that the entire site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding from rivers)'	Agree.
8.25	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	Note that Policy SS3.11 states that part of the site is in Flood Zone 2 – this is not currently the case (and is correct in the SPD).		Noted.
8.25 (Figure 1)	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	LLFA is aware of surface water flooding in the SW corner of the site which correlates with the surface water mapping. HCC recommend this is further investigated when developing the surface water strategy.		No change. Para 8.26 already requires that 'historic records of past events should be used to verify the flood modelling'.
8.25	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	The developer may require ordinary watercourse consent.		Noted.
8.25	Mr Julian Jones	The map should also show the areas that have historically flooded adjacent to Peak Copse.		No change. The maps replicate the Environment Agency maps. It is recognised that flood events may have occurred outside these areas, hence the requirement in para 8.26 that, 'Historic records of past flood events should be used to verify the flood modelling'.
8.27	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	Investigation into any existing culverts under the A30 and M3 should be included as part of the surface water strategy to determine how (if at all) these may impact upon surface water flows.		Add to para 8.28:  <u>'Investigation into any culverts under the A30 and the M3 should be included as part of the surface water strategy to</u>

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
				<u>determine how (if at all) these may impact surface water flows'.</u>
8.27	Hampshire County Council (LLFA)	SuDS (open water storage) should be considered as part of the green infrastructure plan. The council should consider whether the open space could be used to store excess flows in extreme rainfall events.		Noted. Para 8.28 refers to the need to consider the drainage strategy as part of the wider masterplan.
8.27	Thames Water	It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewerage and to reduce the risk of sewer flooding. Additional wording suggested.	<u>It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.</u>	Agree.  Add to end of 8.27  <u>Surface water must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.</u>
8.27	Bloor Homes	To reflect the fact that on-site surveys have already confirmed the suitability of infiltration.	The site is located on permeable chalk and the landowner's initial <del>surveys</del> <u>intrusive ground investigations</u> have identified that infiltration is feasible, <u>and</u> the groundwater levels <del>is</del> <u>are</u> very low. It is therefore expected that the development will be able to make use of infiltration SuDS to attenuate surface water, which is the most-preferred option for surface water discharge in the NPPF's drainage hierarchy. Should this not be possible, this should be thoroughly justified.	Agree. Improved clarity.
8.29	Thames Water	Additional wording suggested in relation to new water and waste water infrastructure.	<u>Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.</u>  <u>The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.</u>	Agree to change (in part)  8.29 The planning application should be accompanied by a utilities assessment to demonstrate that sewerage and urban drainage infrastructure can be provided to serve the site through a new connection to the strategic sewer or through sewer upgrades to the local network. This assessment will need to consider the cumulative impact with other development consented or planned in western Basingstoke. <u>Where appropriate, planning permission for development which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades. Developers are advised to contact Thames Water as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and waste water network reinforcement requirements.</u>
8.29	Thames Water	There is only capacity within the existing foul water network to serve 50 dwellings. An appropriately worded condition will be required on the application to ensure that development does not outpace the delivery of infrastructure. The outline planning application does not indicate that the developer will be discharging surface water into the public sewer network.		Noted. The changes to para 8.30 (set out above) set out the requirement to align housing delivery with infrastructure upgrades.
8.29	Bloor Homes	To reflect current status of discussions with the statutory undertaker.	The planning application should be accompanied by a utilities assessment to demonstrate that sewerage <del>and urban drainage</del> infrastructure can be provided to serve the site through a new connection to the strategic sewer or through sewer upgrades to the local network. <u>The landowner is already in dialogue with Thames Water and</u> <del>the</del> <u>This assessment will need to consider the cumulative</u>	No change. This update is more relevant to the planning application than the SPD.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
			impact with other development consented or planned in western Basingstoke.	
Development Principle 4d	County Cllr Stephen Reid	This should be strengthened to state that a suitable drainage strategy must be agreed with the statutory undertakers. The water companies are obligated to state they will find a way to cope, but with this development being so far from Chineham, the Council needs to know what form the solution will take. If there is a possibility of a new sewage works or links to existing works to the south, this needs to be brought out at the planning stage.		Agree  8.29 The planning application should be accompanied by a utilities assessment to demonstrate that sewerage and urban drainage infrastructure can be provided to serve the site through a new connection to the strategic sewer or through sewer upgrades to the local network, <u>and provide evidence of discussions with the statutory undertakers.</u> This assessment will need to...
Development Principle 4d	Julian Jones	The sewerage network must have capacity before development commences.		Agree. See changes to para 8.30 (set out above) that align housing delivery with infrastructure capacity.
<b>Noise and air quality</b>				
8.30-	Hampshire County Council (Public Health)	Strongly recommend that development meets WHO guidelines of noise pollution exposure.  Air quality assessments should take account of the latest guidance from the National Institute of Clinical Excellence: QS181 Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health.		Noted.  The Local Plan and the SPD sets out robust requirements in relation to noise and air pollution. The National Air Quality Objectives provide an objective baseline against which to judge air quality. The NICE guidance does not add to what would already be expected by other policy/strategy.
8.33	Bloor Homes	The council has previously indicated that there could be some flexibility subject to standards being met for the majority of the site.	In accordance with the council's 'Noise assessments and reports for planning applications - Guidance note for developers and consultants' document, the following noise levels shall be achieved ( <u>where possible</u> ) with mitigation in place	No change. The SPD sets out the LPA's requirements. As part of any planning application it may be possible to take other material considerations into account that may justify deviating from those.
8.34	Bloor Homes	Acoustic fences can be effective and attractive solutions subject to their design and location.	<del>Acoustic fences are generally discouraged given their unsightly appearance and impact upon the streetscene, both along the A30 at this gateway into Basingstoke and from views within the site.</del> <u>could be considered, subject to design, location etc.</u>	No change. Acoustic fencing would be discouraged for the reasons set out in the paragraph. The proposed change is unacceptable as it shifts this emphasis.
8.37	Bloor Homes	Noise resulting from the development itself could be controlled by condition.	It will also be necessary to consider the implications of any noise stemming from the new development itself, for example, the community centre and the play/sports provision are likely to generate some noise, and the relationship between these uses and the new housing will need to be carefully considered <u>at the detailed design stage.</u>	No change. Whilst it is most likely that these types of issues will be addressed through detailed design, it will nonetheless be necessary to give consideration to this matter at the earliest stages to prevent issues occurring.
Development Principle 4e	Highways England	Supportive of mitigation measures in respect of noise and this should be fully understood at outline stage so the developable area can be identified.		Noted.
Development Principle 4e	Cllr Terri Reid	This should be strengthened so that it does more than 'take account' of the appearance of the site. It should explicitly state that the noise mitigation measures alongside the A30 should achieve a gradual change from rural to urban at the gateway to Basingstoke.		Change to supporting text  8.34 Options for mitigation include maximising the separation distance between the source of the noise and the receiver; boundary screening with acoustic fencing where topography allows; the use of buildings as 'barrier blocks' to screen amenity space; and the orientation of buildings and floorplans to avoid noise-sensitive rooms facing onto the noise source. It will be necessary to carefully consider the impact of any mitigation measures upon the character and appearance of the site <u>and achieve a gradual change from rural to urban at this gateway into Basingstoke.</u> Information should be provided to

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
				demonstrate that the design solution would be appropriate. Acoustic fences are generally discouraged given their unsightly appearance and impact upon the streetscene, both from along the A30 at this gateway into Basingstoke and from views within the site. The fencing may also have a harmful impact upon biodiversity where it is located within or adjacent to tree belts. Where acoustic fences are proposed, it should be justified that all other options have been explored and are not appropriate.
Development Principle 4e	Julian Jones	Includes minimal reference to air quality. Targets should be set.		The National Air Quality Objectives provide an objective baseline against which to judge air quality. It is not appropriate to set targets beyond the current legal framework.
<b>Heritage</b>				
8.41	Bloor Homes	We object to reference to the site being a non-designated heritage asset, as we do not agree with this conclusion as confirmed by our Heritage expert.	The site was originally parkland to the former Kempshott House, and is a non-designated heritage asset	No change. The site is included on the Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. It is therefore a non-designated heritage asset.
8.42	Bloor Homes	The site is allocated for 1,000 homes which must be considered in this context. Reference to retaining the historic parkland character must be removed.	<del>the form of the development should aim to retain the historic value and significance of the site, in particular through the retention of trees and open views in order to retain the character of the historic parkland.</del>	No change. The SPD recognises that the site is allocated for approximately 1,000 homes, but there are ways in which the character can be retained.
8.43	Bloor Homes	There is no justification for referencing specific buildings/structures, matters which are subject to consideration as part of the Heritage Assessment during the planning application process.	List of specific heritage assets set out in para 8.43 should be removed (all bullet points).	No change. It is considered helpful to signpost the designated and non-designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the development site to ensure these are covered by any Heritage Assessment.
8.43	Historic England	Brief notes the significance of the surrounding non-designated heritage assets, but could include an explicit link to NPPF paras 184 and 197.		Para 8.43 broadened to state:  The development shall demonstrate how it addresses the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan Policy EM11 (The Historic Environment), and the principles contained in the Heritage SPD (2019), in particular:  More detailed references are not considered necessary.
8.45	Historic England	Support guidance on archaeology.		Noted.
Development Principle 4f	Bloor Homes	The site has no heritage designations, has been a golf course and is allocated for 1,000 homes. This point is too vague and should be removed.	<del>All development shall be based on a sound understanding of the significance of the heritage assets affected, and the design of such development will positively respond to that significance.</del>	No change. The site is a non-designated heritage asset and para 8.42 sets out (in more specific terms) how development should respond to that.
Development Principle 4f	Historic England	Part 1 of the Development Principle should require applications to be supported by a Heritage Statement rather than a Statement of Significance. This goes further than a SofS to provide justification for the development design and sets out how it responds to the historic environment.		No change. Development would require an EIA, which would include this assessment.
Development Principle 4f	Bloor Homes	Should only seek to retain veteran and Category A trees.	The development will preserve an ability to appreciate the character of the historic parkland, in particular through the retention of <u>veteran and Category A</u> trees and open views <u>where possible</u> .	No change. Proposed wording lessens the importance of protecting all trees.
<b>Section 9: Design</b>				
<b>Creating a place</b>				

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
9.5	Bloor Homes	Remove this part as the site is visually enclosed, meaning there are only limited views into the site.	<del>The design and layout should seek to utilise attractive views into the site from outside, views from inside the site towards the woods and trees on its boundaries and opportunities to create successful vistas within the layout</del>	No change.  The new access roundabout will open up the entrance of the site and increase views into it.  The second part of the sentence requires that views within the site are considered. This is necessary to create a high quality, legible development.
9.6	Bloor Homes	Suggest that given the site constraints, such as levels, noise etc. detailed design matters such as this should not be included in the SPD. They will be dealt with through the Reserved Matters application(s).	<del>The design of the dwellings should have a strong and clearly defined character in order to create a strong sense of place. They should be of an appropriate scale, generally limited to 2 storeys. Two and a half or three storey development may be required to provide a noise barrier block in certain locations (subject to the findings of the noise assessment), and may also be considered acceptable in the area around the neighbourhood centre or to define landmark buildings. Taller buildings (of 4 storeys or more) will be permitted in exceptional circumstances.</del>	No change.  It is entirely appropriate for the SPD to set guidelines in relation to the heights of buildings.  The LPA's suggested approach is considered appropriate to the site's location on the rural edge. However, material considerations (such as those cited by the respondent) may justify deviations from this, and these would be considered on their merits as part of any planning application.
9.6	Bloor Homes	Although the majority of homes are anticipated to be 2 storeys, at this early stage it is important to have flexibility.	The design of the dwellings should have a strong and clearly defined character in order to create a strong sense of place. They should be of an appropriate scale, generally limited to 2 or 3 storeys. Two and a half or three storey development may be required to provide a noise barrier block in certain locations (subject to the findings of the noise assessment), and may also be considered acceptable in the area around the neighbourhood centre or to define landmark buildings. Taller buildings (of 4 storeys or more) will be permitted in exceptional circumstances.	No change. See above.
9.7	Bloor Homes	Flexibility is required to allow design matters to be dealt with at the design stage. It may not be possible to front all development to all site boundaries	<del>In particular, development should front out onto all site boundaries, and should be sufficiently set back from The Cedars</del>	No change.  This sets out the LPA's starting point, and represents best practice.  It is however recognised that there may be particular circumstances that justify deviating from this in some locations, and these can be assessed as part of the planning application process,
Development Principle 5a	Bloor Homes	This site is not rural and neither are the site edges.	The development will need to have a coherent, permeable and legible layout, with a character which reflects the site's location <del>on the rural edge.</del>	By definition the site is at the rural edge, as it is at the transition between the edge of Basingstoke and the countryside. This is in contrast to, for example, a site closer to the town centre which would be set within a completely urban context. The A30 at this location also creates a clear gateway into the settlement from which the transition into the settlement from open countryside is experienced.  This is not just about the visibility of the site but also how the character of any new development relates to the surrounding context, which includes open countryside.
Development Principle 5a	Bloor Homes	Increased flexibility about tree protection.	The development will make use of existing trees within the site <u>where possible</u> and use front gardens, trees, hedges and other vegetation to green the streetscene.	No change. This would weaken the document's protection of existing trees.
Development Principle 5a	Julian Jones	Consider ground source and air source heat pumps and their impact on the streetscene.		No change. Any such proposals would be assessed on their merits, including taking into account their visual appearance.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
Development Principle 5a	Natural England	It is recommended that 'Development Principle 5a: Good urban design principles' is broadened to encourage the incorporation of specific features beneficial to wildlife, such as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using native plants and trees characteristic to the local area in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds</li> <li>Incorporating bird boxes for a range of species (including swift) and bat boxes into the design of new buildings</li> <li>Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site</li> <li>Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> </ul>		Agree. Add new para after para 9.8: <p><u>'Development should incorporate specific features beneficial to wildlife, such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Using native plants and trees characteristic to the local area in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds</u></li> <li><u>Incorporating bird boxes for a range of species (including swift) and bat boxes into the design of new buildings</u></li> <li><u>Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site</u></li> <li><u>Adding a green roof to new buildings.'</u></li> </ul>
<b>Parking and refuse collection</b>				
9.10	John Mathew	Council should enforce restrictions on kerb parking. Other new developments have provided insufficient car parking making the pavements unusable for wheelchairs.		Parking should be provided in accordance with the council's adopted Parking SPD. The standards in this document are evidence based.
Development Principle 5b	Bloor Homes	Developer should only be required to provide EV charging points where requested by occupiers	Provision should be made ( <u>where requested as an optional extra by occupiers</u> ) to meet the charging requirements of electric vehicles including both on-site facilities and shared charging units where driveway parking is not being provided.	Partially agree change. <p><u>Where homes have on-plot parking, provision should be made to meet the charging requirements of electric vehicles where they have been requested by the occupier. In all other cases, suitable ducting should be provided to allow EV charging to be easily fitted retrospectively, including both on-site facilities and Shared charging units should also be provided</u> where driveway parking is not being provided.</p>
<b>Sustainable design</b>				
Design Principle 5c	Cllr Terri Reid	This should be strengthened to do more than 'consider' opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy technologies. It should require the development to include facilities for the generation of power through solar and / or wind technology either for feed back into the grid or for the powering of estate assets such as signage and lighting.		The NPPG (Ref 06-009-20150327) states that local requirements for building's sustainability should 'form part of a Local Plan... and will need to be based on robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability'. As the Local Plan does not set any specific standards for domestic buildings, or require any particular proportions of energy requirements from low or zero carbon energy sources, it would not be reasonable or appropriate to introduce this as a requirement through this SPD. This is a matter that the council will review through the Local Plan Update.
Design Principle 5c	County Cllr Stephen Reid	This should be strengthened to actively encourage renewable and low carbon energy technologies. This would accord with objective k of the Local Plan and SS3.11 policy o).		The NPPG (Ref 06-009-20150327) states that local requirements for building's sustainability should 'form part of a Local Plan... and will need to be based on robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability'. As the Local Plan does not set any specific standards for domestic buildings, or require any particular proportions of energy requirements from low or zero carbon energy sources, it would not be reasonable or appropriate to introduce this as a requirement through this SPD. This is a matter that the council will review through the Local Plan Update.
<b>Section 10: Securing quality through the planning process</b>				
Development Principle 6a	Julian Jones	A masterplan and design code should be submitted before outline planning.		The LPA can only require proportionate information (that is necessary to determine the matters for consideration) with the outline planning application.

Section	Respondent's name	Summary of comment	Respondent's suggested modification	BDBC response / agreed change
10.5 / Development Principle 6a	Bloor Homes	The masterplan and design code can form part of the first reserved matters application and should not be required in advance, in the interests of delivery.	the council will require a site-wide masterplan and design code to be submitted and approved <del>prior to the determination</del> <u>as part of the first</u> of any reserved matters applications.	Change:  A masterplan and design code shall be submitted to and approved by the council either: as part of the outline planning application; or prior to the determination of any reserved matters applications; <u>or submitted as part of the first reserved matters application</u> ;  This increases flexibility to allow the Design Code to be submitted as part of the first RMs application should the applicant wish. The design code would still need to be approved alongside or before the RMs.
<b>Section 11: Indicative Development Framework Plan</b>				
11.1	Bloor Homes	The Framework Plan must be shown as being indicative as it includes certain features that require investigation and legal review.	The <u>Indicative</u> Development Framework Plan provides a summary of the key opportunities and constraints that should influence the form of development.	Agree.
<b>Other</b>				
	Southern Water	No comments.		
	National Grid	No comments.		
	Transport for London	No comments.		