

## **Summary of representations received by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council made in relation to the Regulation 16 version of the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to Paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act**

### **Introduction**

1. This document provides a summary of the issues and representations submitted in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan (OB&L NP).
2. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a six week period of public consultation from Monday 30 October to Monday 11 December 2017 on the submission version of the OB&L NP. The consultation documents included the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Plan, a Consultation Statement and a Basic Conditions Statement (which included an Equalities Impact Assessment) and other evidence base documents.
3. The representations submitted during the consultation period have been published on the borough council's website, and can be found by clicking on the following link - <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, RG21 4AH.
4. A total of 24 representations were received from 9 individuals, organisations and statutory consultees (excluding BDBC's comments on the OB&L NP). These can be summarised as:
  - Support: 9 representations made
  - Oppose: 9 representations made
  - Other (General comment/ no specific comment): 6 representations made
5. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised by consultees during the consultation. Appendix 1 of this document provides a summary of the representations made by specific consultees. The borough council's comments (which includes a summary within the covering letter) provided during the consultation can be viewed in full in Appendix 1.

## Summary of issues raised by consultees

### General:

6. Some general comments were made on the plan and include the following:
  - Support was given for contributions towards sustainable modes of travel, landscape and ecological awareness, good design and local distinctiveness.
  - Concerns were raised regarding policies in the Neighbourhood Plan not being consistent with Local Plan policies or guidance in an adopted Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document.
  - The plan could be clearer in setting out in detail the issues affecting the Parish that the Neighbourhood Plan intends to address.
  - Some general concerns were raised regarding sewerage / wastewater infrastructure.
  - Support was given to Objective 7 and 8.
  - A concern was raised that there is no mention of heritage in the heading for Objective 7.

### Policy OB&L 1: Movement Routes

7. A concern was raised that the policy contains detail and requirements that could create viability issues that render a scheme unachievable.

### Policy OB&L 1 and OL&B 2: Developer Contribution

8. Concerns were raised in relation to the policies, in particular:
  - The policies are very specific without the benefit of Transport Assessments to support proposals.
  - The policies could include desire lines and destinations across the NDP area.

### Policy OB&L 3: Settlement Policy Boundary

9. Concerns were raised in relation to the policy including:
  - The use of settlement policy boundaries precludes the delivery of sustainable development opportunities.
  - The Neighbourhood Plan may not support the minimum housing requirements of the Local Plan.
  - There is no need to repeat policies contained in the Local Plan.
  - The approach will adversely affect future sustainable development delivery on land beyond Old Basing.

### Policy OB&L 4: Protection of Iconic Views

10. Concerns were raised in relation to the policy including:
  - The policy should be based on appropriate evidence.

## Policy OB&L 6: Protection of Historic Environment

11. Concerns were raised with suggestions for improvement, in particular:

- It would be helpful to include a map showing the listed buildings, scheduled monuments, Registered Historic Park and Garden, and the conservation area boundary.
- Greater reference to non-designated heritage assets would be welcomed.

## Policy OB&L 7: Appearance of Development

12. A concern was raised that the requirement to be in 'accordance' with the principles of the Village Design Statement may have an adverse effect on viability. Proposals should instead have 'regard' to the principles.

13. Support was given in relation to reference of the Village Design Statement

## Policy OB&L 8: Housing Mix

14. A concern was raised that the policy is not consistent with Local Plan policies.

**Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan (NP) (excluding comments from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council)**

Please note that the representations below are a summary of the representations made. The full representations made by respondents can be viewed here <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
Amec Foster Wheeler (On behalf of National Grid)	General				National Grid has no record of high voltage electricity or Intermediate or High Pressure gas transmission apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	
Environment Agency (Judith Johnson)					No specific comment	
Gladman Developments Ltd (Megan Pashley)	OB&L 1 (page 20)			Oppose	Whilst Gladman commend the intention to ensure that all developments are connected to existing cycle and pedestrian routes, we remind the Council that Policies should not contain such detail and requirements that would add financial burden to any proposal, potentially creating viability issues that render a scheme unachievable.	
Gladman Developments Ltd (Megan Pashley)	OB&L 3 (page 26)			Oppose	<p>Opposed to the use of settlement policy boundaries as they act to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities.</p> <p>Notes that the Adopted Local Plan recognises a clear need for additional housing development beyond defined settlement boundaries, and questions whether development will be supported by the Neighbourhood Plan to enable minimum housing requirements to be met.</p> <p>Suggests there is no need to repeat policies contained in the Adopted Local Plan as these will be considered regardless of their inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Concerned that that approach will affect land beyond Old Basing and have an adverse effect on future sustainable development delivery.</p>	

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
Gladman Developments Ltd (Megan Pashley)	OB&L 4 (Page 29)			Oppose	<p>Opinions on landscape are highly subjective, therefore, without further evidence to demonstrate why these views are considered special will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The response notes that the PPG states that “Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan”.</p> <p>Accordingly, respondent considers that this matter should be investigated and based on appropriate evidence prior to the Plan being submitted for Examination.</p> <p>Considers that to be valued, a view requires a form of physical attribute and that the policy must allow the decision maker to decide whether a location contains physical attributes that would ‘take it out of the ordinary’ rather than based solely on community support. Suggests that a pleasant sense of openness to open countryside cannot solely amount to a landscape that should be protected.</p>	
Gladman Developments Ltd (Megan Pashley)	OB&L 7 (Page 37)			Oppose	<p>Concerned that the requirement to be in ‘accordance’ with the principles of the village design statement may have an adverse effect on viability.</p> <p>Suggests that proposals should instead have ‘regard’ to the principles of the village design statement.</p>	
Hampshire County Council (Tim Crouch)	General			Support	<p>Supports the principle of a Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>Supports contributions towards sustainable modes of travel, landscape and ecological awareness, good design and local distinctiveness.</p>	

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
					States that clarity regarding application policies to allocated housing sites are welcomed but are not consistent with the Local Plan or Development Brief.	
Hampshire County Council (Tim Crouch)	OB&L 1 (Page 20)			Oppose	Concerned that the policy is very specific without the benefit of Transport Assessments to support to proposals.  Suggests that the policy could include desire lines and destinations across the NDP area which would be a valuable guide to masterplanning and would contribute to the local movement network.	Include indicative desire line and destinations across NPD area.
Hampshire County Council (Tim Crouch)	OB&L 2 (Page 20)			Oppose	Concerned that the policy is very specific without the benefit of Transport Assessments to support to proposals.  Suggests that the policy could include desire lines and destinations across the NDP area which would be a valuable guide to masterplanning and would contribute to the local movement network.	Include indicative desire line and destinations across NPD area.
Hampshire County Council (Tim Crouch)	OB&L 8 (Page 38)			Oppose	OB&L 8 is not consistent with Local Plan policies	
Highways England (Glen Strongitharm)	General				No specific comment.  A general principle, Highways England are concerned with any proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operations of the SRN (A34 and M3).	
Historic England (Martin Small)		2.1 to 2.2 (Page 8-14)		Support	Welcomes the description of historical development of the parish.  Questions if the conservation area designation area has been reviewed since 1973, if more could be said about its reason for designation and if it has a character appraisal and/or management plan.	
Historic England (Martin Small)		3.1 (Page 18)		General comment	Notes that there is no reference to the historic environment and no heritage assets in the parish identified as being at risk on the at Risk Register.	

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
					Questions if the condition of heritage assets in the parish is an issue, if there has been a survey of Grade II building condition in the Plan area and if there has been or is any ongoing loss of character.	
Historic England (Martin Small)			Objective 7	Support	Supports and welcomes the aim “to respect and conserve the distinctive character of the landscape, natural environment and historic assets of the parish”, and Objective 7.  Comments that there is no mention of heritage in the heading for this aim.	
Historic England (Martin Small)			Objective 8	Support	Supports and welcomes Objective 8.	
Historic England (Martin Small)	OB&L 6			Support	Supports and welcomes policy.  Notes that Historic England records show 90 listed buildings, two scheduled monuments and one Registered Historic Park and Garden in the Parish and that it would be helpful to show the distribution of these and the conservation area boundary on a map.  Would welcome greater reference to non-designated heritage assets as stated in the NPPG. Non-designated assets such as locally important buildings contribute to creating a sense of place and identity.	Include a map showing the listed buildings, scheduled monuments, Registered Historic Park and Garden, and the conservation area boundary.
Historic England (Martin Small)		Section 5.3 (Page 35-36)		Support	Supports and welcomes the supporting text in sub-section 5.3	
Historic England (Martin Small)	OB&L 7			Support	Supports and welcomes policy.  Welcomes reference to the Village Design Statement.	
Historic England (Martin Small)		Section 6.1 (Page 37 to 38)		Support	Supports and welcomes the supporting text in sub-section 6.1	

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
Historic England (Martin Small)			General	Support	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan could be clearer in setting out in detail the issues affecting the parish that the Neighbourhood Plan intends to address.</p> <p>Notes that neighbourhood plans would usually include a section on issues identified through community consultation and / or higher level plans to inform and justify the NDP policies.</p> <p>Considers, in summary, that the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the basic conditions.</p>	
Natural England (Rebecca Aziz)					No specific comment	
Savills (On behalf of Thames Water)		5.11 (Page 27)		Oppose	<p>Suggests that a key sustainability objective for the preparation of development plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Considers that to accord with NPPF/NPPG additional text should be added to the plan.</p>	<p>Add the below text to the plan, titled: "Water Supply, Wastewater &amp; Sewerage Infrastructure";</p> <p>"Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and/or waste water infrastructure</p> <p>Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows.</p> <p>Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered.</p>

	Policy	Paragraph	Other	Support/Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
						Further information for Developers on sewerage infrastructure can be found on Thames Water's website at: <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/</a>
Savills (On behalf of Thames Water)	General			Oppose	Concerned about the ability of the existing sewerage network to accommodate residential development of this scale. Also concerned about capacity at the Sewage Treatment Works if all proposed growth comes forward.	
Southern Water (Charlotte Mayall)	General				No specific comment  Notes that Southern Water does not supply water or wastewater services to Old Basing and Lychpit Parish.	

Please note that the full representation (including covering letter, which includes a summary of the comments, and appendix) from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (as Local Planning Authority) on the Submission version (Regulation 16) of the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan can be viewed below.



**Basingstoke  
and Deane**

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Civic Offices, London Road,  
Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 4AH  
[www.basingstoke.gov.uk](http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk) | 01256 844844  
[customer.service@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@basingstoke.gov.uk)  
Follow us on [@BasingstokeGov](https://twitter.com/BasingstokeGov)

Mrs Sandra Tuck  
Parish Clerk  
Old Basing and Lychpit Parish Council  
The Pavilion  
Recreation Ground  
The Street  
Old Basing  
Hampshire  
RG24 7DA

Your ref:           Submission Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan

11 December 2017

Dear Sandra

**Local Planning Authority response to Submission Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan Consultation**

I am writing in connection with the submission version of the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan (OB&L NP), which is out to public consultation until 11 December 2017. Please see below the comments from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on the OB&L NP.

The LPA fully supports the initiative for the Old Basing and Lychpit Neighbourhood Plan Team (NPT) to produce a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Old Basing and Lychpit parish. The LPA recognises that a significant amount of work has gone into the development of the plan with extensive community involvement and the LPA commends the NPT for all the hard work to reach such an advanced stage in the neighbourhood plan making process. The LPA would like to highlight that the Submission NP is well structured and presented.

Following submission of the NP in September 2017 the LPA undertook a Compliance Check of the NP. The LPA confirmed, via letter to the parish council on 23 October 2017, that it is satisfied that the neighbourhood plan and process followed complies with the statutory requirements as set out in paragraph 6 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The LPA's comments on the Submission NP have been provided to assist the examination of the NP and have been considered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Infrastructure. The response is based on the documents and evidence submitted to the LPA, which includes the Submission NP, Basic Conditions Statement and Consultation Statement.

Many of the LPA's comments on the Pre Submission NP have been overcome as a result of amendments incorporated in the Submission NP and supporting documents. These amendments are welcomed. However, the LPA considers that some of its comments remain either partially or not met.

The LPA's key remaining areas of concern are:

- the need to ensure the NP is in general conformity with the adopted Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) (ALP) and does not undermine the strategic policies in the ALP including site allocation policies SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane) and SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke);
- the need for the policies to provide sufficient clarity to allow a decision maker to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications in the parish;
- the need for the policies to provide sufficient flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development;
- the need to clearly set out the justification and evidence to support policies.

The LPA would like to particularly highlight the usefulness of Appendix H of the Consultation Statement and the documents that summarise in full all the comments received to the Pre Submission OB&L NP. These documents include a NPT response and/or indicate a suggested amendment to be incorporated into the Submission NP.

The LPA would welcome the opportunity to discuss these comments further and to assist, if required, prior to or during the examination of the NP. The LPA will also be in touch shortly with regards to the examination.

If you require further information please contact me by phone on 01256 845573 or by emailing [edward.rehill@basingstoke.gov.uk](mailto:edward.rehill@basingstoke.gov.uk).

Yours sincerely

Edward Rehill  
Principal Planning Officer

## Local Planning Authority comments on Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan that have been partially overcome or not overcome in the Submission Neighbourhood Plan

This section includes the LPA's comments on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan that have only been partially overcome or not overcome in the Submission Neighbourhood Plan. An additional column has been added to clarify the position.

Where the Local Planning Authority comments on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan have been overcome (i.e through amendments) these have not been included.

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Introduction, p3	<p>The first and third paragraph refers to the plan period for the OB&amp;L NP being 2016 to 2029, however the front cover of the draft OB&amp;L NP states 2015 to 2029.</p> <p>The plan period for the adopted Local Plan is 2011-2029. The OB&amp;L NP could cover the same period as the adopted Local Plan</p>	The front cover or the introduction should be amended accordingly to ensure internal consistency.	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The first paragraph of the introduction still refers to 2011-2029.</p>
Section 2.2.4, p9.	The last paragraph of the section refers to the issue of an increasing population adding more pressure on recreational and leisure facilities. It is noted that the OB&L NP makes no reference to new recreational facilities that will be delivered on the Local Plan allocated housing site of East of Basingstoke. Further information on this can be found within the draft East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD.	Consider adding reference to new recreational facilities that will be delivered on the Local Plan allocated housing site of East of Basingstoke. The LPA can advise further on this.	<p>Partially met</p> <p>The following wording has been added to the paragraph:</p> <p>“...It is hoped that the promise of a Community Facility at the strategic site SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke) will help ease this pressure.”</p> <p>It is suggested that the wording is amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“...Policy SS3.9 c) requires the East of Basingstoke site to provide a community centre.”</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Section 2.2.5, p11	It is welcomed that reference to the Local Plan Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap is included in the OB&L NP, however the plan would benefit from further explanation/ context about the strategic gap. This could include reference to policy EM2 (Strategic Gaps) of the Local Plan and the Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap, as defined on the Local Plan Policies Map, could also be shown on a suitable map in the OB&L NP.	Consider adding further explanation/ context about Local Plan policy EM2 and also the Basingstoke-Old Basing strategic gap.  Consider including a suitable map – the LPA will be able to assist with this on request.	The inclusion of Map 2a is welcomed.  Due to the flow of the document it is considered that the current Map 3 (Loddon and Lyde Valley) should be retitled Map 2a. The current Map 2a (Strategic Gap) should be retitled Map 3.  The Strategic Gap map should also be referred to in the supporting text on page 12.
Map 3, p11	This inclusion of this map is supported. The map could benefit from labelling the adopted Local Plan allocated housing sites e.g SS3.1 and SS3.9	Label the adopted Local Plan allocated housing sites – the LPA will be able to assist with this on request.	The addition of the labels is welcomed. It is recommended that the settlement policy boundary for Basingstoke is also shown on the map. This is because part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is within Old Basing and Lychpit parish.
Section 2.3, p12	Paragraph 2 refers to the Loddon and Lyde character area. This is a character area defined in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Landscape Assessment (2001). It is recommended that some background is included on the Landscape Assessment document and also make clear that it is a borough council document.	Recommend including background on the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Landscape Assessment (2001) and Basingstoke and Deane	Partially met.  The second paragraph under the 'Topography' section refers to the Loddon and Lyde Character Area but no reference, as

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>Paragraph 3 refers to the “Landscape Capacity Study (2010)”. It is recommended that some background is included on this study and also make clear that it is a borough council document.</p>	<p>Borough Council Landscape Capacity Study (2010).</p> <p>Make clear these are borough council documents.</p>	<p>suggested, has been added to explain that this is a landscape character area in BDBC’s Landscape Character Assessment 2001.</p> <p>The amendment made to the penultimate paragraph in section 2.2 is welcomed but it now states “The BDBC Capacity Study 2010...” This should be amended to “The BDBC <u>Landscape</u> Capacity Study 2010...”</p>
<p>Section 2.5, p13</p>	<p>With reference to the first bullet point, please note that the Swing Swang Lane allocated housing site is within the Settlement Policy Boundary. The bullet point should be amended for accuracy.</p> <p>It is recommended that the second paragraph is amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“There are 2 strategic <u>housing</u> sites <u>allocated</u> within the Local Plan which directly impact on Old Basing and Lychpit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SS3.1 Swing Swang Lane will deliver approx. 100 houses. It is within the NP parish area. <del>but outside the development boundary.</del></li> <li>• SS3.9 East of Basingstoke has been <del>identified</del> <u>allocated</u> for <u>approx. 450</u> houses. Approximately 65% of this site falls within the OB&amp;L NP area. <u>It is likely to accommodate about 250 homes within the parish.</u>”</li> </ul>	<p>Consider amending the section as suggested to add clarity.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The first bullet point has not been updated as suggested. It is recommended that the bullet point is recommended as suggested as it is factually incorrect to state that the Swing Swang Lane site is ‘outside the development boundary’. The site is within the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary. This part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is within the Old Basing and Lychpit parish.</p> <p>The amendments to the second bullet point are welcomed. It would be helpful to explain that the East of Basingstoke site is</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			within the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary.
Section 2.5, p13-14	<p>It is not clear how the paragraphs that refer to the SHLAA sites and the SOLVE campaign are relevant to the OB&amp;L NP. Consider deleting these paragraphs or rewording the paragraphs to ensure clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>The LPA will be able to assist with rewording.</p>	Consider amending the section to add clarity and also to ensure accuracy.	<p>It is noted that this section has been reworded by the Neighbourhood Plan Team to demonstrate local feeling towards the landscape character. However, it is still not clear how the paragraphs that refer to the SHLAA sites and the SOLVE campaign are relevant to the OB&amp;L NP. The paragraphs also do not seem to fit under the section title 'Local infrastructure'.</p> <p>It is recommended that these paragraphs are deleted or at the very least reworded to ensure further clarity and accuracy.</p>
Section 2.6, p14.	<p>It is also recommended that this section refers to the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD and explain the relationship between the OB&amp;L NP and the Development Brief. The LPA has prepared a draft Development Brief to guide future development on the Local Plan strategic housing allocations at East of Basingstoke and at Redlands. The Development Brief will have the status of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications across the East of Basingstoke and the Redlands allocations.</p> <p>The East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD sets out principles that will guide future development across both</p>	<p>This section would benefit from being comprehensively reworded for clarity. The LPA will be able to assist with this rewording.</p> <p>The OB&amp;L NP must make clear how its policies relate to the Local Plan allocated housing sites at East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane. This section should include reference to the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The amendments to section 2.6 to overcome some of the LPA's comments are welcome. However, it is considered that further amendments could be made.</p> <p>It is considered that the second bullet point of this section (now section 2.5 in the Submission OB&amp;L NP) repeats word for word the second paragraph of section</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>site allocations. It adds further detail to the policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Public consultation on the draft East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD took place from 20 January to 3 March 2017. It is currently anticipated that the Development Brief SPD will be adopted in July 2017.</p> <p>The second bullet point states "...and it is many of these matters that the neighbourhood plan policies are seeking to address through the development." It is not understood what is meant by reference to "through the development". It is highly recommended that this is clarified.</p> <p>The last bullet point is welcomed but for clarity it is considered it should be amended as follows:</p> <p>"...however it is <del>considered</del> <u>the view of BDBC</u> that recent amendments..."</p>	<p>It is recommended that this paragraph highlights that that the OB&amp;L NP is required to be in general conformity with the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Consider including information on the Community Infrastructure Levy. The LPA will be able to assist with suitable wording.</p>	<p>2.4 (of the Submission OB&amp;L NP). Consideration should be given as to whether it is needed in both sections.</p> <p>For information, the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD was adopted in July 2017.</p>
Section 2.6, p15.	<p>The second bullet point on page 15 refers to the "at least 10 dwelling" requirement for Old Basing settlement as set out in policy SS5 of the Local Plan. It is considered this bullet point could be further explained.</p> <p>In October 2016 and April 2017 the LPA wrote to the parish council regarding the outstanding requirements for Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029). The letter confirmed that as of 1 April 2016, 24 dwellings have been granted planning permission within and adjacent to the defined Old Basing SPB in the period 2011-2016 that satisfy the "at least 10 dwelling" policy SS5 requirement.</p>	Consider amending the bullet point as suggested.	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The amendments made to the section are welcomed. However, it is considered for accuracy and clarity that the second and third bullet points in section 2.6 (page 17 of the Submission OB&amp;L NP) should be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "In October 2016 <u>and April 2017</u>, the LPA wrote to the Parish council regarding the outstanding requirements for</li> </ul>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>The letter concluded that the “at least 10” dwelling requirement of policy SS5 had been achieved, subject to land supply considerations and current planning commitments being built out. The letter also stated that progress will continue to be monitored over the coming years. It is considered that this should be reflected in the bullet point.</p>		<p>policy SS5 of the BDBC Local Plan. The letter confirmed that as of the 1st April 2016, 24 dwellings have been granted planning permission at Peacock House, London Road, which is within and adjacent to the defined Old Basing SPB in the period 2011 – 2016 and that this satisfies the “at least 10 dwellings” policy SS5 requirement <u>subject to land supply considerations and current planning commitments being built out. Progress will continue to be monitored.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BDBC were clear that these dwellings met the requirement which says they must “Have 10 or more (net) dwellings on a site and be within the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) of the settlements named in the policy”. BDBC clarified <del>this with</del> “This site is within Marpledurwell Parish, however, it is within the Old Basing SPB and hence counts as completions for the purposes of policy SS5.”</li> </ul>
Section 4.1, p16 (below para 4.1.4)	The last paragraph of this section provides welcomed clarification that the OB&L NP is “referring to the entire parish, including both SS3.1 and SS3.9”, however it is important to ensure the OB&L NP	Ensure the OB&L NP does not undermine strategic policies in the Local Plan.	Partially met.

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>does not undermine the strategic policies in the Local Plan. The LPA is concerned that some of the policies if applied to the East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane Local Plan allocated housing sites could undermine strategic policies in the Local Plan such as policy SS3.1, SS3.9, CN1 (Affordable housing) and CN3 (Housing mix for market housing).</p>		<p>The amendments to the section are welcomed.</p> <p>The LPA is still concerned that policies (such as policy 8: Housing mix) in the OB&amp;L NP could undermine the strategic policies in the ALP such as policies SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane) and SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke).</p> <p>The council raised similar concerns to the Submission Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan in regards to the Local Plan allocated housing site at Manydown. The Examiner in his report recommended that Policy 1 (New housing development volume) of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan be amended to state:</p> <p>“For clarity, the housing policies of the Neighbourhood Plan do not apply to the Manydown strategic allocation...”</p> <p>This recommended wording is within the made Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended that similar</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			wording, in relation to Local Plan allocated housing sites at Swing Swang Lane and East of Basingstoke is included in the OB&L NP.
Objective 8 p18.	<p>It is considered that objective 8 should not state that all new development is built “in accordance with the Village Design Statement” (VDS). A VDS is a material consideration when determining planning applications but is not part of the development plan. The weight to be accorded to the VDS in the Neighbourhood Plan, whether in an objective or a policy, should therefore be reduced to reflect its status within planning law. It is recommended that the objectives should be amended as follows:</p> <p><u>“To ensure that all new development is built in accordance <del>is built in accordance</del> should have regard to with the Village Design Statement (2006)...</u></p> <p>With regards to objective 8 consideration should be given to the wording “designed sympathetically to existing surroundings”. In some cases, the existing surroundings may exhibit a poor quality of design. It is recommended that more emphasis is placed upon new development needing to positively contribute to local character and distinctiveness as required by Policy EM10 ‘Delivering High Quality Development’ of the Local Plan and by the NPPF.</p>	<p>Consider amending the objective as recommended.</p> <p>Delete the VDS as an appendix to the OB&amp;L NP. Refer to the VDS in the OB&amp;L NP.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>It is recommended that Objective 8 is amended to read “To ensure that all new developments have regard to the Village Design Statement (2006), and contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness”.</p>
Policy 2: Movement routes, p19	<p>It considered that the aim to extend the footpath and cycle network would be better funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy rather than directly from the SS3.1 and SS3.9 strategic sites because the project may not meet the 3 tests for planning obligations (necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind). It is recommended that this is explained in the supporting text to the policy.</p>	<p>Consider amending the policy and its supporting text as suggested.</p>	<p>Not met.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Paragraph 4.2, p20 of the Submission NP	<p>It is noted that a new paragraph 4.2 has been added to the Submission OB&amp;L NP which states:</p> <p>“It is also accepted that any new route out of the East of Basingstoke development (SS3.9) will create “pinch points” on the adjoining roads (Pyotts Hill and A33).”</p> <p>It should be made clear as to who ‘accepts’ this statement. Also, it is not clear what is meant by ‘pinch points’ on adjoining roads.</p>	Amend the paragraph to add clarity.	<p>New paragraph in the Submission OB&amp;L NP.</p> <p>Paragraph should be amended for clarity.</p> <p>It should be made clear as to who ‘accepts’ this statement. Also, it is not clear what is meant by ‘pinch points’ on adjoining roads.</p>
Paragraph 4.4, p20.	<p>It would be helpful for this paragraph to refer to specific evidence as otherwise it would appear to be a statement/ opinion. It should also be recognised that improvements will be made to the local highway network as a result of the SS3.1 and SS3.9 Local Plan allocated housing sites.</p> <p>It is recommended that the paragraph makes reference to section 5 (Transport and access) of the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document. Section 5 includes information on the transport and access requirements for the sites.</p>	Recommend that the paragraph makes reference to evidence and the Local Plan policies and SPD guidance as suggested.	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The addition of a new sentence to the paragraph (now paragraph 4.6) is welcome.</p> <p>However, with regards to the first sentence, it would be helpful for this paragraph to refer to specific evidence as otherwise it would appear to be a statement/ opinion.</p>
Paragraph 4.5, p20.	The second sentence provides information of emissions from new and old cars. It is recommended that this sentence provides information to explain what these emissions actually mean and relate to specific evidence.	Recommend sentence provides information to explain what these emissions actually mean and relate to specific evidence.	<p>Not met.</p> <p>The sentence has not been amended.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Paragraph 4.7, p20	<p>This paragraph states “The Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 is supported by the Basingstoke and Deane Local policy SS3.11...”, it is recommended the paragraph is amended as follows:</p> <p><del>“The Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 is supported by the Basingstoke and Deane Local policy SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane – site SS3.7– 100 houses) which states...”</del></p> <p>This paragraph refers to site SS3.7. Local Plan allocated housing site SS3.7 is Redlands and this site is not within the parish of Old Basing and Lychpit. Consider deleting reference to site SS3.7. This paragraph should also refer to site SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke).</p>	Consider amending the paragraph as recommended.	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The amendments made to the paragraph (now paragraph 4.9) are welcome. It would be helpful to reference which policy SS3.1 criteria have been extracted (i.e criteria d), e) and g).</p> <p>It is noted that a new paragraph 4.10 has been added which provides an extract from Local Plan policy SS3.9. It is recommended the paragraph is amended as follows for clarity:</p> <p><del>“The Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 is also supported by the BDBC Local Plan policy SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke) <u>criterion i</u> which states...”</del></p>
Paragraph 4.9.1, p21.	<p>Paragraph 4.9.1 should be further explained for clarity. The paragraph should explain that it was a questionnaire undertaken by HCC as landowner of the Swing Swang Lane Local Plan allocated housing site.</p> <p>This paragraph could make reference to the following specific criteria in policy SS3.1 of the Local Plan to make clear the requirements of Local Plan policy:</p> <p>d) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to Basing Road and Swing Swang Lane;</p>	<p>Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.</p> <p>Consider referencing specific criteria in Local Plan policy SS3.1 as suggested.</p>	<p>Not met.</p> <p>The sentence has not been amended.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>e) Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes particularly to Old Basing and ensure the ability to service the site by public transport, including the connection of the site with existing cycle and pedestrian routes, including the Public Rights of Way Network and the Strategic Cycle Network with direct cycle access to Eastrop Park, Basing View and the Town Centre;</p>		
<p>Paragraph 4.10, p21</p>	<p>This paragraph states that “As Crown Lane and Hatch Lane are likely to form part of the Strategic Cycle Route to Basingstoke...” By reference to strategic cycle route, is this meant to be the Proposed Strategic Cycle Network route (from Old Basing to towards Upton Grey) identified in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council’s adopted Cycling Strategy (2016)? This should be clarified and amended as appropriate.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the borough council’s adopted Cycling Strategy (– this can be viewed here <a href="http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/cyclestrategy">http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/cyclestrategy</a>)</p> <p>This paragraph also states “...these new developments...”, it is not clear what new development are being referred to. It is recommended that this should be clarified.</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph as suggested for clarity.</p> <p>Recommend adding a reference to the borough council’s adopted Cycling Strategy</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The amendments to the paragraph are welcome. However it is noted that the paragraph (now 4.13) states “...it will be important that any proposed development provides safe footpath...”. In light of the amendments to policy 1 which now states “Save for householder development and other minor development...” it is suggested that the wording in paragraph 4.13 is amended as follows:</p> <p>“...it will be important that any proposed development (<u>apart from householder and other minor development</u>) provides safe footpath...”</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.11, p21.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“...will be sought through <del>Section 106</del> <u>S106 agreements</u> or CIL agreements...”</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph as suggested for clarity.</p> <p>Consider including further explanation on “match-finding”.</p>	<p>Amendments to the paragraph are welcomed.</p> <p>It is appreciated that “lever in match funding” is a community</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>The paragraph refers to “match-funding” and it is recommended that this is further explained in the paragraph. It is recommended that the paragraph explains where the parish consider match funding will come from.</p>		<p>aspiration. It is recommended that the paragraph (now para 4.14 is amended as follows:</p> <p>“...and lever in match funding from other sources <u>where possible.</u>”</p> <p>It should be noted that these measures suggested in the paragraph are not on the CIL Regulation 123 list, so it is unlikely that CIL can fund these at the present time. However, the Neighbourhood Fund could (which is associated with CIL once introduced)</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.15, p22</p>	<p>This paragraph refers to the “Hampshire Highways Transport Plan” but footnote 24 refers to the “Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031”. Paragraph 4.15 should be updated to refer to the Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 to ensure internal consistency.</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph as suggested to ensure internal consistency.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The paragraph (now 4.18) refers to the “Hampshire Highways Transport Plan 2011-2031...”. It is recommended this wording is amended as follows:</p> <p>“Hampshire Highways Transport Plan 2011-2031...”</p>
<p>Objective 4 box, p23</p>	<p>Objective 4 is defined on this page and at the end of the objective it states “...(as defined in the B&amp;D landscape assessment.”. It is recommended that this is amended to the following for accuracy:</p> <p>“...(as defined in the <u>B&amp;D Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</u> landscape assessment <u>(2001).</u>”</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.</p>	<p>The amendment to Objective 4 (now on page 26) is welcomed.</p> <p>It is noted the wording for objective 4 in the “Aims and Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan” section on page 19 does not include the wording “as</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			defined in the Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council landscape assessment 2001". It is recommended that objective 4 on page 19 is amended to reflect the wording on page 26 to ensure internal consistency.
Policy 3: Built-up area boundary. P23.	<p>The title of this policy is "Built-up area boundary" but the last main bullet point of the policy covers planning matters outside of the built-up area boundary. Consider if the title of the policy should be amended.</p> <p>Although it is understood what it meant by "built-up area boundary", the adopted Local Plan calls this the Settlement Policy Boundary. The "built-up area boundary" should be referred to as the "Settlement Policy Boundary" to ensure conformity with the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is also not clear whether this policy relates to just new housing development or all forms of development. It is recommended the policy and supporting text to the policy is clarified accordingly.</p> <p>Careful consideration should be given as to whether this policy adds to policy SS1 (Scale and distribution of housing), SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) and SS6 (New housing in the countryside) of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy H1 (new housing development) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan includes the following wording:</p> <p>"New housing development outside the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if it is in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside..."</p>	<p>Consider amending the policy title.</p> <p>Amend the policy to ensure consistency with the Local Plan, to avoid conflict with the Local Plan and to add clarity.</p> <p>Consider amending the supporting text to ensure clarity.</p>	<p>It is noted that some minor amendments have been made to the policy including re-naming the policy.</p> <p>However the LPA's main concerns outlined in its comments to the Pre Submission OB&amp;L NP still remain in that:</p> <p>It is not clear whether this policy relates to just new housing development or all forms of development. It is recommended the policy and supporting text to the policy is clarified accordingly.</p> <p>Careful consideration should be given as to whether this policy adds to policy SS1 (Scale and distribution of housing), SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) and SS6 (New housing in the countryside) of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Similar wording to that in the policy H1 (new housing</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>Similar wording to that in the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan could be used to replace the final main bullet point of policy 3 of the OB&amp;L NP to ensure clarity.</p> <p>The final main bullet point of the policy lists exceptions. Local Plan sites SS3.1 and SS3.9 are within a settlement policy boundary as defined on the adopted Local Plan Policies therefore they are not exceptions. Also there are other Local Plan policies that in principle allow some development in the countryside such as CN2 (Rural exceptions for affordable housing), EP4 (Rural economy) and EP5 (Rural tourism).</p> <p>In this regard, the LPA considers that as currently worded policy 3 of the OB&amp;L NP is potentially in conflict with the Local Plan. The policy is recommended to be amended as follows:</p> <p><del>“Subject to the other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan and the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Policy SS6, development outside the Built-up Area Boundary shall not normally be permitted. The only exceptions to this are:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Site SS3.9 East of Basingstoke 450 dwellings</del></li> <li><del>• Site SS3.1 Swing Swang Lane 100 dwellings</del></li> <li><del>• any necessary utilities infrastructure proposed by service providers where no reasonable alternative location is available.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>Development outside of the defined O&amp;L Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if its in accordance with relevant other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan.”</u></p> <p>If the bullet points that refer to SS3.1 and SS3.9 remain, it is recommended they are amended as follows to ensure consistency with wording in policies SS3, SS3.1 and SS3.9 of the Local Plan:</p>		<p>development) of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan could be used to replace the final main bullet point of policy 3 of the OB&amp;L NP to ensure clarity.</p> <p>The final main bullet point of the policy lists exceptions. Local Plan sites SS3.1 and SS3.9 are within a settlement policy boundary as defined on the adopted Local Plan Policies therefore they are not exceptions. Also there are other Local Plan policies that in principle allow some development in the countryside such as CN2 (Rural exceptions for affordable housing), EP4 (Rural economy) and EP5 (Rural tourism).</p> <p>As the policy currently reads it implies that all of the 450 dwellings on the East of Basingstoke site are in Old Basing and Lychpit parish. The East of Basingstoke is within the Old Basing and Lychpit Parish and also Sherfield on Loddon Parish.</p> <p>In addition, both the Swing Swang Lane and East of Basingstoke sites are outside of</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site SS3.9 East of Basingstoke <u>approx.</u> 450 dwellings</li> <li>• Site SS3.1 Swing Swang Lane <u>approx.</u> 100 dwellings</li> </ul> <p>If the bullet point that refers to “necessary utilities infrastructure” remains in the policy, consideration should be given to the fact that utilities infrastructure is generally covered under permitted development. However, where it is not, the policy as currently worded is supportive of <u>any</u> such development outside of settlement boundaries where there is no reasonable alternative location. Very careful consideration should be given to any unintended consequences of the current policy wording. The supporting text could also explain what is meant by ‘utilities infrastructure’ and also a ‘reasonable alternative location’?</p>		<p>the Old Basing Settlement Policy Boundary however they are within the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary.</p> <p>The policy needs to reflect that part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is within the parish. At the current time it only refers to the Old Basing Settlement Policy Boundary.</p> <p>In light of the comments above, the LPA considers that as currently worded policy 3 of the OB&amp;L NP is potentially in conflict with the Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy is recommended to be amended as follows:</p> <p><del>“Subject to the other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan and the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Policy SS6, development outside the Built-up Area Boundary shall not normally be permitted. The only exceptions to this are:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Site SS3.9 East of Basingstoke 450 dwellings</del></li> </ul>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Site SS3.1 Swing Swang Lane 100 dwellings</del></li> <li><del>• any necessary utilities infrastructure proposed by service providers where no reasonable alternative location is available.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>Development outside of the defined Old Basing Settlement Policy Boundary and Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if its in accordance with relevant other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan.”</u></p> <p>If the bullet point that refers to “necessary utilities infrastructure” remains in the policy, consideration should be given to the fact that utilities infrastructure is generally covered under permitted development. However, where it is not, the policy as currently worded is supportive of <u>any</u> such development outside of settlement policy boundaries where there is no reasonable alternative location. Very careful consideration should be given to any unintended consequences of</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			the current policy wording. The supporting text could also explain what is meant by 'utilities infrastructure' and also a 'reasonable alternative location'?
Paragraph 5.2 to 5.10, p24.	It is recommended that these paragraphs are amended to provide an improved relationship with policy 3 and to provide clarity as to what this policy is trying to achieve. Some of the paragraphs, such as those that discuss landscape matters, may be better suited to the supporting text to policy 4 (Protection of iconic views).	Consider amending/ moving the paragraphs as suggested.	Partially met.  The amendments to some of the paragraphs is welcomed, however it is still considered that these paragraphs are amended further to provide an even better relationship with policy 3.  It is noted that paragraph 5.11 of the Submission OB&L NP is new. It is not clear why this paragraph has been added to the supporting text to policy 3. It is recommended that this paragraph be deleted.
Paragraph 5.4, p24.	This paragraph provides useful background but it is not clear to the reader what the relationship is with policy 3. It is recommended that the paragraph is amended. It should be noted that the supporting text to policies SS4 (Ensuring a supply of deliverable sites) and EM6 (Water quality) of the Local Plan provide detailed background on the River Loddon water quality matters.	Consider amending the paragraph as suggested.	Not met. It is still not clear to the reader how the paragraph relates to policy 3. This paragraph should be amended to provide a clearer connection.

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Paragraph 5.5, p24.	It is not clear what is meant by the following wording in the paragraph "...and they have all been considered in assessing the suitability of development opportunities." The draft OB&L NP does not allocate sites so it is assumed that the suitability of development opportunities has not been assessed as part of its production.	Consider deleting/ rewordng the wording from the paragraph.	No met. The paragraph has not been amended.
Paragraph 5.7, p24.	For clarity (and to reflect the wording in policy SS3.9 of the Local Plan) it is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows:  "...With considerable development already scheduled to take place within the Loddon Valley on site SS3.9 and the potential for <del>doubling this</del> <u>a later phase of 450 dwellings beyond the plan period...</u> "	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	Met.  The amendments to the paragraph are welcomed.  In light of this reworded policy, it is considered that paragraph 5.4 of the Submission OB&L NP is no longer required and could be deleted.
Paragraph 5.8, p24	For accuracy it is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows:  "Directing new development to within the <del>development boundary</del> <u>Settlement Policy Boundary</u> therefore will protect the important features of the Loddon Valley. The extent of the <del>development</del> <u>Settlement Policy</u> Boundary is shown in Map 5.	Consider amending the paragraph for accuracy.	Met.  The amendments are welcomed. However, the paragraph should make clear that part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is within the parish. It is recommended the paragraph is amended as follows:  "Directing new development to within the Settlement Policy <del>Boundary</del> <u>Boundaries</u> therefore will protect the important features of the Loddon Valley. The extent of the Settlement Policy <del>Boundary</del> <u>Boundaries</u> is shown in Map 5 "

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			Map 5 should be amended to identify the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary.
Paragraph 5.9, p24	It is not understood what is meant by “Within the existing development proposals...”. The paragraph should be suitably amended for clarity purposes.	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	<p>Not met.</p> <p>It is noted that this paragraph has been moved to the supporting text to policy 4 and has not been amended. It is paragraph 5.19 of the Submission OB&amp;L NP.</p> <p>It is not understood what is meant by “Within the existing development proposals...”. The paragraph should be suitably amended for clarity purposes.</p>
Map 5: Development Boundary, p25.	The inclusion of this map is supported in principle. However, it is considered that the legend should be updated to state “ <u>Old Basing and Lychpit</u> Settlement Policy Boundary.” This is particularly important as it would otherwise appear that there is no SPB for Basingstoke as the SPB for Basingstoke is not defined on the map.	Consider updating the legend as recommended. The LPA can assist in providing an amended map on request.	<p>Met.</p> <p>The amendment to the map is welcomed, however the map should be further edited to show the Settlement Policy Boundary for Basingstoke. This is important as part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is within the parish of Old Basing and Lychpit.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Policy 4: Protection of iconic views, p25.	<p>Policy 4 is a landscape policy, however a lot of the evidence for the policy relates to ecological features and designations in terms of the terminology used rather than landscape terminology.</p> <p>Consider if evidence for the policy as explained in the supporting text to the policy should be amended to better reflect landscape matters. This could involve explaining what visual element a habitat gives to the iconic views rather than referring to their ecological importance. 4.</p>	Recommend amending the policy and/ or supporting text as suggested to add clarity.	Although it is appreciated that some amendments have been made to the supporting text, the LPA's comments made on the Pre Submission OB&L NP still remain.
Paragraph 5.11, p28	<p>This paragraph states that “Approximately one third of the Old Basing and Lychpit is made up of the Loddon Valley (see map 3 and map 6).” It would appear from map 3 that more than one third of the parish is made up by the Loddon Valley. Consider amending the sentence as appropriate.</p> <p>The sentence also refers to map 6 defining the Loddon Valley. Map 6 only defines the viewpoints and not the Loddon Valley. It is recommended that the sentence is amended for accuracy.</p> <p>Consider deleting footnote 19.</p>	Consider amending the paragraph and footnote as suggested.	The amendments are welcome. It is still considered that footnote 19 (now footnote 23 in the Submission OB&L NP) is deleted.
Paragraph 5.13, p28	The paragraph refers to “biodiversity strategies and several other projects”. For clarity, it is recommended that further information on these strategies and projects is added to the paragraph.	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	<p>Partially Met.</p> <p>Information on the particular strategies in question are welcomed.</p> <p>For accuracy, it is recommended that the paragraph (now paragraph 5.15) is amended as follows:</p> <p>“There are several SINCs and other designations on the Loddon and has had biodiversity</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			<p>strategies and several other projects (e.g. <u>Biodiversity Strategy by the Environmental Agency</u><sup>24</sup> <u>Biodiversity Strategy: The Loddon Catchment (Hampshire and Isle and Wight Wildlife Trust)</u>, the Countryside Access Plan <u>for the Forest of Eversley 2008-2013</u> by Hampshire County Council<sup>25</sup>) in place to ensure its durability.”</p> <p>It is recommended that footnotes 24 and 25 in the Submission OB&amp;L NP are deleted as they either repeat what is in the text or they are no longer needed in light of the suggested amendments above.</p>
Paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19, p29	Although these paragraphs provide useful information about green infrastructure and the borough council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy it is not clear how this is related to Local Green Spaces designated in the OB&L NP. Consideration should be given to deleting these paragraphs.	Consider deleting these paragraphs.	Not met.
Policy 7: Appearance of residential development, p33.	<p>The intent of this policy is welcomed.</p> <p>It is noted that this policy applies to residential development. Development proposals for non-residential development may also likely to be submitted during the plan period. Consider if the policy needs to be made more generic to cover the appearance of ‘development’ rather than just residential development.</p>	<p>Consider amending the policy as suggested.</p> <p>Carefully consider any potential unintended consequences of the wording included in the second bullet point of the policy.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>In terms of the first bullet point of the policy, it is suggested that the words ‘where appropriate’ are inserted after ‘conservation area’ as some developments may be in locations where there</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>The first bullet includes a requirement for all new development to create dwellings of a 'rural quality as set out within the Old Basing and Lychpit Village Design Statement'. This aim is certainly valid for many parts of the parish. However, it should be recognised that there are several parts of the area subject to the Neighbourhood Plan where the local character is other than rural. For example, the built-up area of Lychpit which lies within the settlement of Basingstoke rather than Old Basing has more of a suburban character.</p> <p>The Local Plan allocated housing sites of East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane would also be subject to the policies of the OB&amp;L NP, and yet their location on the edge of Basingstoke may allow a character that is more suburban or, in some circumstances, more urban rather than rural.</p> <p>It is suggested that flexibility should be introduced into the policy so that developments 'have regard' to the VDS and also to allow more of an emphasis on local character and distinctiveness rather than a blanket 'rural' appearance being applied to development throughout the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Similar to the point raised in respect of Objective 8, there are concerns over the second bullet of the policy attaching such weight to the appearance of 'neighbouring dwellings' which, in some cases, may have poor design quality. Any potential unintended consequences of such wording should be carefully considered.</p> <p>It is recommended that the second bullet should make reference to other elements which contribute to character such as scale and the siting of a building within a plot.</p> <p>It is also suggested that clarity is provided as to what the reference to 'palette' applies to: is it materials or colour?</p>		<p>is very little or no need to integrate the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The word 'dwellings' in the third line of the first bullet should be replaced with the word 'buildings' as much development will be other than residential.</p> <p>The amendments to the second bullet are welcome, however it is recommended that it should read: "New development should have sympathetic regard to the scale, siting, roof lines, fenestration, materials and colour palette of neighbouring buildings where this is required to create a high quality streetscene which respects the character of the area".</p> <p>This suggested amendment clarifies that new development should only be guided by neighbouring buildings where they have a higher design quality which contributes to the character of the area.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>This policy could make reference to the special character and appearance of the conservation area. In this regard the policy could be amended as follows:</p> <p>“All new development will be required to recognise and integrate the distinctive local character of the parish, <u>including the special character and appearance of the conservation area</u>, and sensitively contribute to creating dwellings...”</p>		
Paragraph 6.1.1, p33	<p>Although a reference to policy EM10 of the Local Plan is welcome, it is not understood how this policy forms ‘evidence’ for policy 7 of the OB&amp;L NP. It is also not necessary to quote part of policy EM10 in this OB&amp;L NP.</p> <p>Incidentally, the number ‘28’ should be removed from paragraph 6.1.1 (1) as this refers to a footnote in the Local Plan.</p>	Consider deleting the wording of policy EM10 quoted in the paragraph.	<p>Not met.</p> <p>It is also considered that footnote 26 of the Submission OB&amp;L NP is not required.</p>
Policy 8: Housing size, p34.	<p>The aspirations of the policy are generally welcomed. The need and demand for smaller sized units of accommodation is both a market and affordable housing issue. It is not clear if the policy applies to market or affordable housing or both. It is recommended that this should be clarified.</p> <p>The policy is quite specific and the LPA is concerned that the NPG has not provided sufficient evidence, including on viability, to justify or test the proposed mix requirements. It would be helpful for the NPG to provide further justification and evidence prior to the submission of the neighbourhood plan. Also, whilst the policy refers to bedrooms it does not cover housing types, tenures etc.</p> <p>The LPA also has significant concerns that the policy will be applicable to the East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane Local Plan allocated housing sites. The LPA therefore objects to this policy being applicable to the Local Plan housing sites and it should be made clear in the OB&amp;L NP that the policy does not apply to these Local Plan allocated housing sites.</p>	<p>Consider amending the policy as suggested.</p> <p>Ensure suitable evidence supports the policy, including on viability.</p> <p>The policy requirements should not apply to the Local Plan allocated housing sites (East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane).</p> <p>If this policy is to apply to the East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane Local Plan allocated housing sites, it is highly recommended that the OBLNPT liaise with Hampshire</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The amendments to the supporting text are welcomed. However, the LPA is still concerned that policy 8 could undermine the strategic policies in the ALP such as policies SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane) and SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke).</p> <p>The council raised similar concerns to the Submission Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan in regards to the Local Plan allocated housing site at Manydown. The Examiner in his report recommended that Policy 1</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
	<p>Policies SS3.1, SS3.9, CN1 (Affordable housing) and CN3 (Housing mix for market housing) of the Local Plan all provide policy guidance on housing mix requirements for the East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane Local Plan allocated housing sites. Development Principles 1a (A mix of market homes that respond to current and future needs) and 1b (A mix of affordable housing) of the draft East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief SPD also provide guidance on housing mix for these Local Plan allocated housing sites.</p> <p>The strategic sites will provide 40% affordable housing and the mix of that would generally be for smaller dwellings, but should be based on evidence of need. The mix of market housing should be in line with policy CN3 of the Local Plan which allows some flexibility.</p> <p>Housing mix could also be influenced by the fact the strategic sites are functionally linked to Basingstoke, despite being in the Old Basing and Lychpit parish.</p> <p>If this policy is to apply to these sites, has the OBLNPT liaised with Hampshire County Council as landowner of the two sites?</p> <p>Finally, careful consideration should be given to any possible viability impacts on the Local Plan sites as a result of this policy requirement.</p>	<p>County Council as landowner of the two sites.</p>	<p>(New housing development volume) of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan be amended to state:</p> <p>“For clarity, the housing policies of the Neighbourhood Plan do not apply to the Manydown strategic allocation...”</p> <p>This recommended wording is within the made Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended that similar wording, in relation to Local Plan allocated housing sites at Swing Swang Lane and East of Basingstoke is included in the OB&amp;L NP. This will ensure consistency in approach across all Neighbourhood Plans in the borough and consistency in the council’s Development Plan.</p> <p>The inclusion of paragraph 6.2.14 and reference to the Swing Swang Lane application (17/02846/OUT) is on the face of it helpful, however, it would appear that the proposed mix is not helpful evidence. The overall percentage of 2 bed dwellings (market and affordable) proposed is 35% - this is lower</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			<p>than the requirement or “at least 40%” in the policy. Looking at just the market housing element, only 25% will be 2 bed. Whereas, for the affordable housing element 75% will be 2 bed or less.</p> <p>Taking into account the proposed mix of the Swing Swang Lane in paragraph 6.2.14, it is not clear what is meant by “...which indicates a higher percentage mix than policy 8 requires.”</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 6.2.14 is deleted or amended to provide further clarity.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.11 has been added following the consultation on the pre Submission OB&amp;L NP. It states “The Neighbourhood Housing Stock Analysis<sup>31</sup> projections show that by 2026 single person households in the borough will compromise 36% of all households.” This reference is helpful background, however it is suggested that more up to date evidence could be taken from the Council’s Strategic Housing</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			<p>Market Assessment (2015), specifically table 6.4 and paragraph 6.33.</p> <p>The Swing Swang Lane application has also yet to be determined.</p> <p>Amendments have been included in the Submission OB&amp;L NP (paragraph 6.2.16) that “For the avoidance of doubt, this policy is intended to apply to both market and affordable housing, unless material considerations clearly indicate that an alternative housing mix is appropriate.”</p> <p>The LPA has concerns with this wording as at the very least the requirements of Policy 8 should not apply to the affordable housing element as housing mix for affordable housing is considered on a case by case basis in discussions with the council’s Housing Team.</p> <p>In addition, taking into account that it has been clarified that the policy requirements apply to both market and affordable housing, does this mean 40% of the housing plus affordable units (i.e</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
			all the proposed units) should be 2 bed or less. Or does it mean 40% of the market units should be 2 bed or less and 40% of the affordable units should be 2 bed or less? This should be clarified.
Appendix 2: Community aspirations/ CIL monies projects, p40.	<p>The principle of this appendix is supported.</p> <p>The LPA recommends that the OBLNPT consider the recommendation in paragraph 141 of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report (October 2016). This is equally applicable to Appendix 2 of the OB&amp;L NP. Paragraph 141 states:</p> <p>“I note that Hampshire County Council, as Highway Authority, does not fully support the measures proposed to mitigate identified traffic hazards in Appendix G. To provide a practical framework for decision making, I recommend modification to Appendix G. Preferably the solutions to the traffic hazards should be modified to those that have the support of the Highway Authority, or at least Appendix G should be modified to make it clear where the Highway Authority does not support the solution.”</p> <p>Following the publication of the Examiners Report, Bramley NPG liaised with HCC (as Highway Authority) and made amendments to Appendix G in line with the Examiner’s recommendations. It is recommended that appropriate amendments to Appendix 2 are made to ensure potential similar concerns are overcome prior to Submission of the OB&amp;L NP. The LPA encourages the OBLNPT to work with HCC (as Highway Authority) where appropriate.</p> <p>In addition, has there been discussions with Network Rail about whether it is feasible to develop footways at railway bridges. If not it is recommended that these discussions do take place.</p>	<p>Consider amending the appendix as suggested.</p> <p>The LPA encourages the OBLNPT to work with HCC (as Highway Authority) and Network Rail where appropriate.</p>	<p>The amendments made to the Appendix are welcomed.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted that Stagecoach are the bus operator, so as well as working with HCC on a traffic management plan, the parish council may wish to engage with the operator about improving bus services. The parish council may also wish to work with the school regarding traffic management at drop off times. It is recommended that the paragraph at the bottom of page 45 of the Submission OB&amp;L NP is amended to reflect this.</p>

Section/ Policy of the Pre Submission NP	Issue	Options/actions for potential changes	Not met/Partially Met/ Comment
Appendix 3: Example of appropriate design, p41- 42.	It is suggested that better examples could be found of building design which complement better the local character of the area and reflect the visual richness of much of the local area.	Consider adding better examples to the appendix. The LPA can assist with this on request.	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>Better examples have been added to the appendix and this is welcomed.</p> <p>In the new sentence under the heading, the words 'existing style' should be replaced with 'the locally distinctive character'.</p> <p>This amendment would clarify that it is 'character' as opposed to 'existing styles' which is a more helpful guide to the appearance of new development.</p> <p>On page 47 of the Submission OB&amp;L NP, the heading 'Inappropriate examples of design' may read more easily if it is arranged horizontally at the top of the page instead of vertically down the side.</p>

