

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Foreword, p2  4th paragraph	It is recommended that the last sentence of the paragraph should be amended as follows for consistency with terminology in the adopted Local Plan:  “...in the different areas within the Settlement <u>Policy</u> Boundary, and to...”		Consider amending the paragraph as suggested.	Amended as suggested
Introduction, p3	The first and third paragraph refers to the plan period for the OB&L NP being 2016 to 2029, however the front cover of the draft OB&L NP states 2015 to 2029.  The plan period for the adopted Local Plan is 2011-2029. The OB&L NP could cover the same period as the adopted Local Plan		The front cover or the introduction should be amended accordingly to ensure internal consistency.	Amended as suggested
Introduction, p3	The reference to regulations is useful but not necessarily required.		Consider deleting the references to the regulations.	Kept in for reference
Introduction, p3	The last paragraph of the introduction states:  “The Plan is accompanied by a Policies Map, shown in Section 7 at the end of the document.”  It would appear there is no section 7 in the OB&L NP.		Section 7 should be added or this paragraph deleted.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph 1.6, p6.	For clarity it is recommended the paragraph is amended as follows:  “In May 2016, the emerging <u>neighbourhood plan</u> policies...”		Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph 1.7, p6.	With reference to “At each stage of consultation, results and comments were published through posters,...”, does this mean the results and comments from previous consultations were published through each way mentioned in the paragraph? If not this paragraph should be amended accordingly.		Consider amending the paragraph for clarity.	Yes, comments from previous consultations were published through each way mentioned.

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Section 2.2, p8.	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows to emphasise the conservation area:</p> <p>“...expansion echoing the growth of Basingstoke. <u>Old Basing was designated as a conservation area in 1973, in recognition of the special architectural and historic interest of the village.</u> In the 1970’s Lychpit was developed.</p>		Consider amending the paragraph as suggested.	Amended as suggested
Section 2.2.4, p9.	<p>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&amp;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.</p>		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.	Amended as suggested
Section 2.2.5, p11	<p>It is welcomed that reference to the Local Plan Basingstoke-Old Basing Strategic Gap is included in the OB&amp;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&amp;L NP.</p>		<p>Consider adding further explanation/ context about Local Plan policy EM2 and also the Basingstoke-Old Basing strategic gap.</p> <p>Consider including a suitable map – the LPA will be able to assist with this on request.</p>	Amended as suggested, Map added

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
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.	Amended as suggested
Section 2.3, p12	<p>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.</p> <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>Recommend including background on the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Landscape Assessment (2001) and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Landscape Capacity Study (2010).</p> <p>Make clear these are borough council documents.</p>	References included
Section 2.5, p13	<p>It is recommended that the first paragraph is amended as follows for clarity:</p> <p>“Basingstoke and Deane <u>Borough Council</u> <del>have</del> <u>has</u> produced an...”</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>		Consider amending the section as suggested to add clarity.	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>The draft Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 6.2.3 states:</p> <p>“The East of Basingstoke site, SS3.9, which stretches from the Redlands site to Old Basing and lies partly within the Parish, is expected to accommodate about 200 homes within the Parish.”</p> <p>In light of the above, it is recommended that second bullet point makes reference that the part of the site within Old Basing and Lychpit parish is likely to accommodate about 250 homes.</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 houses</u>. 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>			
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>	At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-	Consider amending the section to add clarity and also to ensure accuracy.	Section reworded to demonstrate local feeling towards the Loddon Valley

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		<p>making and decision-taking. (paragraph 14 of the NPPF)</p> <p>Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan (paragraph 16 of the NPPF).</p>		
Section 2.5, p14	<p>The penultimate paragraph of this section refers to the approach within policies SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) and SS1 (Scale and distribution of housing) of the adopted Local Plan but without specifically referring to the relevant policies. It is considered that this paragraph should be reworded to provide an improved introduction to the policies.</p> <p>Also, consider if this paragraph is required when section 2.6 introduces the local planning policy context.</p>		<p>Consider amending the section as suggested.</p> <p>Carefully consider if the paragraph is needed.</p>	Amended as suggested
Section 2.5, p14	<p>It is not clear why the last paragraph is included in this section. If the paragraph is to remain, it is recommended that additional context is be included.</p>		<p>Carefully consider if the paragraph is needed. If it is to remain consider adding additional context.</p>	Paragraph deleted

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Section 2.6, p14.	<p>This section should more clearly explain the requirements of policy SS5 (Neighbourhood planning) of the adopted Local Plan for the settlement of Old Basing. It should also include reference to policies SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane), SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke) and SS6 (New housing in the countryside) of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The LPA is concerned that the OB&amp;L NP does not make clear how its policies relate to the Local Plan allocated housing sites at East of Basingstoke and Swing Swang Lane.</p> <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 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>See the NPPG neighbourhood plan guidance on 'General conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.'</p> <p>At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. (paragraph 14 of the NPPF)</p> <p>Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan (paragraph 16 of the NPPF).</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>It is recommended that this paragraph highlights that that the OB&amp;L NP is required to be in general conformity</p>	<p>More information added and amendments to wording made as suggested</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<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>The table at the end of the section is useful but it would be helpful to explain that Old Basing and Lychpit is outside of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>This section could also include information on the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>	<p>The NPPG (paragraph 72 Reference ID – 41-072-20140306) states that:</p> <p>“A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures).</p> <p>In order to demonstrate that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to sustainable development, sufficient and proportionate evidence should be presented on how the draft neighbourhood</p>	<p>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>	

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		plan or Order guides development to sustainable solutions.”		
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> <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>“A neighbourhood plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development...” (paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 41-004-20140306</p> <p>“...National planning policy states that it should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan, plan positively to support local development and should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies (see paragraph 16 and paragraph 184 of the National Planning</p>	Consider amending the bullet point as suggested.	Amended as suggested



## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		Policy Framework). Nor should it be used to constrain the delivery of a strategic site allocated for development in the Local Plan.” (paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20160519).		
Paragraph 4.1.1, p16.	The paragraph should be amended as follows for accuracy:  “Ensuring that strategic developments <del>identified</del> <u>allocated</u> in the Basingstoke and Deane <del>Borough Council Core Strategy</del> <u>Local Plan</u> are integrated...”		Amend the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
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 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).	“A neighbourhood plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development...” (paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 41-004-20140306  “...National planning policy states that it should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan, plan positively to support	Ensure the OB&L NP does not undermine strategic policies in the Local Plan.	Wording amended for clarity

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		<p>local development and should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies (see paragraph 16 and paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework). Nor should it be used to constrain the delivery of a strategic site allocated for development in the Local Plan.” (paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044-20160519).</p>		
<p>Section 3.3, p17-18</p>	<p>The table on page 18 is useful but its content repeats the text in the coloured boxes on page 17.</p> <p>The table on page 18 includes a column titled ‘Evidence’ but this remains empty throughout.</p>		<p>Consider if the coloured boxes should be deleted to limit repetition.</p> <p>The evidence column should be populated.</p>	<p>Table removed</p>
<p>Objective 8 p18.</p>	<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</p>		<p>Consider amending the objective as recommended.</p> <p>Delete the VDS as an appendix to the</p>	<p>Amended as suggested</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>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 should have regard to with the Village Design Statement (2006)...</u></p> <p>It is noted that the Old Basing and Lychpit VDS is included in Appendix 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. By doing this it is seen to be elevating the VDS into the Development Plan. The VDS should be referred to in the OB&amp;L NP but not be an appendix to the OB&amp;L NP.</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>OB&amp;L NP. Refer to the VDS in the OB&amp;L NP.</p>	
<p>Policy 1: Movement routes, p19</p>	<p>The principle of this policy is supported. However, it is recommended to consider whether it is appropriate for this policy to apply to “all new development”. For example, is it considered that this policy should apply to householder extensions? The supporting text could clarify this.</p> <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>The second bullet point of the policy states “Where new developments may negatively impact upon movement routes...” The principle of this is</p>	<p>Paragraph 32 (bullet point 3) of the NPPF</p> <p>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-</p>	<p>Consider amending the policy and its supporting text as suggested.</p>	<p>Reworded for clarity and amendments made as suggested</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>again supported, however it is noted that paragraph 32 of the NPPF states “Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are <u>severe</u>.” Policy CN9 criterion e) (Transport) of the adopted Local Plan also states “Does not have a <u>severe</u> impact on the...”.</p> <p>Consider amending policy 1 as follows “Where new developments may <del>negatively</del> <u>severely</u> impact upon movement routes...”</p> <p>It should also be noted that policy T2 (Improving road safety in Bramley) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan states the following “Development proposals will not be supported if it is demonstrated that there will be a <u>severe</u> adverse impact...”.</p> <p>The Bramley Neighbourhood Plan examiner recommended modifications to policy T2 that have been incorporated into the made neighbourhood plan policy as quoted above. Paragraph 139 of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report (October 2016) states:</p> <p>“The wording in the second paragraph in Policy T2 does not provide a practical framework for decision making. I have suggested alternative wording to seek to ensure that new development does not have a severe adverse impact on road safety at known traffic hazards. I have specifically referred to ‘severe adverse impact’ to have regard to criteria in the NPPF and to be in general conformity with BDLP Policy CN9.”</p>	<p>041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p> <p>See the NPPG neighbourhood plan guidance on ‘General conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.’</p>		
Paragraph 4.2, p19.	<p>It is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“...(<del>total just under 600</del> <u>approximately 550 dwellings</u>)...”</p> <p>As highlighted in earlier sections of the OB&amp;L NP, the East of Basingstoke site is partly within Old Basing and Lychpit parish and also Sherfield on Loddon parish. This should be reflected in this paragraph.</p>		<p>Consider amending the paragraph for accuracy.</p> <p>Amend the paragraph to refer to movements per</p>	<p>Amended as suggested. Traffic figures per house not available, so figures kept as is</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	In addition, traffic is usually measured in terms of movements per hour, not the number of cars owned. Stating the number of cars owned does not provide an accurate picture of the increase in vehicle movements as not all will be directly affecting the settlement/ parish of Old Basing and Lychpit as they disperse elsewhere onto the network (e.g. A33).		hour, rather than the number of cars owned.	
Paragraphs 4.3, p19-20	<p>It is suggested that this paragraph makes reference to the following policies and guidance which will help to facilitate travel by means other than the car in the parish of Old Basing and Lychpit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policy SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane) criterion e)</li> <li>• Local Plan policy SS3.9 (East of Basingstoke) criterion i)</li> <li>• Local Plan policy CN9 (Transport)</li> <li>• Section 5 (Transport and access) of the East of Basingstoke and Redlands Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document.</li> </ul>		Make reference to the policies and guidance as suggested.	Amended as suggested
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.	Amended as suggested
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.	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported	Recommend sentence provides information to explain what these emissions actually mean and relate to specific evidence.	Reference checked

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)		
Paragraph 4.6, p20.	This paragraph implies that all the parish’s issues relating to transport are due to the quality of infrastructure. However there are other factors which affect people’s choice of travel mode such as distance to work and whether they are making multi-modal journeys. In this regard this should be made clear in the OB&L NP.		Amend the paragraph as suggested for clarity.	Wording amended for clarity
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 t</del>The Basingstoke and Deane Local policy SS3.1 (Swing Swang Lane —site SS3.7– 100 houses) which states....”</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.	Amended as suggested
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>	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported	<p>Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.</p> <p>Consider referencing specific criteria in Local Plan policy SS3.1 as suggested.</p>	Reference checked

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<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>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>	by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)		
Paragraph 4.10, p21	<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>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</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>Suggested information added in and wording amended for clarity</p>
Paragraph 4.11, p21.	<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>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>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise,</p>	<p>Amend the paragraph as suggested for clarity.</p> <p>Consider including further explanation on “match-finding”.</p>	<p>Amended as suggested. Ref match funding-as it is a community aspiration, this will be further investigated</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)		if/when monies are forthcoming
Paragraph 4.13, p22.	It is appreciated why it may not be desirable for the roads to accommodate more traffic. However, this paragraph would benefit from references to specific evidence otherwise it would appear that statements in the paragraph such as “constraints of access” and “unreasonable for the roads to accommodate more traffic” are opinions. For instance, this evidence could help explain why it is unreasonable for the roads to accommodate more traffic.		Consider amending the paragraph to include references to evidence.	Reworded and second sentence removed
Paragraph 4.15, p22	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.		Amend the paragraph as suggested to ensure internal consistency.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph 4.18, p23	This paragraph states “...the previous Hampshire Highways Department traffic survey...”. It is recommended this is amended to the following for accuracy:  ““...the previous Hampshire <del>Highways Department</del> County Council ( <u>as Highway Authority</u> ) traffic survey...”		Amend the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph 4.19, p23	This paragraph states “...work with the Highways department...”. It is recommended this is amended to the following for accuracy:  “...work with the <del>highways department</del> <u>Hampshire County Council (as Highway Authority)</u> ...”		Amend the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.	Amended as suggested



## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	The LPA supports the community aspiration to work with Hampshire County Council (as Highways Authority).			
Objective 4 box, p23	Objective 4 is defined on this page and at the end of the objective it states "... (as defined in the B&D landscape assessment.". It is recommended that this is amended to the following for accuracy:  "... (as defined in the <u>B&amp;D Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council landscape assessment (2001).</u> "		Amend the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
Policy 3: Built-up area boundary. P23.	<p><b>A</b> 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><b>B</b> 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><b>C</b> 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><b>D</b> 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><b>E</b> Policy H1 (new housing development) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan includes the following wording:</p>	<p>See the NPPG neighbourhood plan guidance on 'General conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan.'</p> <p>"... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence." (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</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>Very carefully consider any potential unintended consequences of this policy.</p> <p>Consider amending the supporting text to ensure clarity.</p>	<p><b>A</b> Amended as suggested</p> <p><b>B</b> Amended as suggested</p> <p><b>C</b> Amended for clarity</p> <p><b>D</b> OB&amp;LNPSG feel the policy does add to SS1, SS5 and SS6</p> <p><b>E</b> Bullet point reworded</p> <p><b>F</b> reworded as suggested below</p> <p><b>G</b> policy wording amended</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<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>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><b>F</b> 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 Old Basing and Lychpit 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>At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. (paragraph 14 of the NPPF)</p> <p>Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan (paragraph 16 of the NPPF).</p>		

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p><b>G</b> 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> <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>			
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.	Amended as suggested below
Paragraph 5.2, p24.	This paragraph should be amended as follows for clarity:  “The <u>Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Landscape Capacity Study 2010...</u> ”		Consider amending the paragraph for accuracy.	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Paragraph h 5.3, p24.	It is recommended that the first sentence of the paragraph is reworded to explain that the Local Plan focusses the majority of proposed housing growth within the plan period around the settlement of Basingstoke.  The sentence should be amended to reflect the LPA's comments on section 2.6.		Consider amending the paragraph as suggested.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph h 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.	Bullet point moved
Paragraph h 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.	"... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence." (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	Consider deleting/rewording the wording from the paragraph.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph h 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:	"... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	“...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> ”	when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)		
Paragrap h 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.	Amended as suggested
Paragrap h 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.	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	Wording amended

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Paragraph 5.10, p24	The paragraph sounds like policy. Consider if this wording could be incorporated into policy 4 of the OB&L NP.		Consider including paragraph within policy 4 of the OB&L NP.	Moved to policy
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 Settlement Policy Boundary</u> .” 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.	Amended as suggested
Policy 4: Protection of iconic views, p25.	<p>The second sentence of the policy requires an assessment of views to accompany a planning application. Is this only a requirement for development proposals within the distinctive view areas defined on map 6? If so, this should be clarified in the policy. Is the assessment of views a requirement for <u>all</u> new development? Clarification should be included in the policy and/ or supporting text.</p> <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. Some of the supporting text for policy 3 would appear to be better suited to be supporting text for policy 4.</p>	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	Recommend amending the policy and/ or supporting text as suggested to add clarity.	Wording amended & additional info added

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Paragraph h 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.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph h 5.12, p28	<p>It is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“The <u>Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</u> Landscape Capacity Study...”</p>		Consider amending the paragraph for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
Paragraph h 5.13, p28	<p>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.</p>	<p>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p>	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	More information added

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Policy 5: Protectio n and maintena nce of Local Green Space, p28	<p>Policy is supported. The policy could also seek to enhance local green space as well as to protect it.</p> <p>It is noted that policy 5 is titled “Protection and maintenance of Local Green Spaces.” It is not clear why the title refers to ‘maintenance’ and therefore it is recommended the policy title is amended as follows:</p> <p>“Protection and maintenance of Local Green Spaces”</p>		<p>Consider if the policy should also seek to enhance local green space.</p> <p>Consider amending the policy title as suggested.</p>	Policy title reworded
Policy 5: Protectio n and maintena nce of Local Green Space, p28	<p>The ‘made’ Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy on local green space (policy 7). It is noted that the examiner for the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan recommended in his report that the policy should be revised and subsequently the policy in the made Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan reads as follows: “Local Green Space is designated at the sites shown on the plans below, for the reasons set out in the supporting text. Development of Local Green Space will only be permitted in very special circumstances.” The made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and the draft Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan includes very similar wording.</p> <p>In light of paragraph 76 of the NPPF and the wording used for Local Green Space policies in other neighbourhood plans in the borough it is recommended that the policy is amended as follows:</p> <p>“The following areas, as shown on the Proposals Map 7, are recognised as important to the local community and as such are designated as Local Green Spaces and will be strongly protected from development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Basingstoke Canal sections behind Cavalier Road (1)</li> <li>• Hodds Lane Copse (2) (shown on map 7)</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 76 of the NPPF:</p> <p>“By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances...”</p>	<p>Recommend the policy is amended as suggested to ensure consistency with the NPPF.</p>	Amended as suggested



## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p><del>Development on this local Green Spaces will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of the identified Local Green Space. Development on the designated Local Green Spaces will only be permitted in very special circumstances.</del></p>			
<p>Policy 5: Protection and maintenance of Local Green Space, p28</p>	<p>Paragraph 76 and 77 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans can be used to identify special protection green areas which are of particular importance to them. However it must be noted that the designation should only be used in specific circumstances. It is important to ensure that the proposed Local Green Spaces in the OB&amp;L NP meet all the requirements of the NPPF otherwise they could be in danger of being deleted by the Examiner appointed to examine the Submission OB&amp;L NP.</p> <p>The NPPG (Reference ID: 37-019-20140306) states that:</p> <p>“A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan.”</p> <p>In order to provide clarity that all relevant landowners have been contacted, it is recommended that this is explained/ evidenced in the evidence base supporting the OB&amp;L NP. This will help the subsequent examiner appointed to examine the Submission OB&amp;L NP.</p>	<p>Paragraph 76 and 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>NPPG (Reference ID: 37-019-20140306)</p>	<p>Give careful consideration to the NPPF paragraph 76 and 77 requirements prior to the submission of the OB&amp;L NP.</p> <p>Provide clarity that all relevant landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces have been contacted</p>	<p>OB&amp;L liaised with BDBC to clarify if there are any existing designations on the 2 pieces of land proposed as Local Green Spaces. A small part of the Local Green Space at Hodds Farm Lane is within a Conservation Area. Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes and a Local Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. The designation of the Hodds Farm Lane Local Green Space will ensure</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
				additional local benefit is gained
Paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19, p29	<p>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&amp;L NP. Consideration should be given to deleting these paragraphs.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.19 also refers to "local green gaps". It is not clear what it meant by local green gaps. Are these strategic gaps, local green spaces or open space? If this paragraph remains then this should be amended for accuracy and clarity.</p>	"... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence." (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	<p>Consider deleting these paragraphs.</p> <p>If paragraph 5.19 is to remain it should be amended for accuracy and clarity.</p>	Kept in for information and clarity
Paragraph 5.21, p29.	This paragraph provides useful information on the NPPF, however a full quotation of paragraph 77 of the NPPF is considered not necessary.		Consider deleting the bullet points.	Kept in for information
Paragraph 5.22, p31	<p>Rather than saying "The consultation process has..." should this read as "The community engagement has..." for clarity.</p> <p>This paragraphs also refers to "town", consider amending to "village".</p>	"... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence." (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	Consider amending the paragraph to add clarity.	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Map 7, p30.	<p>Large maps for each designated Local Green Space should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to aid clarity and precision.</p> <p>The Local Green Spaces defined on Map 7 should also be clearly labelled as 1) and 2) on the map so they can be easily identified.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to moving map 7 to below paragraph 5.27 to provide a better connection with the supporting text.</p>	<p>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p>	<p>Amend the OB&amp;L NP as suggested.</p> <p>The LPA will be able to assist with new maps and amending existing maps.</p>	New maps added
Paragrap h below 5.26.5, p31.	<p>The paragraph below paragraph 5.26.5 should be amended as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“Policy OB&amp;L 5 therefore seeks to designate these two areas as <del>marked</del> <u>defined</u> on the proposals maps <u>7</u> as <del>new</del> <u>Local</u> Green Space.”</p>		Consider amending the paragraph for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
Policy 6: Protectio n of the historic environm ent, p31.	<p>This policy is generally supported.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy is amended as follows to ensure general conformity with policy EM11 (The Historic Environment) of the Local Plan:</p> <p>“Any designated historic heritage assets in the Parish and their settings, both above and below ground, will be conserved <del>and</del> <u>or</u> enhanced for their historic <u>and architectural</u> significance...”</p> <p>In terms of reference to “local distinctiveness, character and sense of place” in the policy, it would be useful for the supporting text to the policy to explain what these mean in the context of the policy. The Old Basing and Lychpit Village Design Statement (2006) may be able to assist in adding an explanation into the supporting text.</p>	Section 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the NPPF.	Consider amending the policy and supporting text as suggested.	Wording added and amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>For internal consistency it is recommended the second main bullet point is amended as follows:</p> <p>“Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic <u>heritage</u> assets...”</p> <p>It is recommend that the supporting text makes reference to existing and emerging Conservation Area Appraisals. The existing Old Basing Conservation Area Appraisal map highlights some non-designated heritage assets as notable structures, making a particularly positive contribution to the conservation area but not all non-designated heritage assets are shown as notable structures. The supporting text could also make reference to the Local List buildings – please note these are not shown on the current Old Basing Conservation Area Appraisal Map, but are likely to be included in the future. It is recommended that the supporting text to the policy states the following:</p> <p><u>“The Borough Council is currently undergoing a review of all the current Conservation Area Appraisals in the borough.”</u></p>			
Paragrap h 5.13, p32.	Rather than sating that the policy is in accordance with policy EM11 of the Local Plan, it is recommended that the paragraph purely makes reference to policy EM11 (The historic environment) of the Local Plan.		Consider amending the paragraph as suggested.	Amended as suggested
Policy 7: Appeara nce of residenti al develop ment, 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>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</p>	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate	<p>Consider amending the policy as suggested.</p> <p>Carefully consider any potential unintended consequences of the wording included in the</p>	Wording amended for clarity and suggested amendments made

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>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>evidence." (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p>	<p>second bullet point of the policy.</p>	

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<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>			
<p>Paragraph 6.1.1, p33</p>	<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>	<p>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p>	<p>Consider deleting the wording of policy EM10 quoted in the paragraph.</p>	<p>Kept in for information</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.1.2 (the first paragraph 6.1.2), p33</p>	<p>Although the principle of this paragraph is supported it is not clear how it relates to policy 7. This is because the policy covers the “appearance of residential development” whereas the paragraph covers “community” and “function”.</p>	<p>“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate</p>	<p>Consider amending or deleting the paragraph.</p>	<p>Wording amended</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
		evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)		
Paragraphs 6.1.2 (2 <sup>nd</sup> 6.1.2 paragraph), p34	It is recommended that the paragraph is amended as follows for accuracy: “Residents do not like <u>the inappropriate</u> housing styles...”		Consider amending the paragraph as suggested for accuracy.	Amended as suggested
Penultimate paragraph 6.1.2, p34	This paragraph reads as policy. Consider if it should be incorporated into a policy.		Consider if paragraph should be included in a policy.	Not added to policy as considered hard to clarify different locations/styles
Last paragraph 6.1.2, p34	This paragraph provides useful information on the factors contributing to its history. Consideration should be given as to whether any of these factors should be integrated into suitable policy wording to ensure they are conserved or enhanced through new development where suitable.		Consider whether any of the factors should be integrated into suitable policy wording.	Not added to policy as considered hard to clarify different locations/styles
Policy 8: Housing size, p34.	<p><b>A</b> 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><b>B</b> 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>	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Reference	<p>Consider amending the policy as suggested.</p> <p>Ensure suitable evidence supports the policy, including on viability.</p> <p>The policy requirements</p>	<p><b>A</b> wording added for clarity</p> <p><b>B</b> further justification added</p> <p><b>C</b> OB&amp;LNPT have discussed at length the policy with BDBC and has amended the policy, however it is still to apply to SS3.1 and SS3.9</p>

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p><b>C</b> 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 these Local Plan allocated housing sites.</p> <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>ID – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)</p> <p>Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened (Paragraph 173 of the NPPF).</p>	<p>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 County Council as landowner of the two sites.</p>	
List of policy maps, p36.	The list of policy maps on page 36 is useful but it is recommended that this list would be better placed in the main contents page. Page numbers should also be added to the list for ease of reference.		Consider amending as suggested. This will aid the reader.	Amended as suggested



## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
Appendix 1: Old basing and Lychpit Demographic data. P37-39	This appendix could become its own evidence document and sit outside of the neighbourhood plan.		Consider deleting this appendix from the OB&L NP and add to an evidence document that sits outside of the OB&L NP.	Kept in for information
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>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>	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	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.			
Appendix 2: Community aspirations/ CIL monies projects, p40.	<p>The table refers to “GOS”, it is not clear what is meant by this abbreviation. It is recommended this should be clarified.</p> <p>It is not clear what the table is trying to present and the relationship between the table and the number list below is not explained. It is recommended that this is explained.</p> <p>It is recommended that the parish council clearly identify which projects it intends to fund through CIL as it is not appropriate to seek S106 and CIL for the same projects. Generally it is better to fund infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of a particular development site through S106, while more general infrastructure is better funded through CIL.</p>	“... should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.” (Paragraph 41, Reference – 41-041-20140306 of the NPPG)	<p>Clarify the “GOS” abbreviation.</p> <p>Recommend amending the appendix as suggested for clarity.</p>	Typo amended
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.	Designs added
Acknowledgments, p43	It is appreciated that Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council officers are acknowledged however this is not required. Please can the following sentence be deleted:		Delete the sentence as requested.	Amended as suggested

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council Regulation 14 Responses & Old Basing & Lychpit Responses

Section/ Policy	Issue	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	OB&LNPT response/action
	<p>“Emma Betteridge, Edward Rehill and Margaret McGrath of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council provided valuable assistance with advice, information about sites and in creating maps.”</p>			