



WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

www.winchfield-pc.org.uk

Chairman	• Meyrick Williams	• Pepper Box, Sprats Hatch Lane, Winchfield, Hook, Hampshire RG27 8DD	• Tel: 07980 660001
		• e-mail: meyrick@csmw.co.uk	
Clerk	• Alison Ball	• e-mail: winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com	• Tel: 01256 397009

By e-mail

For the attention of Mr Andrew Ashcroft
c/o Hart District Council
Civic Offices
Harlington Way
Fleet
GU51 4AE

1st July 2023

Dear Mr Ashcroft,

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012 (as amended) Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan

The District Council has provided the Parish Council with the representations made in response to the recent Regulation 16 consultation and is grateful to Mr Hawes and his team for their continued advice and co-operation.

The Parish Council is also grateful to everyone who has taken the opportunity to review and comment upon the draft plan and for responding to earlier consultations and engagement events.

The representations have been reviewed and it is acknowledged that you will now consider them and the content of the plan in your examination to determine whether the relevant requirements are satisfied.

In response to some of the observations received, the Parish Council would point out that Winchfield has a small resident population and is characterised by several modest areas of settlement and properties within dispersed pockets. As such, Winchfield is not identified for additional housing growth and in line with Policy SS1 in the Hart Local Plan, 2023 new development is expected to take place within the settlement boundaries defined by planning policy documents.

In recognition that there are few if any available sites within the existing and proposed settlement boundaries defined for Winchfield, the Parish Council has been keen to promote the possibility of providing some affordable housing on a rural exception site (RES) which is commensurate in scale with the size of the village. Discussions are currently on-going in relation to the identification of a suitable site which would deliver new homes to meet the needs of the parish based upon the findings of a recent housing survey. Again, the Parish Council appreciates the professional assistance of the District Council team who are working closely with us on this project. Discussions relating to a future RES are entirely separate to the advancement of the neighbourhood plan; further consultation and public engagement activities are already scheduled in July to address the points that have perhaps inadvertently been made to the Regulation 16 consultation.

Whilst the plan is not required to propose sites the plan does, in several sections, refer to supporting sustainable development should any previously developed land come forward in the future. In such a circumstance some additional housing to meet the identified need would be fully supported by the Parish Council.

The Parish Council and neighbourhood plan group has sought to work closely with the District Council to ensure that the plan meets the relevant requirements and responded positively to most suggested changes from the District Council in response to the Regulation 14 consultation. The Parish Council is slightly surprised to find that the District Council has requested some further changes to wording which were amended following the earlier consultation.

For example, the comments made regarding Policy NE1: Landscape Character. The suggested substitution of the word “retain” for “respect” would dilute the purpose of the policy and the desire to ensure that the character of the landscape is not undermined. Likewise, the Parish Council consider the other suggestions made by the District Council would weaken the policy further. However, the suggestion that a map is provided within the plan to show the six landscape character areas is supported and will be provided in the final version.

The Parish Council also questions why the inset maps provided to support Policy NE2: Protection of Key Views should be moved to an appendix. The District Council's previous response suggested inset plans should be included for the purposes of using and interpreting the policy as required by paragraph 16(d) of the NPPF without the need to revert to another part of the plan. The Parish Council notes that the District Council does not seek to question the use of the words ‘retain and reinforce’ in Policy NE2.

The District Council has also requested that paragraph 4.14 is moved. Objective 7 is very important to residents and the Parish Council considers that with some minor wording revisions to make it clear that the matter falls outside the scope of the planning system there is no need to move this text.

Finally, the Parish Council notes that one respondent has requested that a hearing should be held to determine the issues raised by Policy NE3: Brenda Parker Way. However the comments would appear to be capable of resolution in writing with any corresponding map changes being made as recommended by the Examiner. The Parish Council agrees that additional information should and will be added to the legend to identify the area which, in this aerial view, shows the outline of the tree canopy. The word ‘indicative’ can also be added to the text for further clarity. Policy NE3 as currently drafted seeks to recognise the importance of the path and the contribution that the adjacent countryside makes to its enjoyment by users of the route. The purpose of the policy does not appear to be disputed by the respondent.

The Parish Council would be grateful if all these comments could be considered as you conduct your examination. A table is shown below to provide some additional brief information which might assist you in relation to some of the representations received.

The Parish Council also looks forward to receiving your clarification note following your visit to the neighbourhood area.

Yours sincerely

Meyrick Williams

Meyrick Williams
Chairman

cc Mr Daniel Hawes - Hart District Council

	Representation	Comment	WPC(abbreviated for the purpose of this table) proposed action or response
001	Transport for London	No comments	No further action required
002	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	No comments	No further action required
003	Louise Wright	Opposed to any more building in Hart due lack of infrastructure	This appears to be a high level complaint about HDC Planning and does not have specific relevance to WNP
004	Bryan Whyatt	Wants more building in this area and more housing allocated in this Plan	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements
005	National Highways	No comments	No further action required
006	Alison Abley	Questions why Winchfield is not proposing development given the need across the District	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements
007	Sport England	Generic response	Should significant development take place WPC would strongly support the requirement for opportunities to be included which would promote and encourage healthy lifestyles and communities.
008	Coal Authority	No comments	No further action required
009	Gary Comerford	Fully supports the Plan	No further action required
010	Dave Ramm.	Supports attempts to create permissive footpaths which would reduce walkers using the road network	Will continue to pursue any opportunity to achieve this outcome
011	Trustees of Fisk Family Trust	Observations about 'value' of views and protection of key views.	Key Views Document, Appendix A2, provides clarity on the importance of each view. Winchfield is a rural village, the majority of which is indeed farm land.
012	Mr Paul Jackaman	Plan lacks references to sustainable development.	Sustainable development is fully supported in various terminologies throughout the Plan.
013	Crookham Village Parish Council	Suggests the Plan is designed to 'thwart' future development	Plan supports and complies with current LPA requirements and would welcome a small development on PDL should such land become available.
014	Thames Water	Two observations on waste water and flooding, suggests new policy / text is required.	Previously advised that such a policy is not advisable as in force building regulations address such issues.

015	National Gas Transmission	No assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area	No further action required
016	Sarah Cramer and Petition	Opposed to possible Rural Exception Site at Shapley. Letter and petition from other residents	No decision on an RES site has been made. The development of a RES site is supported in Policy BE2 but final decisions are beyond the scope of this Plan and will be considered at the planning application stage. Public responses to a possible RES will be welcomed and addressed at the Engagement meeting in July. A new Settlement Boundary at Shapley has not been defined at Reg 16 Consultation.
017	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	With reference to RAF Odiham	MoD requirements noted and would be addressed in development proposals.
018	Hart District Council	Specific comments on wording and suggested edits and changes to text and policies	Typos, missing para and page numbers will be corrected. In addition to comments in the above letter WPC will carefully review the Reg 16 suggestions and observations relating to paras 1.7, 1.22, 3.12, 4.14, 5.23-5.26, Policy NE4 (glossary definition additions) 5.65, Fig 5.10, Policy BE1, BE2 and BE4. Every effort will be made to ensure that clarification and clear guidance is provided for decision makers as required by NPPF para 16d & e. Each suggested change to wording will be reviewed e.g. para 4.14 does not relate to a policy but WPC would wish to carefully consider road safety in matters pertaining to development and use of land. Suggested legibility improvements will be actioned and additional maps, references and footnotes supplied (NE2, NE4, Dark Skies map, NE5) Additional wording as suggested will be added to HE1 to ensure conformity with HLP32. Policy BE5 reflects the proposal in the draft Hart SPD that NPs may, in some circumstances, require parking standards which are specifically appropriate to rural rather than urban conditions. The Plan will be amended to reflect the most up to date position and the outcome of the Examiners modifications.
019	Pearson Strategic Ltd	Specific comments about policy NE3	Please see comments in the above letter
020	North East Hants Ramblers	Supports proposals for Brenda Parker Way (NE3) and permissive footpaths	Reference to Three Castles Path will be addressed.

021	Michael Odell	Opposing Shapley as a possible RES	See 016.
022	Network Rail	Suggest possible improvements may result from the introduction of the settlement boundary around Beauclerk Green / Station Road	Noted but no further action required
023	Hampshire County Council, Public Health	Recommends reference to active travel within the Plan.	Noted and would be addressed in development proposals.
024	Kim Hull	Specific comments about Policy NE3	This representation is a near duplicate of 019 from Pearson Strategic. As these two respondents are owners of the land adjacent to or on which this footpath is located at the Winchfield Parish Boundary. WPC will make every effort to work with land owners and Hook Parish Council to achieve an acceptable outcome for all parties.
025	Natural England	No comments.	No further action required