



Appendix A – Detailed Planning Policy

Context

**To support the Planning Representations on behalf of
Winchfield Parish Council, Hook Parish Council and
Hartley Wintney Parish Council**

A.1 Section 3 of the Representations on behalf of Winchfield Parish Council, Hook Parish Council and Hartley Wintney Parish Council identifies the principal planning policy and decision-making framework relevant to the determination of Application 26/01201/OUT. This Appendix provides the more detailed national, local, and neighbourhood planning policy context which supports the assessment contained within Section 4.

A.2 The policies identified below should be read alongside Section 3 and the substantive assessment of the Development. The purpose of this Appendix is to provide the detailed policy context without repeating that material throughout the main body of the representations.

National Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework – August 2026

A.3 The Application was submitted in July 2026 and prepared with regard to the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) which was the relevant national policy framework at the time of submission. The NPPF was subsequently revised on 17 August 2026, replacing the December 2024 Framework.

A.4 Annex A confirms that the policies of the revised NPPF are material considerations which must be taken into account in decision-making from the date of publication. The Application must therefore be determined against the August 2026 NPPF notwithstanding that it was submitted under the previous Framework.

A.5 The revised NPPF makes a clearer distinction between policies intended for plan-making and national decision-making policies which apply to individual development proposals. The following section therefore focuses on the national decision-making policies relevant to the Application.

Sustainable Development and Development Outside Settlements

A.6 The goal of sustainable development sits at the heart of the NPPF. This is set out in Section 4 of the NPPF and seeks to meet development needs through sustainable patterns of development, including by maximising the potential for growth on suitable land within settlements, enabling development which will support the rural economy, rural communities and the provision of infrastructure, and limiting development away from settlements to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This objective provides context for the national decision-making policies which follow but is not itself a decision-making policy.

A.7 Policy S3 of the NPPF establishes the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It requires decision-makers to apply Policy S4 to development within settlements and Policy S5 to development outside settlements.

A.8 As the Site lies outside the defined settlement boundaries in the adopted Development Plan, Policy S5 – Principle of development outside settlements provides the key national policy direction for considering the principle of the Development.

A.9 Policy S5 identifies particular categories of development which may be supported outside settlements as set out at Section 4 of the NPPF. Of particular relevance to

the Development is S5(1)(j), which applies to development addressing an evidenced unmet need, such as a lack of Five-Year Housing Land Supply. HDC's published Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement at 1 April 2025 identifies 2.07 years of housing land supply. Accordingly, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply for the purposes of S5(1)(j).

A.10 For residential development to progress through Policy S5(1)(j) it must address both policy limbs which require the development to:

- a. be physically well-related to an existing settlement; and*
- b. be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure.*

A.11 Policy S5(1)(h) provides a separate route for residential and mixed-use development outside settlements where development would:

- a. be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station;*
- b. be physically well-related to that station or the settlement within which it is located;*
- c. be of a scale capable of being accommodated having regard to infrastructure; and*
- d. not prejudice long-term comprehensive development in the same location.*

A.12 For the purposes of S5(1)(h), the NPPF defines reasonable walking distance as around 800 metres, or around ten minutes' walk where route quality, topography or physical barriers would prevent or discourage walking from that distance. Where only part of a site falls within the reasonable walking-distance catchment, S5(1)(h) applies only to that part of the site.

A.13 Development falling within one of the categories identified in S5(1) “should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by adverse effects, assessed against the national decision-making policies in the NPPF”. Policy S5(2) identifies that a failure to comply with a national policy which expressly states that development should be refused is a circumstance in which the benefits are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects.

A.14 Where development outside a settlement does not fall within one of the categories identified by S5(1), Policy S5(4) states that it should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where its benefits substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including effects on countryside character and the promotion of sustainable patterns of movement.

Strategic Sites and Housing

A.15 Policy HO7 requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of providing homes which contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.

A.16 The NPPF defines a strategic site as a residential, commercial or mixed-use site which would be implemented in multiple phases, have significant infrastructure requirements and require a masterplan. For residential-led development, such sites would typically have capacity for at least 1,500 dwellings. The proposed Development of up to 2,160 dwellings therefore falls within this definition.

- A.17 Policy HO13 requires major housing development to be capable of bringing housing forward within a reasonable period, having regard to the tenure mix, local market conditions including absorption rates, and the development history of the site.
- A.18 In relation to strategic sites, HO13 requires the establishment of parameters and requirements for design, infrastructure, affordable housing and other features of the development.
- A.19 Policy HC3 requires proposals which would give rise to significant numbers of additional people living in, working in or visiting an area to be informed by an understanding of the need for associated improvements to community facilities and public service infrastructure. Where necessary for development to be acceptable in planning terms, new or improved facilities and infrastructure should be provided directly or through contributions to off-site improvements.

Transport and Sustainable Locations for Development

- A.20 Policy TR3 requires development which would generate significant movement to be located in a sustainable location, or one which can be made sustainable through planned improvements. This means limiting the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. TR3 also requires significant transport-network and safety impacts to be mitigated to an acceptable degree and the environmental effects of traffic and transport infrastructure to be identified and addressed.
- A.21 TR3 further states that the Government's Connectivity Tool should be used alongside other relevant quantitative and qualitative evidence when assessing the connectivity of locations proposed for development.
- A.22 Policy TR6 sets out that transport assessment must consider reasonable future scenarios, including impacts at relevant times of day, cumulative effects, multimodal trip generation and the promotion of sustainable modes.
- A.23 TR6 states that development should be refused where it would have a “*severe adverse*” impact on the transport network, including cumulative capacity and congestion effects, or an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This test applies both during the construction phase and following completion.
- A.24 Policy TR8 requires development to protect and enhance the public rights of way network and, where opportunities arise, to extend, link or improve existing routes, including where this would improve access to green spaces and the countryside or support walking, wheeling and cycling. This is particularly relevant to the extensive public rights of way network crossing the Site, including the Brenda Parker Way.

Natural Environment

- A.25 Policy N2 requires development to take account of the environmental qualities of land proposed for development, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside. It requires ecological networks and existing natural features to be conserved and enhanced where possible and states that

development should be refused where significant biodiversity harm cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated.

- A.26 N2 also requires the quality and grade of agricultural land to be taken into account and states that, where significant development of agricultural land is necessary, areas of poorer-quality agricultural land should be used where possible.
- A.27 Policy N6 provides the relevant national decision-making framework for designated habitats and irreplaceable habitats. This is particularly relevant to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the proposed SANG mitigation and the ancient woodland and veteran-tree interests associated with the Site.
- A.28 For a habitats site, N6 states that development should be refused unless an Appropriate Assessment has concluded that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the site, either alone or in combination, or the relevant alternative route provided by the policy is satisfied.
- A.29 N6 further states that development which would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees, should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

Design, Landscape, and Heritage

- A.30 Policy DP3 requires development to respond appropriately to site history, character and setting, ensuring it integrates with and enhances its surroundings and establishes or maintains a distinctive and characterful sense of place.
- A.31 Policies HE5 and HE6 establish the national decision-making framework for assessing the significance of heritage assets and the effect of development upon them. HE6 requires substantial weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and any harm to their significance to be afforded considerable importance and weight.
- A.32 Policy HE7 considers non-designated heritage assets and requires that the effect of development upon the significance of these assets be considered through a balanced judgement, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss, the significance of the asset and the benefits of the proposal. Where substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset would arise, the policy establishes a more specific balancing test.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- A.33 Policy F4 requires a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment for development of one hectare or more within Flood Zone 1, as well as development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and land otherwise identified as being at risk from any source of flooding. The assessment should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposal and, where relevant, inform application of the sequential and exception tests.
- A.34 Policy F5 seeks to steer new development to areas at the lowest risk of flooding from any source and requires application of the sequential test where relevant.

- A.35 Policy F7 states that development should not present a flood risk to occupiers or increase flood risk elsewhere. Development in a location known to be at risk from flooding should be refused unless it can be demonstrated to be safe throughout its lifetime, residual risk can be appropriately managed and flood risk will not be increased elsewhere.

Ground Conditions, Pollution, Hazards, Minerals and Town Centre Uses

- A.36 Policy P2 requires development sites to be suitable for their proposed use having regard to contamination and other ground conditions and requires adequate site investigation information to support the assessment of these matters.
- A.37 Policy P3 requires development to be appropriate for its location, taking account of the likely effects, including cumulative effects, of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment both on and off-site. Development should avoid or appropriately mitigate unacceptable effects from air, noise, artificial light, water, soil and other forms of pollution. P3 also requires noise impacts to be minimised, the character of tranquil areas to be maintained, adverse effects from artificial light on intrinsically dark landscapes and nature to be limited, and effects on water quality to be assessed and mitigated, particularly in relation to sensitive water bodies such as chalk streams.
- A.38 Policy P5 addresses development involving, or located within consultation zones associated with, major accident hazard pipelines. Where applicable, development should only proceed where the relevant safety requirements are satisfied following consultation with the appropriate bodies.
- A.39 Policy M6 requires non-mineral development not to constrain potential future mineral working within Mineral Safeguarding Areas and supports prior extraction where practical and environmentally feasible.
- A.40 Policy TC3 requires the sequential approach to be applied to main town centre uses requiring planning permission where they are neither located within an existing centre nor allocated for that purpose in an up-to-date development plan. Where a proposal fails the sequential test, the policy states that it should be refused.

Weight to be given to Existing Development Plan Policies

- A.41 Annex A of the revised NPPF establishes the approach to the weight to be given to existing Development Plan policies. It states that Development Plan policies should not be given reduced weight simply because they were adopted before publication of the revised NPPF. This expressly includes policies within made neighbourhood plans.
- A.42 However, where development plan policies, or parts of policies, are materially inconsistent with the national decision-making policies they are to be given very limited weight.
- A.43 The relevant Hart Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies are therefore considered on a policy-by-policy basis for their consistency with the revised national decision-making framework. Their age and HDC's current five-year housing

land supply position do not, by themselves remove them from the decision-making framework.

Information Requirements and Determination

A.44 Policy DM1 expects proposals for major development to be accompanied by a Planning Statement explaining how the development is consistent with the relevant Development Plan and national decision-making policies. The Applicant's submitted Planning Statement assesses the Development against the superseded December 2024 NPPF and its former paragraph 11(d) tilted balance.

A.45 The Parish Councils therefore consider that the Applicant should update its planning policy assessment before determination to address the August 2026 NPPF.

A.46 Policy DM2 requires development proposals to be supported by the information specified by the relevant national decision-making policies, with any additional information requirements being proportionate to the scale and potential impacts of the development.

A.47 Policy DM6 establishes the national requirements for the use of planning conditions and obligations. Conditions must be necessary, relevant, precise and reasonable, while planning obligations should only be used where potentially unacceptable impacts cannot appropriately be addressed by condition.

Local Policy Context

Adopted Development Plan

A.48 Hart District Council ("HDC") is the Local Planning Authority responsible for determining the Application. The statutory Development Plan relevant to the Site includes:

- The Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, adopted April 2020;
- the remaining saved policies of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996–2006;
- the relevant made Neighbourhood Plans, considered separately below;
- the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2026; and
- relevant saved regional policy, including South East Plan Policy NRM6 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

The adopted Local Plan confirms that it should be read as a whole and that development proposals will be judged against all relevant policies.

Weight and Relevance of the Adopted Spatial Strategy

A.49 The Applicant states that the Development Plan is "demonstrably out-of-date", relying on the increase in housing need since adoption of the Local Plan and HDC's inability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply to conclude the Development Plan policies controlling development outside built-up areas are out-of-date and "should not be afforded full weight". Neither circumstance means that the adopted Local Plan, or its spatial strategy, ceases to form part of the decision-making framework.

- A.50 That assessment was undertaken under the superseded December 2024 NPPF and its former paragraph 11(d) tilted balance. The August 2026 NPPF establishes a different approach to the weight afforded to existing Development Plan policies. Annex A requires policies, or parts of policies, which are materially inconsistent with the new national decision-making policies to be given very limited weight. Conversely, other Development Plan policies should not receive reduced weight simply because they pre-date publication of the revised Framework.
- A.51 Policy SS1 establishes that development will be focused within defined settlements, on previously developed land in sustainable locations, and on allocated sites shown on the Policies Map. The policy identifies the principal sources through which housing was expected to be delivered, including development within defined settlement boundaries, Hartland Village, Neighbourhood Plans and limited forms of development outside settlement boundaries.
- A.52 The numerical housing requirement of 423 dwellings per annum within SS1 is now out-of-date and is no longer the applicable basis for calculating HDC's five-year housing land supply. This must, however, be distinguished from the policy's broader locational strategy. The latter remains materially relevant to the determination of the Application. Its objective of concentrating development within settlements and in sustainable locations is consistent with the revised NPPF's continued emphasis on sustainable patterns of development and with Policy S5, which itself establishes specific circumstances in which development outside settlements may be supported.
- A.53 Policy NBE1 defines the countryside as land outside settlement policy boundaries and designated Strategic and Locally Important Employment Sites. Its supporting text establishes a more restrictive approach to development in the countryside than within settlement boundaries. Policy S5(1)(j) changes the national policy context within which NBE1 must now be applied, particularly insofar as its specified categories of countryside development are more restrictive than the new routes provided by S5. It does not, however, render the policy irrelevant.
- A.54 As set out in Section 2, Murrell Green/Winchfield was expressly considered as a strategic growth option during preparation and examination of the current Local Plan through former Policy SS3. That policy and the associated Area of Search were removed through Main Modification following the Inspector's concerns regarding the justification and deliverability of the proposed new settlement. The spatial strategy, as modified without Policy SS3, was subsequently found sound.

Other Relevant Local Plan Policies

- A.55 Policy NBE2 requires development to respect and, where possible, enhance the special characteristics, value and visual amenity of Hart's landscapes. Of particular relevance to this Application, criterion (e) requires development not to result in the physical or visual coalescence of settlements or damage their separate identity, either individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development.

- A.56 Policy NBE3 establishes the local avoidance and mitigation framework for residential development affecting the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Within the 400m–5km zone of influence, mitigation is required for all net new dwellings and must be delivered prior to occupation and in perpetuity through SAMM and SANG. The policy requires a minimum SANG standard of 8 hectares per 1,000 new occupants after discounting for existing access and capacity.
- A.57 Policy NBE4 protects internationally, nationally and locally designated sites, ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees and wider ecological networks and applies the mitigation hierarchy. Where significant biodiversity harm cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated, permission should be refused.
- A.58 Policies NBE5, NBE6 and NBE7 address flood risk, water quality and sustainable water use respectively. NBE5 requires development to be safe throughout its lifetime, not increase flood risk elsewhere and comply with the relevant sequential and exception tests. NBE6 requires protection of the District’s water environment.
- A.59 Policy NBE8 requires development to conserve or enhance heritage assets and their settings and requires an appropriate understanding of significance and effects. Where harm would arise, the relevant national policy tests must be satisfied.
- A.60 Policy NBE9 requires development to respond to local scale, density, massing, landscape character, views, heritage and movement patterns.
- A.61 Policy NBE11 requires development potentially affected by pollution or contamination to be supported by an assessment of the associated risks and appropriate mitigation or remediation. This is relevant to the historic landfill areas, road and rail noise, air quality and other potential sources of environmental risk affecting the Site.
- A.62 Policies ED4 and ED6 establish the District’s hierarchy and role of town, district and local centres. Hook is identified as a District Centre and Hartley Wintney as a Local Centre. These policies are relevant to the assessment of the proposed new centre uses alongside national Policy TC3.
- A.63 Policy INF1 requires development to make appropriate provision for necessary on- and off-site infrastructure. It expressly requires developers to demonstrate adequate wastewater capacity and surface-water drainage and states that infrastructure provision should be directly linked to development phasing so that it is delivered in a timely manner. This requires applicants to demonstrate that existing, planned and/or committed infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate new development.
- A.64 Policy INF3 requires development to promote sustainable transport, improve accessibility to services, integrate with existing movement networks and avoid severe impacts on highway operation, safety or accessibility. It also requires mitigation of cumulative transport effects and protection or enhancement of public rights of way.
- A.65 Policy INF7 safeguards the Phoenix Green Flood Alleviation land shown on the Policies Map for implementation of the flood alleviation scheme. The policy remains

part of the adopted Development Plan and the safeguarding designation remains shown on the Policies Map.

Saved and Minerals Policies

- A.66 Relevant saved policies of the earlier Hart Local Plan also remain part of the Development Plan. These include policies relating to the River Whitewater and riverine environments (CON7), trees, woodland and hedgerows (CON8), and public rights of way (CON23).
- A.67 The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2026 is also relevant. Policy 15 safeguards Hampshire’s identified mineral resources against sterilisation. Non-mineral development within a Mineral Safeguarding Area may proceed without prior extraction only where the required Mineral Resource Assessment demonstrates that the relevant policy criteria are satisfied.

Emerging Local Plan

- A.68 HDC has commenced preparation of a new Local Plan under the new plan-making system, with adoption currently targeted for October 2028. WPC, HPC and HWPC are actively engaged in that process.
- A.69 The emerging Local Plan provides relevant context because Murrell Green represents a strategic-site-scale proposition with implications for the future distribution of housing, infrastructure and growth across the District. The revised NPPF places renewed emphasis on a genuinely plan-led system as a priority for delivering housing and other development in a sustainable manner. This enables strategic growth locations to be assessed comprehensively and comparatively through the plan-making process, taking account of development needs, reasonable alternatives, infrastructure requirements, sustainable transport, environmental constraints and long-term delivery.
- A.70 The Parish Councils do not rely upon the preparation of the emerging Local Plan as a reason for refusal on grounds of prematurity. However, the national policy emphasis on identifying and planning for strategic sites through the Development Plan is important context for an unallocated proposal of this scale, particularly where the same broad location has previously been considered and removed through the Local Plan process and where HDC is now preparing a new spatial strategy.

Neighbourhood Planning Policy

- A.71 The Application engages four made Neighbourhood Plans within the Site and its surrounding area. The Site itself straddles two designated Neighbourhood Plan Areas which form part of the statutory Development Plan for the respective parts of the Site falling within their designated areas. These are:
- the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan 2022–2037; and
 - the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2018–2032.
- A.72 Two further made Neighbourhood Plans cover adjoining and nearby areas at Hartley Wintney and Odiham/North Warnborough. Although these plans do not form

part of the Development Plan for land within the Application Site and their policies do not directly govern the Development, they are nevertheless relevant to the extent that the Development would give rise to material effects upon land, assets or other receptors within those neighbourhood areas. In particular, the plans and their supporting evidence identify locally important landscape views, settlement character, heritage assets, ecological features and movement networks which may be affected by the Development. These are:

- the Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2032; and
- the Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2032.

A.73 The Applicant's Planning Statement was prepared under the December 2024 NPPF and relied upon the former paragraph 14 neighbourhood-plan provisions. It acknowledged that the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan was less than five years old, but concluded that neither the Hook nor Winchfield plans benefited from the additional paragraph 14 protection because they did not contain policies and allocations sufficient to meet an identified housing requirement.

A.74 The August 2026 NPPF now addresses this matter through Policy S6 – Neighbourhood plans and the presumption. S6 provides an enhanced level of protection where a neighbourhood plan became part of the Development Plan five years or less before determination and contains allocations meeting its identified housing requirement. For the two Neighbourhood Plans which directly govern land within the Application Site, this additional protection does not apply: the Hook Neighbourhood Plan was made more than five years ago, while the Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan does not contain allocations meeting an identified housing requirement.

A.75 The absence of the additional protection provided by S6 does not, in itself, render the Neighbourhood Plans out-of-date or determine the weight to be afforded to their individual policies. They remain part of the statutory Development Plan. Annex A of the revised NPPF confirms that Development Plan policies should not receive reduced weight simply because they were made before publication of the revised Framework. The appropriate approach is therefore to consider each policy according to its consistency with the current national decision-making policies.

Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2037

A.76 The revised Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan was made by HDC in January 2024, following independent examination and referendum, and forms part of the statutory Development Plan for the Winchfield portion of the Site. The Plan covers the whole of Winchfield Parish.

A.77 The Plan is supported by a detailed evidence base. Of particular relevance to the Application are the Winchfield Landscape Character Assessment (Appendix A1) and Winchfield's Key Views (Appendix A2), which the Plan expressly states should be read as part of it. The Landscape Character Assessment provides a parish-level assessment based upon national guidance and identifies six landscape character areas, while the Key Views study identifies 26 publicly accessible views which illustrate the landscape qualities and distinctive character of Winchfield. The Plan

places particular importance on the rural character of the approaches into the Parish, noting that “every gateway to our village is green and offers a key view of rural life”. Of particular relevance to the Development is Key View 3, which records the approach into Winchfield from the north along the B3016 from Phoenix Green.

- A.78 Policy NE1 requires development proposals to respect the key characteristics identified in the Landscape Character Assessment, harmonise with the existing landscape and be capable of being accommodated without unacceptable effects arising from their height, scale, materials, siting or location. Importantly, it expressly requires development to avoid the physical and visual coalescence of Winchfield with Fleet, Hook, Hartley Wintney and Dogmersfield. Development outside Winchfield’s defined settlement boundaries is also required to be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal demonstrating compliance with those criteria.
- A.79 Policy NE2 requires development to safeguard and respond positively to the Key Views identified within the Plan. Development affecting those views should be supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal demonstrating how the proposal respects and, where practicable, reinforces them. Proposals resulting in an unacceptable effect on the characteristics of an identified Key View are not supported. The defining qualities of the Parish include its dispersed and small-scale settlement pattern, extensive rural countryside, mosaic of farmland and woodland, wooded rural lanes, historic landscape pattern, heritage assets and network of public rights of way.
- A.80 Policy NE3 provides specific protection to the Brenda Parker Way, an ancient sunken route which follows part of the boundary between Winchfield and Hook. Development proposals are required to safeguard the route and its associated tree canopy. The supporting text identifies the route as an important historic and biodiverse landscape corridor and requires the trees, root structures and canopy to be addressed where development is proposed on adjoining land.
- A.81 Policy NE4 resists the loss of or damage to ancient woodland, and ancient or veteran trees other than in exceptional circumstances, and also resists the loss of or damage to other woodland, trees and hedgerows.
- A.82 Policy NE5 considers Dark Skies and requires outdoor lighting to be limited to the minimum necessary for safety and security, minimise light spill and glare, particularly in the countryside and on settlement edges, and avoid unacceptable effects upon landscape character, biodiversity, heritage assets and highway safety.
- A.83 Policy NE6 requires development to retain and, where possible, reinforce existing watercourses, wetlands, ponds, woodland, mature native trees, hedgerows and roadside verges. Significant biodiversity harm must be avoided, adequately mitigated or compensated, and development is required to provide measurable biodiversity net gain.
- A.84 Policies HE1 and HE2 provide the neighbourhood-level framework for the historic environment. HE1 requires proposals affecting designated assets to be supported by a proportionate Heritage Statement addressing significance, setting

and potential effects, together with appropriate mitigation where required. HE2 identifies locally important non-designated heritage assets and requires their significance to be conserved where possible, with proposals affecting them supported by proportionate analysis sufficient to enable a balanced judgement.

- A.85 Policy BE1 supports housing within the defined settlement boundaries and requires development outside those boundaries to accord with national, local and neighbourhood planning policy. All development is required to minimise effects upon Winchfield's essentially open character, respect existing settlements and the gaps between them, protect important views and landscape features, and avoid unnecessary additional openings onto rural lanes.
- A.86 Policy BE3 seeks an emphasis on two and three-bedroom homes unless tenure considerations or the latest housing-needs evidence demonstrates a different requirement. The provision of bungalows is also supported where this would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the surrounding area.
- A.87 Policy BE4 requires all new development to reflect the local characteristics of the Neighbourhood Plan area and create a high-quality, safe and sustainable environment. Its detailed requirements include responding to local character, scale and density, sustainable design, highway safety, native landscaping, wastewater disposal, surface-water management, cycle storage and mitigation of pollution.
- A.88 Policy P&C1 states that development which would unacceptably affect the tranquillity, rural nature or layout of existing roads, lanes, roadside verges, bridleways, byways and footpaths will not be supported. Improvements and new routes are supported where they respect local character, while the loss of existing or proposed rights of way is resisted unless an alternative route is at least as attractive, safe and convenient.

Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2018–2032

- A.89 The Hook Neighbourhood Plan was made by HDC on 27 February 2020 and forms part of the statutory Development Plan for the Hook portion of the Site. The designated Neighbourhood Area covers the whole of Hook Parish.
- A.90 Policy HK1 provides that the focus for new growth over the Plan period will be within the existing Hook settlement boundary. Development is supported where it maintains Hook's distinctive character and is supported by sufficient infrastructure, services and facilities.
- A.91 As with the corresponding strategic policies of the Hart Local Plan, HK1 was prepared before the introduction of Policy S5(1)(j) and its locational approach must therefore be read in light of the new national route for development meeting evidenced unmet need outside settlements. Its requirements concerning Hook's distinctive character and the sufficiency of infrastructure, services and facilities remain directly consistent with matters expressly addressed by the revised NPPF.
- A.92 The Plan deliberately does not duplicate Local Plan countryside and landscape policy. Its supporting text states that development outside Hook Village is controlled through Local Plan Policies NBE1 and NBE2, which were considered to provide sufficient coverage.

- A.93 Policy HK4 seeks protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of Hook and is particularly relevant to the western part of the Site and the River Whitewater. Development adjoining the River Whitewater or other watercourses should contribute to a corridor of good-quality habitat and should not harm water flow or water quality.
- A.94 The supporting evidence to HK4 identifies the River Whitewater and its floodplain, ancient woodland and farmland as key interconnected habitats within Hook Parish. In particular, farmland, grassland and hedgerows are identified as providing connections between the River Whitewater, heathland and woodland ecosystems.
- A.95 Policy HK5 requires development to respect and, where possible, enhance the small-scale lowland mosaic landscape of the Neighbourhood Area and the key characteristics of the Loddon Valley and Forest of Eversley West Character Area. Those characteristics include an undulating landscape crossed by wooded watercourses, thick hedges and ancient trees, a high density of public rights of way, an intimate and secluded character and a historic pattern of small settlements and farms.
- A.96 The supporting text to Policy HK6 expressly records that the need for a gap between Hook and Murrell Green/Phoenix Green was considered during preparation of the Plan. A formal gap was not designated because the risk of coalescence was then considered small, with Hook and Murrell Green/Phoenix Green separated by substantial areas of open countryside, including woodland and the River Whitewater and its associated floodplain.
- A.97 Policy HK7 requires development to respect identified views from the Hook settlement boundary towards the north-east and east across the River Whitewater valley and its setting, together with identified views on the western side of the settlement. The eastern views are directly relevant to consideration of landscape and visual effects arising from development within the countryside between Hook and Murrell Green.
- A.98 Policy HK8 requires development involving external lighting to demonstrate that light pollution has been minimised. Development leading to a significant noise impact will not be supported, and noise arising from new development should be mitigated and reduced to a minimum.
- A.99 Policy HK11 applies to large unallocated residential and mixed-use sites and requires consideration of proposed uses and community facilities, key design principles, layout and connectivity, social cohesion, existing and new pedestrian and cycle links, biodiversity and Thames Basin Heaths SPA mitigation, and linkages with existing services, facilities and open spaces.
- A.100 Policy HK14 requires open space and other community facilities provided as part of large developments to be easily accessible from Hook Village and to provide footpath and cycle connections to the village as a whole.
- A.101 The Hook Neighbourhood Plan also establishes a clear strategy for the role and regeneration of Hook Village Centre in Policies HK2 and HK3. This forms relevant

local context to the assessment of proposed out-of-centre uses alongside Local Plan Policies ED4 and ED6 and national Policy TC3.

Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan 2017–2032

- A.102 The Hartley Wintney Neighbourhood Plan was made in November 2019 and forms part of the statutory Development Plan for Hartley Wintney Parish. The Application Site lies immediately to the south-west of the Neighbourhood Area.
- A.103 The Plan seeks to preserve, safeguard and enhance the distinctive landscape and character of Hartley Wintney. Its objectives include protecting distinctive views and conservation areas, maintaining the village’s rural setting and improving traffic management, pedestrian and cycle connectivity. The Plan’s vision describes Hartley Wintney as a village with an attractive built heritage surrounded by open countryside.
- A.104 Policy HW4 identifies locally important views within Hartley Wintney which are relevant to assessing the Development’s cross-boundary landscape and visual effects. Of particular relevance is View E from the A30 western approach at the Parish boundary near Murrell Green.
- A.105 View E is identified as important in preserving the rural approach to Hartley Wintney and states that the rising topography means development could be intrusive. It also identifies the horizon seen when approaching Hartley Wintney from Murrell Green as an important feature of arrival into the village and as contributing to the maintenance of green gaps required to prevent coalescence.
- A.106 Policy HW5 requires development within the setting of any of Hartley Wintney’s conservation areas to demonstrate that it will conserve or enhance the heritage asset or its setting in accordance with its significance. This is relevant to both Hartley Wintney Conservation Area and Phoenix Green Conservation Area.
- A.107 Policy HW6 reflects the importance which the Plan places on the Parish’s rural night-time character. It seeks to avoid unnecessary external and street lighting and requires necessary lighting to be justified and appropriate to its location. The supporting text identifies dark skies as a characteristic of Hartley Wintney’s rural setting.

Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan 2014–2032 – Review 2025

- A.108 The reviewed Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan was formally made by HDC on 24 April 2025, following independent examination and a referendum in March 2025. The southern boundary of the Application Site meets the boundary of Odiham Parish.
- A.109 Policy 7 identifies the characteristics, setting and significant views which contribute to the significance of the North Warnborough Conservation Area. These provide relevant neighbourhood-level evidence when assessing whether the Development would affect the setting or appreciation of that designated heritage asset.
- A.110 Policies 6, 7 and 8 provide detailed protection respectively for the Odiham, North Warnborough and Basingstoke Canal Conservation Areas and their settings.

Across these policies, particular importance is placed on significant views, open spaces, the relationship between the historic settlements and surrounding countryside and the contribution of the River Whitewater and Basingstoke Canal landscapes.

- A.111 Policy 12 establishes protection within the Neighbourhood Area for designated and locally important wildlife areas, seeking to avoid adverse effects on the distinctive open landscapes of the Parish and valued public views. It also contains specific protections for watercourses, including the River Whitewater, seeking to prevent adverse effects from runoff, pollution, erosion, artificial lighting and increased recreational pressure, requiring appropriate ecological buffers.
- A.112 The Whitewater Valley is recognised as a distinct landscape and ecological character area comprising the river channel, floodplain and adjoining farmland. The River Whitewater is a chalk stream of particular ecological importance. The policy framework therefore requires consideration not only of direct impacts within the Parish but also of effects which could alter the ecological integrity, landscape setting or recreational pressures associated with this connected river corridor.