

**Draft Local Plan Consultation**

We are preparing a new Local Plan which will guide development in the district up to 2032. The Draft Local Plan contains planning policies and site allocations, including where new housing and employment development will take place.

You can find all supporting information to this consultation online via [www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan](http://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan) or hard copies of the consultation documents are available to view at the Hart District Council Offices, Town and parish council offices and public libraries across the district.

All valid comments (electronic or written) and the name(s) of the respondent will be made publically available. Personal contact details will remain confidential.

We encourage you to respond to our Draft Local Plan consultation using our online form available at [www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-consultation](http://www.hart.gov.uk/draft-local-plan-consultation). However if you wish, you can use this word version of the response form and email to [planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk) or post to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.

This form contains two comments sections. If you wish to make more than two comments please copy and paste the boxes as required.

**All comments must be submitted no later than 5pm on Friday 9 June.**

\* Indicates a required field.

**Response form**

**Are you a:** \*☐ Resident   
☐ Business  
☐ Agent  
☐Other (i.e. Community interest group)

If Resident please complete:  
**Name**\* Click here to enter text.   
**Address**\* Click here to enter text.  
**Phone number** Click here to enter text.  
**Email**\* Click here to enter text.

If Business please complete:  
**Name**\* Click here to enter text.  
**Organisation**\* Click here to enter text.  
**Job title** Click here to enter text.  
**Business address** Click here to enter text.  
**Phone number** Click here to enter text.  
**Email**\* Click here to enter text.

If Agent please complete:  
*Agent details*  
**Name**\*Click here to enter text. **Organisation**\*Click here to enter text. **Job title** Click here to enter text. **Phone number** Click here to enter text. **Email**\*Click here to enter text.*Client details*  
**Name**\*Click here to enter text. **Organisation** Click here to enter text. **Address**\*Click here to enter text.

If Other please complete:  
**Please specify** Click here to enter text. **Name**\*Click here to enter text. **Completing details on behalf of** Click here to enter text. **Address**\*Click here to enter text. **Phone number** Click here to enter text. **Email**\*Click here to enter text.

☐ Please tick this box if you do not want to be contacted about Local Plan documents or updates

**Comment 1**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **Page 22**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **Key Issues**

**Paragraph: 6, 11, 12, 13**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?** \*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Key issues: The draft plan  
6 – does not respect the separate character and identity of Hart settlements.   
11 –pays lip service to the issues of water quality and ecological status of water bodies many of which fail to meet the target as set by the Water Framework Directive.   
12 – fails to protect or enhance biodiversity by plans to develop on greenfield sites  
13 - fails adequately to protect and enhance the district’s green infrastructure.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 2**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\*Pages 23 and 24.

**Section/Policy number:**\*Our Vision

**Paragraph:** Click here to enter text.

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Page 23 The plan as drawn will not remain a largely rural area because of greenfield development. The need for a new development at Murrell Green, contradicts the plan claims to enhance the quality of life and sustain the districts environment. Page 24 The character and quality of the natural assets defined in the vision (but omitted from the plan) such as the Valley of the River Whitewater will be seriously degraded by the plan developments such as Murrell Green.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 3**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **Pages 25 and 26**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **Objectives**

**Paragraph: 1,2,4,10**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Local Plan objectives page 25 para 77, 1,2 By incorrectly identifying a target of 10,000 new homes in order to satisfy an affordable homes target (page 33, para 101), which could be met by other means. The plan forces the greenfield developments such Murrell Green, in direct contradiction of the plan’s vision. Other means include for example regenerating Fleet town centre as the plan says is needed; planning for a more realistic use of brownfield unused existing office sites. Page 25 para 4 The plan will do nothing to encourage the much needed redevelopment of the urban centres such as Fleet hence the plan will oversee its attractiveness and vitality continue to diminish as other surrounding centres offer a more attractive proposition to business and residents. Page 26 para 10 The detrimental impact imposed by the greenfield sites in the plan contradicts the plan’s claims to protect and enhance the natural environment.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 4**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **28**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **Spatial Strategy**

**Paragraph: 86**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

**Spatial Strategy Page 28 para 86 The strategy adopted by the plan fails to consider how to retain the rural character of the district in the long term. Only by a strategy which recognises the need for increased density of development in the urban centres will this character be retained. The plan seems to be all about short term solutions rather than long term**

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 5**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **32**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **Delivering new homes**

**Paragraph: 99,100,101**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Page 32 a Delivering new homes Para 99,100,101 The justification for the adopted approach to meeting the subsidised rental homes target with the direct result of requiring 1500 additional houses on greenfield site developments is not proven and contradicts the plan’s stated objectives. Murrell Green sits squarely in the middle of the Valley of the River Whitewater precisely one of the locations which the plan claims to protect.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 6**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **36**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **New settlements**

**Paragraph: 114,115,116**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

New settlements page 36, para 114,115,116. Based upon the greenfield sites selected the detrimental impact upon the rural section of the district is clear and offers a long term erosion of what is claimed to be important to its character.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 7**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **38,39,40**

**Section/Policy number:**\*A place to work Employment and the economy

**Paragraph: 125,126, 131, 133, 134**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

A place to work Employment and the economy Para 125, 126.Page 38,39 Previous plans by HDC illustrate a failure to understand what a classic waste of greenfield land the Bartley Heath Development has been this is reflected in the Ancells Farm vacancies. Regeneration within urban areas offers a more sustainable approach and would increase the vitality and viability of such towns as Fleet. Plan is repeating past errors by planning for still more employment land Page 39 para 131 Rural Hart Association has demonstrated that what is required is significant increased development and redevelopment particularly in Fleet to enable the statements made in this paragraph to be realised. Page 40 para 133,134 The need for significant investment in Fleet to revitalise the town is recognised in the plan, however without sustainable growth and increased density Fleet will not be able to compete with other centres. To suggest that a new retail development in the countryside at Murrell Green and Hartland Village will be able to satisfy that need is not demonstrated in the plan.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 8**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **44**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **MG3**

**Paragraph: 143**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Managing GrowthMG3 The selection of Murrell Green, in the middle of the Whitewater Valley contradicts the plan policy claims and will have a detrimental impact upon the valley and the river. If the housing numbers had not been exaggerated and inflated, the plan wouldn’t need Murrell Green with all its problems.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 9**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **48**

**Section/Policy number:**\*Gaps between settlements MG6

**Paragraph: 158**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Gaps between settlements WVPS supports the policy, para 158 x, xii and xiii, which are located in the Whitewater Valley. However by proposing the Murrell Green new development, despite the proposed gaps, will inevitably threaten the coalescence of Hook and Hartley Wintney, and the Hook to Murrell Green gap will effectively only be Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 10**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **56**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **SC2**

**Paragraph: 189**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Page 56 Murrell Green para 189 Policy SC2. If the housing numbers had not been exaggerated and inflated (see our comment 5 above), the plan wouldn’t need Murrell Green with all its problems. The mix of housing suggests 42 % affordable homes. Not very desirable for a location remote from all other settlements, not ready walking distance to Hook or Hartley Wintney. Proposals to improve access to the Winchfield Station conflict with the claim to prevent rat running to the station and Totters Lane is a single track road quite unsuitable for additional traffic from the proposed new vehicular access. The already heavily trafficked A30 is soon to receive additional traffic from the NE Hook Development. The proposed Murrell Green development will exacerbate existing traffic problems. There is no visible infrastructure plan to identify, let alone mitigate these and other infrastructure issues. The detrimental visual and environmental impact upon the Whitewater Valley is not even mentioned and the ecological damage unsustainable. The identification of the Whitewater Valley as a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (para 202, page 59) directly conflicts with a 1,800 house development and cannot be regarded as sustainable. The proposed SANG to be owned by the council is envisaged to support other developments in the district hence creating more footfall and hence more damage to the ecology of the Biodiversity Opportunity Area, as well as more vehicular traffic. The suggestion that convenience stores on site will complete the Fleet retail offering is unconvincing. The admission that the area is prone to flooding makes the choice of the site contradictory, as does the overhead power cable and the high pressure gas main. It remains for Hart to show that the site is viable at all for the uses proposed in the absence of detailed recognition of the impact particularly of the gas main. If this allocation were to go ahead, the plan should make sure that financial contributions arising from developments near to the river should in part be directed towards mitigating the detrimental impact of such developments.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 11**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **85**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **ED2 Part 2**

**Paragraph: 273**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Policy ED2 Part 2 xiv Lodge Farm. We note the designation of this site right on the River Whitewater and acknowledge the employment significance of the site. The use needs to be sensitively managed given its close proximity to the river and its prominent landscape position. We would also note that the steady expansion of the retail offering is contrary to the principle of retail developments in the countryside and is already developing an unsustainable level of vehicular traffic movements alongside the river (the Biodiversity Opportunity Area) since foot or cycle access is inappropriate. The plan should make sure that financial contributions arising from developments near to the river should in part be directed towards mitigating the detrimental impact of such developments.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 12**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **96**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **Natural and Built Environment**

**Paragraph: 323**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Natural and Built Environment page 96 Quote para 323“a fundamental aspect of the district’s character is its natural and built environment” the plan appears to set out to undermine the natural environment by over-increasing the built.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 13**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **101,102**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **NE2, NE3**

**Paragraph:**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Landscape Page 101 policy NE2,NE3 pages 102,103,The plan fails to show convincingly how mitigation for example on the Murrell Green site in combination with a SANG development will adequately protect the Landscape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity of this site in the sensitive Whitewater Valley or protect the unique ecology of the chalk stream.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 14**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **105,106**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **NE5**

**Paragraph: 352**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Water Quality NE5 para 352 The River Whitewater fails to meet its Water Framework Directive classification of Good Ecological Status. The developments at NE Hook and now proposed at Murrell Green with the increased usage of the river banks for public recreation through SANG will inevitably lead to further deterioration in the river ecology contrary to the plan’s claims and vision. The council must show how the plan’s targets for biodiversity can be met if sites such as Murrell Green are to be proposed. The plan should make sure that financial contributions arising from developments near to the river should in part be directed towards mitigating the detrimental impact of such developments.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 15**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **110, 111**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **BE3**

**Paragraph: 371**

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Sustainable Water Use Page 110 Policy BE3. WVPS supports the requirement to be placed by building regulation of a water consumption standard of 110 litres per person per day. Para 371 should recognise that current demand within the Loddon Catchment means that of the “water available for licensing”, at times currently 50% of the Loddon flow is treated effluent with its consequential impact upon the river ecology. Abstraction from the chalk aquifers at Greywell is also deemed to be having a detrimental impact upon the SSSI at Greywell Fen and this source may have to close. Low water levels are also due to the abstraction of 500 million gallons per annum from the aquifers that feed the river. Whilst the plan appears to support these valuable resources, any unnecessary increase in housing numbers will increase the environmental damage in this water stressed area. The plan should make sure that financial contributions arising from developments near to the river should in part be directed towards mitigating the detrimental impact of such developments.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 16**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **111**

**Section/Policy number:**\*BE4 Renewable and Low Carbon energy

**Paragraph:** Click here to enter text.

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
x Oppose  
☐ Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Policy BE4 Renewable and Low Carbon energy page 111 In view of the designation of the River Whitewater and its valley and the recognition of the landscape importance of the rural western portion of the district, the principle of NO photovoltaic or wind generation sites should be established unless a full impact and landscape assessment has taken place and local residents have been consulted and agreed.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

x Yes  
☐ No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Comment 17**

**Please indicate the document and specific page, section or policy and paragraph you are commenting on:**

x Draft Local Plan: Strategy and Sites  
☐ Sustainability Appraisal

**Page number/s:**\* **113**

**Section/Policy number:**\* **BE4 Pollution**

**Paragraph:** Click here to enter text.

**Do you support, oppose or have general comments about this part of the document?**\*  
☐ Support  
☐ Oppose  
x Comment

**Please provide your comments below:** \*

Pollution BE6 page 113 The plan notes that the foul sewage network is inadequate in certain areas to meet demand. As a direct result, pollution is occurring in some residential areas and polluting discharges occur into the river. The plan needs to undertake a complete review of the Thames Water network in the vicinity of the River Whitewater and before committing to developments should ascertain the level of investment required to meet projected demand for foul drainage. The plan should make sure that financial contributions arising from developments near to the river should in part be directed towards mitigating the detrimental impact of such developments.

**Do you wish to comment on another part of the consultation?** \*

☐ Yes  
x No

If Yes, please copy and paste and complete the comments section as before.

**Equality monitoring questions –** Please note thatthese fields are not mandatory.

The information that you provide below will help us identify which different demographic groups have engaged with this consultation.

**How would you describe your ethnic group?**☐ White  
☐ Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups  
☐ Asian or Asian British  
☐ Black or Black British  
☐ Other – please specify Click here to enter text.  
☐ I would rather not answer

If White please complete:  
☐ White British  
☐ White Irish  
☐ White Traveller (including Gypsy, Roma or Irish traveller)  
☐ Other White background

If Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups please complete:  
☐ White and Asian  
☐ White and Black African  
☐ White and Black Caribbean  
☐ Other Mixed background

If Asian or Asian British please complete:  
☐ Nepalese  
☐ Bangladeshi  
☐ Indian  
☐ Pakistani  
☐ Chinese  
☐ Other Asian background

If Black or Black British please complete:  
☐ African  
☐ Caribbean  
☐ Other Black background

**Do you consider yourself to have a disability as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (2005)?**

Definition: A person has a disability for the purposes of this Act if s/he has a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on her/his ability to carry out day-to-day activities.

☐ Yes   
☐ No  
☐ Don’t know  
☐ I would rather not answer

**What is your gender?**☐ Male  
☐ Female  
☐ I would rather not answer

**In which age category are you?**☐ Under 18  
☐ 18 – 24   
☐ 25 – 34   
☐ 35 – 44   
☐ 45 – 54  
☐ 55 – 64   
☐ 65 – 74  
☐ 75 +  
☐ I would rather not answer

**Thank you for completing this form.**

Please email this response to [planningpolicy@hart.go.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@hart.go.uk) or send it to Planning Policy, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE.