

## Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee Meeting – 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018

Those present: CF, MS, AG, CH, CR, TB, JS

Apologies: JM, DC, DH

The main purpose of the meeting was to commence the review of the feedback from the survey monkey put in place to record comments related to the Regulation 14 process of the plan and the document produced by Becky Hopkinson was used for this.

As an aid to agreeing feedback the Steering Group had been asked in advance to summarise common themes from the feedback and this is below using the comments as provided.

### 1. Strategic gaps/Green spaces

1.1 Several comments seem to mention the need to ensure strategic gaps are maintained all around the village in order to safeguard the village identity. Although the NP plan mentions "Green Gaps" I think we should consider to what extent we can strengthen this part of the plan to take account of the concerns several seem to share. We have to be careful to avoid being accused of just trying to just block development but no doubt Liz can advise us in this regard. You may have read the Opinion from "We Heart Hart" in the News & Mail this week. Interestingly a specific reference was made to the fact that the HDC Policies in the Local Plan "...contain a number of strategic gaps around the district but leave Hartley Wintney totally exposed with no strategic gaps planned".

1.2 Green Gaps are seen as vitally important. We have included this in Objective 10. There is concern that Hart District have not defined gaps for Hartley Wintney in their plan. However, the Hart Plan Section 274 has asked the Neighbourhood Plans to define the Green Gaps. Should we be specifying other gaps in addition to Murrell Green as requested in some comments? eg from Hartley Row Park to Elvetham Heath boundary.

1.3 There are a few comments on maintaining green spaces within the village in addition to those in Policy 6, Objective 8. Those mentioned are the field next to Church View and the fields near The Grange.

1.4 Recognise the green space in Church View

1.5 Increase no of green gaps / preserve them. New strategic gaps

1.6 Expand protected view from the west to give some protection from Murrell Green

### 2. Traffic management

2.1 As expected there are numerous comments regarding traffic (many of the views I share) I understand there is little we can do as far as the NP is concerned. If this is still the case maybe the Parish Council should appear to be more proactive in this regard, especially as they are the promoters of the NP, and indicate they are aware of local concerns and what they are going to do about them (or are doing) although they can't form part of the local plan.

2.2 Many comments on parking in the village and specifically Hartford Road and Green Lane. We have covered the topic in Section 7 but should we include these two roads as requiring particular attention?

2.3 The poor quality of public transport is a theme as is the very limited parking available at Winchfield Station. We discussed this in section 7.6. Should we include an aspiration to press for a regular shuttle to the Station, instead of just rush hours?

2.4 Impact of new settlement on traffic, traffic calming in Bracknell Lane, parking on residential roads

2.5 Address inadequate public transport Housing estates size

### 3. Housing Developments Size

3.1 There seems to be some confusion as to why, when we are only now proposing a total of 23 new houses we still state that no development should exceed 50 units. I understand the reasons for us setting a limit but it might be best to ask Liz to comment on any revision of wording especially as some of the "developer" comments seem to refer to this figure as being a cap that should not be in the plan.

3.2 There is confusion on the reason for choosing a maximum of 50 houses for any development, especially since our total proposed housing is only 23. This was of course the figure suggested in public consultation early in the 3.3 process. (I feel it should be kept as it is to prevent large developments at the 5 yearly reviews of the Plan.)

3.3 Reduce maximum of 50 houses in a development

3.4 Ensure 23 new homes is a maximum / no new developments in an already full core to the village

#### 4. Cycleways and Footpaths

4.1 Our policy 12 is headed Cycleways and Footpaths. Some have commented that Cycleways are not otherwise described. They would like to see more about planned Cycleways. At one stage we talked about the Hook to Hartley Wintney Cycleway. Should this be included as a planned construction? Other Cycleways are needed, especially Fleet Road and the A30.

4.2 Need for cycle lanes, cycle lane to Fleet, cycle and foot-ways policy only addresses footpaths, need for shared cycle/foot-ways

#### 5. Document improvement

5.1 Distinctive View E: We need to emphasise that this shows the Hartley Wintney view. The view at the other side of the A30 is in Winchfield Parish.

5.2 The quality of Fig 24 needs to be improved. Also, some have suggested that the Conservation Area boundary has been modified recently. Is this factually correct?

5.3 Fig 24 conservation area map not legible and needs to incorporate recent extension

5.4 SEA Conservation area map page 56 out of date, not encompassing recent boundary changes

#### 6. Proposed Sites

6.1 It appears that some have picked up on the apparent conflict between our desire to protect existing businesses and avoid change of use in the village core whilst at the same time identifying Nero Brewery (a significant local employment site) and Pools Yard as residential development sites. We have previously discussed this "conflict" at our meetings so maybe we need to consider adding some form of words that indicates change of use will only be supported where it can be proven there is no longer any local need for the premises to be used for commercial purpose.

6.2 Remove rural exception scheme support

6.3 Fewer residences on pools /nero to reduce parking, more car parking, new development must provide adequate car parking

6.4 James Farm is greenfield – why being allowed? Will put extra traffic on West Green Rd / Arrow Lane

6.5 Allow development at Taplins cottage, Grange Farm, Wintney Court, Riverside Farm and new site Oakfield Farm!

6.6 Avoid a new town development / Hartley WinchHook

#### 7. Other comments

7.1 Some have said that the Health Service and Chemist are already overloaded. Do we need to include more on this in our Plan? (My view is that it would be difficult to argue for this with only 23 more houses.)

7.2 Village health service overloaded

7.3 More street lighting, esp east end of village

7.4 Need for a site for youth centre

The above comments were then reviewed in detail together with some feedback that DH had provided in advance to determine the view of the Steering Group in formulating agreed responses and actions to the Reg 14 comments.

A number of agents acting on behalf of landowners had provided detailed responses outside of the

survey monkey process. These were not discussed at the meeting.

### **Next steps**

JS offered to produce a first draft of the responses/actions that the SG thought they could perform and then the SG would be asked to review and provide further feedback.

The Steering Group will be asking LB to respond on the following where more detailed understanding of the specific comments made is needed:

6702835654.00 this relates to Elvetham Chase

6702824695.00 this relates to Elvetham Chase

6702811162.00 this relates to Elvetham Chase

6700096801.00 this relates to Grange Lane

6684209557.00 this relates to Taplins Farm

6673485540.00 this relates to Taplins Farm

6659617300.00 this relates to Oakfield Farm

6659573469.00 non-specific comments but likely to relate to Taplins Farm

and the specific paper responses related to Lowfields, Taplins Farm, Oakfield Farm, Wintney Court, Pools Yard, Winchfield Garden Community and Grange Farm

The response recently received from HDC has raised issues related to the 3 proposed sites in the plan and these need to be reviewed as a matter of urgency. A copy of their comments is attached and the SG are requested to review and comment on this.

**2. Date of next meeting - no date was set. This will be set when the work on responses and actions is complete.**