



**Local Plan: Core Strategy 2011-2029  
Pre-Submission Consultation**

Ref:

**Representations Form**

**(For official use  
only)**

**Please return completed forms to:**

- Planning Policy Team, Hart District Council, Harlington Way, Fleet, Hampshire GU51 4AE
- or by email to [planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk)
- or by fax to: 01252 774410

**Responses must be received by 5pm 7th January 2013**

**This form has two parts:**

**Part A:** Personal Details

**Part B:** Your representations.

- Please complete Part B of this form for each representation you wish to make. You do not need to complete Part A more than once, but please ensure you state your name or organisation as applicable at the top of each Part B form you submit.
- Please refer to the attached guidance notes on making representations so that they address issues of legal compliance and/or soundness.
- Please note that when representations are submitted only Part B of the form will be published. Contact details on Part A will not be published.

# Part A

## I. Personal Details\*

\*If an agent is appointed please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

## 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Mrs	
First Name	Christine	
Last Name	Randall	
Job Title (if applicable)	Deputy Clerk	
Organisation (if applicable)	Hook Parish Council	
Address Line 1	Community Centre	
Address Line 2	Ravenscroft	
Address Line 3	Hook	
Address Line 4	Hampshire	
Postcode	RG27 9NN	
Telephone Number	01256 768687	
E-mail address	<a href="mailto:christine.randall@hook.gov.uk">christine.randall@hook.gov.uk</a>	

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	POLICY CS3 AND KEY DIAGRAM
---	----------------------------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**1. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

- a. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No
- b. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**2. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- a. Positively Prepared**
- b. Justified**
- c. Effective**
- d. Consistent with national policy**

**3. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

<p><b>POLICY CS3 AND KEY DIAGRAM</b></p> <p>Hook Parish Council (HPC) accepts that it will be necessary for some of the 4,253 net additional dwellings proposed for Hart District 2011 – 2029 to be located in Hook. It considers, however, that the total of 600 is too great a figure and that it should be reduced to about 200. In its objections to the 2011 draft core strategy, the parish council expressed its concerns that the impact of such a large number of houses on Hook had not been fully taken into account. The draft Local Plan (DLP) has not done so either.</p>
---

The Key Diagram on page 27 of the DLP sets out the numbers of dwellings proposed for each of the main settlements. HPC is concerned with the disproportionate amount proposed for Hook in comparison with that proposed for other settlements, especially Fleet. Table 1 below summarises the existing and future population figures based on the proposed numbers.

### Proposed Comparative Growth Rates

Settlement	Existing Population <sup>1</sup>	Proposed Additional Dwellings	Resulting Additional <sup>2</sup> Population	% Increase
Fleet	37,583 (50.0%)	653 (907)	1,125	4.2%
Yateley	14,649 (19.4%)	162 (352)	389	2.7%
Blackwater	9,461 (12.5%)	0 (226)	0	0.0%
Hook	7,530 (10.0%)	600 (181)	1,440	19.1%
Hartley Wintney	4,281 (5.6%)	220 (102)	528	12.3%
Odiham	1,947 (2.6%)	180 (47)	432	22.2%
Total	75,541	1,815	3,914	

This shows that only Odiham has a higher proposed increase in population than Hook but both are substantially higher than all the rest particularly the main settlement of Fleet. The percentage figures in brackets under the existing population heading show that settlement as a proportion of the total figure. The figures in brackets under the proposed additional Dwellings heading are what the additional numbers would be if they were allocated on a *pro rata* basis according to existing population size. Fleet comprises half of the existing population but is allocated only 36% (653 as a % of 1,815) just a little bit more than the same number for Hook which is one-fifth the size.

Interestingly, the number proposed for Fleet in the Preferred Approach for Consultation Core Strategy, July 2011 - before the May 2012 council election - was 1,040 dwellings broadly commensurate with its population size.

### Sustainability Appraisal

In July 2011 Hart Council produced a Sustainability Appraisal Report<sup>3</sup>. Paragraph 19 of the Non-Technical Summary set out the main options for greenfield development. These were:

- “Option 1) Extend Fleet;*
- Option 2) Extend Fleet, Blackwater, Yateley and Hook (Hart’s four main settlements);*
- Option 3) Extend Fleet, Blackwater, Yateley, Hook, Hartley Wintney, and Odiham (Hart’s six main settlements);*
- Option 4) Extend all settlements (broadly reflecting their current scale);*
- Option 5) Allocate a new settlement at Winchfield.”*

<sup>1</sup> The existing population figures are given in Appendix 1 on page 19 of the Background Paper, “A Settlement Hierarchy for Hart District”, January 2010.

<sup>2</sup> The population figures ascribed to the proposed new dwelling numbers are based on an average household size of 2.4 persons as set out in the Office for National Statistics Statistical Bulletin “Families and Households, 2001 to 2011”.

<sup>3</sup> Sustainability Appraisal Report (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment), Core Strategy Development Plan Document Preferred Approach, Regulation 25

Paragraph 20 went on to say:

*“No single option clearly scored better than another. Options 1-4 were all considered appropriate options. Option 5 was not considered appropriate as the amount of development likely to be allocated at Winchfield would probably be insufficient to improve existing service provision to a standard required for a new settlement. There are very few existing services and facilities in Winchfield therefore significant improvements would be necessary, which may be at the expense of other Council objectives e.g. provision of affordable housing, and sustainable construction.”*

And paragraph 21 concluded:

*“The Council has selected Option 4 as the most appropriate option for greenfield development as this is likely to make the best use of existing infrastructure capacity. This will allow significant resources to be targeted at delivering the larger strategic allocations where maximum community gain and infrastructure improvements can be secured.”*

Hook Parish Council concurs with this strategic approach in that it proposes an extension of all settlements – **reflecting their current scale**. But as is shown by the figures in Table 1 above this is precisely the opposite of what the DLP actually does. The bulk of development is directed away from the larger settlements, Fleet in particular. The actual strategic approach is accordingly unsound in that it is not justified in that it is not supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.

It is useful to consider the relevant parts of the Sustainability Appraisal in more detail. Paragraph 24 sets out seven options for strategic locations. These include four at Fleet and three at Hook although there is no underlying analysis as to why Hook is the only settlement other than Fleet to be considered suitable for strategic development. In paragraph 25 it states, *“there was no perfect location for relatively large scale development.”*

Paragraph 27 then concludes that of the potential locations around Fleet, locations 1, 2 and 3 performed the best,

*“but Strategic Location 1 could be considered isolated from the rest of the settlement in landscape terms, and there are several constraints at location 3, **therefore location 2 was preferred**. However, it was stressed that the northern parts of both locations 2 and 3 were preferred over the southern parts. **Development of the northern parts of locations 2 and 3 would, amongst other things, retain a gap between Fleet and Crookham Village.**”* (emphasis added)

Then in November 2012, The District Council issued its Pre-Submission Plan and the accompanying SA<sup>4</sup>. The Pre-Submission draft now completely excludes Strategic Option 2 (The West Fleet Area). The ostensible reasons for this deletion are set out in paragraph 32. In particular, following consultation on the Core Strategy: Preferred Approach:

*“Significant concerns were raised by the public over the environmental and traffic impacts that would arise from development in this area, which is perceived as a very important rural gap between Hart’s largest town Fleet/Church Crookham, and the attractive small settlement of Crookham Village.”*

So, whereas in the Preferred Approach, development in this area would retain a gap, it will not now do so. The landscape hasn’t changed and the evidence hasn’t changed. All that has changed is that there was an election in

---

<sup>4</sup> Sustainability Report (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) Local Plan: Core Strategy Pre-Submission Version, November 2012.

May 2011 when a number of local candidates opposed to this development were elected to the council and whereby the Conservative Group lost its overall majority.

There is also no new evidence in respect of traffic impacts which would make what was previously acceptable at West Fleet now not acceptable. Indeed, if perceived traffic impacts are to be taken as a sound reason for omitting a strategic site then that argument applies with even greater force to north east Hook.

For these reasons, HPC is of the view that the DLP is unsound in that the proposed distribution of development is not supported by the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and that the figure for Hook should be reduced to 200 with the other 400 being redistributed elsewhere in the District.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

1. The Key Diagram should be amended by replacing the figure of 600 dwellings for Hook with 200.
2. The figure of 100 dwellings for Hook in Table 6 should be deleted.

These two changes would bring the DLP into line with the Sustainability Appraisal that concluded that Option 4 was the most sustainable option (“Extend all settlements (broadly reflecting their current scale)”)”

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**3. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

- a. **Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public
- b. **No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**4. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

This matter raises a number of inter-related issues which can only be properly and fully addressed at the Examination in Public.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	Policy CS11
---	-------------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**5. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

- c. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No
- d. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**6. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- e. Positively Prepared**
- f. Justified**
- g. Effective**
- h. Consistent with national policy**

**7. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

<p><b>POLICY CS11; INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>HPC has observed that much of the infrastructure of Hart District is defective with respect to the Parish of Hook. We are concerned that the services (Gas, Water, Electricity and Sewage Removal) currently provided are incapable of supporting long-term provision to Hook as currently installed. As such the system will not provide for a further 600 Houses without considerable upgrading.</p>
---

## **Water Supply**

The Loddon CAMS (Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy) 2003 states that much of the area is over abstracted. Abstraction is currently licensed at 6.82 MI/d (megalitres per day); actual abstraction ranges between 5 and 6.4 MI/d, and the average abstraction is 5.7 MI/d. This abstraction supplies many communities in Hart and is having a serious impact on the ecology of the area. The Loddon CAMS (September 2003) classified the entire Loddon area as suffering from severe water stress (see also Hart Water Cycle Study Scoping Report page 48, figure 5.2 and pages 51-52).

In view of this position, unless Hart Council can demonstrate that domestic water can be provided from other sources, HPC believes it is unsustainable, and unsupportable, to build more dwellings in any location in the district that depends on this water source. It follows that further building at Hook is unsupportable unless water supplies can be provided from another source.

## **Sewage Effluent**

HPC is particularly concerned that raw sewage is regularly transported by road tanker from the Hook Holt Lane Sewage Treatment Works to the Chineham Sewage Treatment Works because of insufficient pumping capacity at the Hook Plant. Currently there is a risk that sewage can - and has been known to - overflow and ultimately pollute the River Whitewater. Quite apart from the regular escape of malodorous gases for which Holt Lane has now become infamous, transportation to Chineham provides a continuing risk of accidents and pollution. It is understood that the pumping station is currently operating within capacity but is unreliable and beyond practical repair. Its actual capacity is accordingly considerably less than its design capacity. It follows that all effluent from new housing would have to be transported to Chineham, greatly increasing the risks.

It is, therefore, essential that extra sewage pumping capacity be provided prior to any new build commencing. A major failure of this pumping station could become a health hazard. HPC understands that a scheme has been prepared but has yet to see any of the relevant information,

## **Hart Water Cycle Study**

It is also essential that the issues of abstraction and sewage treatment are the subject of a full Hart Water Cycle Study and that the results will lead to a long-needed update of the services in Hook **before** any work commences on the further increasing of the number of dwellings in Hook.

## **Gas and Electricity Provision**

The core infrastructure for gas and electricity in Hook depends on a system that dates from the very beginning of the provision of these services to the area, and has been added to over many years. Virtually every major storm causes faults to occur, leading to outages across large areas of Hook. These are only preventable by a major overhaul, which must obviously be done before increasing the loading on both services by up to 20%.

Hook Parish Council is of the view that the DLP is unsound in this respect unless and until it has seen evidence to demonstrate that the existing infrastructure deficiencies can be overcome so as to enable the proposed level of housing at Hook to be delivered in a satisfactory manner.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

8. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

9. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?

- c. Yes I wish to participate at the Examination in Public
- d. No I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

10. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	Policy CS13
---	-------------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**11. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

- e. **Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No
- f. **Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**12. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| i. <b>Positively Prepared</b>             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. <b>Justified</b>                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| k. <b>Effective</b>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| l. <b>Consistent with national policy</b> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**13. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

**POLICY CS13: TRANSPORT**

Hook Parish Council does not have the professional expertise to provide a detailed response in respect of this policy but nevertheless wishes to bring the following main points to the Inspector's attention.

One of the supporting documents is the M3 Study<sup>5</sup>. The summary states:

*"The Transport Evaluation for the M3 Corridor study is a cross-authority study to consider the cumulative impacts of future development along the M3 corridor specifically between M3 Junction 3 (Lightwater) and M3 Junction 4a*

<sup>5</sup> Transport Assessment for the M3 Corridor J3-4A Joint LDF Study (no date is apparent for this document)

(Farnborough). The study assists in assessing the sensitivity of both the Strategic Route Network (SRN) and Local Road Network (LRN), including classified A and B roads, to the likely additional traffic generated by committed and planned residential and commercial development as proposed in the emerging Core Strategies of the Local Development Frameworks (LDF) for the following local authorities:

- Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC) - Hampshire
- Hart District Council (HDC) - Hampshire
- Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) - Surrey

Within the LDF process there is a requirement to undertake assessments to evaluate the highway impacts of such development. This joint work is required to satisfy and inform the Highways Agency responsible for the SRN, and both Hampshire County Council and Surrey County Council the designated highway authorities for Hampshire and Surrey's LRN, on the ability of the highway network to cope with the additional traffic demand and subsequently to assist in identifying specific locations which may either require additional infrastructure provision or further investigation to identify deliverable mitigation or demand management measures." (emphasis added)

By its very title, however, it does not fully address the planned residential and commercial development in the emerging Hart District Core Strategy in that it completely ignores the impact of the proposed 600 houses for Hook on Junction 5 of the M3. That junction is already extremely busy at peak hours. This is for two main reasons:

- The Bartley Wood business park in the south east corner of Hook has recently become very occupied. This results in extensive queues using Junction 5 at peak times.
- In addition, there is a considerable amount of traffic between J5 of the M3 and J11 of the M4 which goes directly through Hook (via the B3349 and A33) and across the Griffin Way roundabout onto the M3. This roundabout is also the junction with the east-west route along the A30. The proposed accesses into both the strategic north east Hook site and the convenience store are located along the B3349 and the A30 very close to this critical junction.

The sensitivity of this junction to even more traffic movements is acknowledged in another background document<sup>6</sup>. Paragraphs on pages 8 and 9 state:

*"The Infrastructure Assessment has identified widespread traffic congestion on the Hart District highway network in 2026 **without** the developments considered in this report. The main locations with capacity difficulties are:*

- .....
- A30 either side of Hook

*"Any developments which add significant volumes of traffic to these links will need to be considered carefully. These developments are:*

- All Hook developments, due to the potential impacts on the A30 and the B3349 Griffin Road." (emphasis added)

The parish council has not seen any evidence at either a strategic or a local level which demonstrates that the impact of the proposed developments on this already congested junction can be satisfactorily mitigated. It considers therefore this part of the Local Plan to be unsound in that it is unjustified in that it is not supported by a robust evidence base.

<sup>6</sup> HTP "Preliminary Transport Assessment", April 2010

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**14. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**15. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

- e. **Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public
- f. **No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**16. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	CS15
---	------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**17. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

**g. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No

**h. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**18. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- m. Positively Prepared**
- n. Justified**
- o. Effective**
- p. Consistent with national policy**

**19. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

**POLICY CS15: WATER QUALITY**

HPC strongly supports this policy and considers that it should be followed in full in relation to the proposed development at north east Hook.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**20. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**21. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

**g. Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**h. No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**22. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	CS16
---	------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**23. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

- i. **Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No
- j. **Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**24. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- q. **Positively Prepared**
- r. **Justified**
- s. **Effective**
- t. **Consistent with national policy**

**25. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

<p><b>POLICY CS16: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>HPC strongly supports this policy and considers that it should be followed in full in relation to the proposed development at north east Hook.</p>
---

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**26. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**27. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

- i. **Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public
- j. **No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**28. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	
----------------------	--

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	CS19
---	------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**29. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

**k. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No

**l. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.*

*\*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**30. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- u. Positively Prepared**
- v. Justified**
- w. Effective**
- x. Consistent with national policy**

**31. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

<p><b>POLICY CS19: DESIGN</b></p> <p>HPC strongly supports this policy and considers that it should be followed in full in relation to the proposed development at north east Hook.</p>
---

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**32. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**33. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

**k. Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**l. No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**34. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	CS20
---	------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**35. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

**m. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No

**n. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value. \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**36. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- y. Positively Prepared**
- z. Justified**
- aa. Effective**
- bb. Consistent with national policy**

**37. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

**POLICY CS20: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION**

HPC strongly supports this policy and considers that it should be followed in full in relation to the proposed development at north east Hook.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**38. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**39. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

m. **Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public

n. **No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**40. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation	Hook Parish Council
----------------------	---------------------

**3. What part of the Local Plan: Core Strategy (including Policies Maps document) does your comment relate to?**

e.g. Policy Reference, Paragraph, Map title	Policy CS23
---	-------------

*If your comment does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.*

**41. Do you consider that the Local Plan: Core Strategy is:**

- o. Legally compliant\*?**  
 Yes  No
- p. Sound\*?**  
 Yes  No

*To check a box when completing this form electronically, double click on it and select 'checked' under default value.  
 \*Please refer to the attached note for guidance on legal requirements and soundness.*

*If you have entered **No** to Q4.b. please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances please go to Q6.*

**42. Do you consider the Local Plan: Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:**

- cc. Positively Prepared**
- dd. Justified**
- ee. Effective**
- ff. Consistent with national policy**

**43. Please support your response to Question 4/Question 5 by explaining why you think the Local Plan: Core Strategy is, or is not, legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.**

**POLICY CS23: NORTH EAST HOOK**

Hook Parish Council accepts that there will need to be some development at Hook but as indicated in detail in the response to Policy CS3 and the Key Diagram, and Policy CS13, is concerned at the scale of the development proposed which it considers to be unsound in that it is not justified by the supporting evidence either in terms of the general location or in the number proposed. Strategic Location 5 (North East Hook) is assessed on pages 84 to 86 of Appendix 7 of the SA. It starts off by saying that the location could provide up to 1,800 houses but then proposes 500 houses without any assessment of alternative numbers. Where is the evidence in support of 500?

HPC considers that, taking into account the underlying approach in the SA and the already very congested highway network, a more appropriate and justifiable figure is 200 dwellings in total.

Hook Parish Council wishes to make it clear, however, that if notwithstanding its objections, the Inspector eventually supports Policy CS3, the Key Diagram (and Table 6) as they relate to Hook, and Policy CS23, the parish council will work in a positive manner with both Hart District Council and the developers to ensure the most beneficial outcome for the residents of Hook. In this context it has the following comments to make on Policy CS23 as drafted:

1. As drafted the policy is too loose. The word *“approximately”* in sub-paragraph a) should be replaced by *“not more than”*.
2. Sub-paragraphs b) and c) are confusing in respect of the provision of community facilities. Sub-paragraph b) refers to *“associated changing facilities”*, and sub-paragraph c) refers to land for a *“community facility (approximately 0.35 hectares)”*. It is not clear whether this is meant to be the same thing or two separate items. Further clarification is given in paragraph 211 and it would be better if the policy was amended accordingly so as to avoid any possible confusion. HPC is strongly of the view that land should be provided adjacent to the proposed sports pitches of a sufficient size to accommodate a *“sports barn”* which can also include changing facilities.
3. The policy is deficient in that it makes no reference to an appropriate amount of car parking to serve those facilities.
4. If development is to take place as proposed in Policy CS23, HPC supports the principle of a convenience store in that location but only if it can be demonstrated that there would be no unacceptably detrimental impact of the village centre and only if the severe traffic problems can be satisfactorily addressed.
5. It is not clear what are the *“primary objectives”* for the site mentioned in the second bullet point under sub-paragraph ii).

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**44. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan: Core Strategy legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5. You will need to say why this change will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

The words *“approximately 500 new homes”* should be replaced with *“no more than 200 new houses”*.

If this change is not supported by the Inspector, amendments should be made to the policy in response to the matters set out in bullet points 1 – 5 above.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Planning Inspector, based on the matter and issues he/she identifies for examination**

**45. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the Examination in Public?**

- o. Yes** I wish to participate at the Examination in Public
- p. No** I do not wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**46. If you wish to participate at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

This matter raises a number of inter-related issues which can only be properly and fully addressed at the Examination in Public.

(attach separate sheets as necessary)

**Please note** the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the Examination in Public

**Please ensure you have printed your name or organisation at the top of this form**

## **Representation Form Guidance Notes**

Representations made within the consultation period will be considered alongside the submitted Local Plan: Core Strategy as part of an examination by an independent planning inspector. The purpose of the examination is to establish whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with **legal requirements**, and whether it is **sound**.

### **Representations should therefore focus on legal compliance and soundness.**

If you wish to make a comment seeking to change the Local Plan: Core Strategy, you should make clear in what way you consider it is not legally compliant or sound. You should try to support your comment by providing evidence and supporting information showing why it should be changed. It will be helpful if you also say precisely how you think it should be changed.

For the plan to be **legally compliant** it must:

- be prepared in accordance with:
  - the Council's Local Development Scheme (a timetable for plan preparation);
  - the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (which includes the Council's policy for community engagement on Local Plans) and
  - relevant Acts and Regulations; in particular the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;
- have been subject to sustainability appraisal;
- have regard to:
  - national policies, advice and guidance issued by the Secretary of State; and
  - the Hampshire Sustainable Community Strategy and the Hart Sustainable Community Strategy;
- be in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (The South East Plan);
- meet legal requirements under the Duty to Co-operate (introduced via the Localism Act 2011).

**Soundness** is explained in the National Planning Policy Framework. For a plan to be sound it must be:

- **Positively prepared** - the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy based on a robust and credible evidence base;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period;
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Where there are groups who share a common view on how they wish to see the Local Plan: Core Strategy changed, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single comment rather than for a large number of individuals to send in separate comments which repeat the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.